

AGENDA

ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES May 31, 2017

EPICENTER MEETING ROOM (1-453)
13805 -58th STREET N.
Largo, FL

SPECIAL MEETING: 9:00 AM

The Board of Trustees of St. Petersburg College met on Wednesday, May 31, 2017 at the St. Petersburg College EpiCenter, 13805 – 58th Street N., Largo, Florida. The following Board members were present: Chair Bill Foster, Vice Chair Nathan Stonecipher, Katie Cole, Bridgette Bello, and Deveron Gibbons. Also present were William D. Law, Jr., President of St. Petersburg College and Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Joseph H. Lang, Board Attorney, and Suzanne Gardner, St. Petersburg College Attorney. Proof of public notice of this meeting is included as part of these minutes. Notices were duly posted.

I. CALL TO ORDER

- A. Invocation
- B. Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was convened by Chair Foster at 9:01 a.m. The invocation was given by Chairman Foster and was immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. COMMENTS

- A. Board Chair
- B. Board Members
- C. Public Comment pursuant to §286.0105 FS

Chairman Foster expressed that it is an exciting day in the history of St. Petersburg College and he is glad everyone is here. He added that this was an arduous process for the Board of Trustees, but before they started interviewing the five candidates, there was a Selection Committee chaired by Mr. Terry Brett. Chairman Foster thanked Mr. Brett and the committee members for their service.

Chairman Foster said the selection process brought five extremely well qualified, very talented candidates, and it was the honor of the Board to have interviewed each one. He commented that many people who were present at today's meeting had an opportunity to meet the candidates during their campus visits. Chairman Foster thanked everyone who participated in the process.

Chairman Foster noted that the Board read the surveys, their interviews were open to the public, and their videos were posted. He stated he hoped everyone had a chance to see the interviews which were each an hour and a half long. He stated the Board asked very pointed questions during the interviews and he is certain they will select the new president at this meeting, although they have big shoes to fill.

Chairman Foster stated that community colleges are changing, under attack by the legislature, and St. Petersburg College is there to meet the immediate and future needs of the community. He expressed his excitement by stating that the next President, like Dr. Bill Law, will be one that will take us into the future with great ideas.

Chairman Foster invited Trustee Nathan Stonecipher to add his comments.

Mr. Stonecipher thanked everyone and stated this was one of the big decisions in the life of this institution. He said that St. Petersburg College is a beacon in our community to make lives just a little better and improve upon what they have. He stated that it seemed like a long process, but it has flown by quickly and they are at the end of process.

Mr. Stonecipher stated that the vetting process was thorough and got them to this point with 5 outstanding candidates to be the next leader of St. Petersburg College. He commented that the work done by both the Search Committee and the Board of Trustees was thorough, in depth, and took up a lot of time that they loved to give since this is extremely important for the community.

Mr. Stonecipher stated they are looking for someone to carry on the mission of the college that is putting students first, focusing on student success, and making sure it enriches the community we live in. He noted that this decision was about who can best do that and lead them forward with vision, excitement, get to the end goal, and be able to roll up their sleeves and get a little dirty if needed. Also, who not only puts students' needs first, but balance and attend to the needs of faculty, staff, and administrators. He agreed with Chairman Foster that the next president has big shoes to fill and said to Dr. Law that he will be missed, but that the next president has quite an example to follow as the leader of this school.

Mr. Stonecipher concluded by saying that as the candidate list went down to 20, then 10, then to the final 5 candidates, his list of who was on top has shuffled many times as they have thought more about this.

Chairman Foster stated that Trustee Cole had a death in her family and she will be joining the meeting late. He noted they will continue with Board comments and will recess until she arrives as this is too important of a decision to not have all of the Trustees present.

Chairman Foster invited Trustee Bello to share her comments.

Ms. Bridgette Bello stated she hires and fires people every day and was not fully aware of the impact this decision would have on her personally and the weight of this decision. She promised she has spent a ton of time reading and she also has the best interest of the college, students, faculty, and staff. She thanked Chairman Foster for his invocation as it was a great reminder as to how this needs to go. She also thanked them for bringing her back on the Board to help with the selection process, and she is honored to be trusted with this decision.

Chairman Foster invited Trustee Gibbons to share his comments.

Mr. Deveron Gibbons stated that this was a fair and equitable process. He shared that he has not slept since Friday because he has been reviewing the material, watching the videos, and looked over 300 comments given by people around the community and the college. He

stated this is a tough decision but that is why they are here. He reiterated the words from the prayer of wisdom, discernment, and guidance as to how they need to make today's decision.

Chairman Foster asked for comments from the public.

Darlene Westburg, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, thanked the Board of Trustees for being here and going through this process. She stated she hoped they will take into account the survey that the faculty filled out. She shared that there 167 responses out of 374 faculty and they placed their heart and soul in the survey. She reiterated that she hopes they will take their comments into consideration when they make their decision.

Mr. Gibbons stated he read all of the 167 comments, but did not get a copy of what the question was.

Ms. Westburg responded they were instructed to pick their top two candidates and they could write a comment in the box.

Chairman Foster asked for a recess at 9:10 a.m. to reach out to Trustee Cole and determine when she will arrive.

Ms. Cole arrived and Chairman Foster called the meeting back to order at 9:18 a.m.

Chairman Foster invited Trustee Cole to share her comments.

Trustee Cole apologized for her delay in joining the meeting because of her family circumstances and that she was glad to be here. She noted that she joined the Board at an opportune time to participate in this selection process. She thanked Mr. Brett for the work he and the Search Committee did in advance and she thoroughly enjoyed meeting four of the five candidates. She noted that she was unable to attend Dr. Frank Biafora's interview. She expressed her appreciation of the candor of the comments from the faculty, students, and community members during the interview process.

III. BOARD DISCUSSION REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL FINALISTS:

- Dr. Frank Biafora, Dean and Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg
- Dr. Edward Bonahue, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Santa Fe College, Gainesville
- Dr. James Henningsen, President, College of Central Florida, Ocala
- Dr. Stan Vittetoe, Provost, St. Petersburg College, Clearwater
- Dr. Tonjua Williams, Senior Vice President, St. Petersburg College, St. Petersburg

Chairman Foster reminded the Board that majority carries when they vote for the next president. He noted that when one candidate gets three votes, he or she will become the next president. He stated that although it may be unorthodox, he would like a motion to confirm that vote. He recommended that the entire Board confirm this selection unanimously as it will send a strong message that they are all on the same page.

Chairman Foster stated he would like everyone on the Board to go to the white board and write down their two top candidates. He shared that he has not made up his mind and he may be swayed because there are five strong candidates. He noted there may be some who are not in the top two so he would like to focus just on the top two.

Ms. Bello requested that the Board has a discussion before they share their top candidates and she noted that at this time she has three top candidates.

Chairman Foster agreed to have a discussion.

Ms. Bello stated she wants to hear what the other members of the Board have to say as there has been no conversation up to this point although they have all had access to the same information from the applications, surveys, and interviews.

Chairman Foster opened it up to the Board for comments about the candidates.

Chairman Foster stated every candidate did a great job. He noted that their introductory videos gave him a certain level of expectation and then some were strong on paper and got to the interview and they were underwhelming, but that he got to his top two. He shared that the interviewing process evolved from their first interview with Dr. Bonahue, he learned as he went, and he took written notes.

Chairman Foster went back and studied Dr. Bonahue's interview and thought he was balanced, steady, and experienced. He noted they only got to ask him three questions and it went a little long, but he did a good job. He stated Dr. Williams had by far, the best interview, and she was extremely well prepared and obviously knows the college very well.

Chairman Foster said that Dr. Biafora was bright, fresh, local, and an external candidate who did a great job and has good vision. He stated that Dr. Vittetoe was polished, very strong with ideas on the budget. He said they focused on students, faculty, budget, programs, relationship, and vision, and they all had strengths and weaknesses. He thought Dr. Vittetoe did a great job.

Chairman Foster stated it was an odd interview with Dr. Henningsen because they only got three questions out and he was not sure he answered each one. Dr. Henningsen was strong on video and paper, but was a little underwhelming, and after the interview, there was no socialization, and it left him cold. Chairman Foster stated that after the five interviews, he narrowed down his top two choices to Dr. Bonahue and Dr. Williams.

Mr. Stonecipher stated he did something similar and took his handwritten notes and translated them to a Word document to be more manageable. He concurred with the Chair that there were many pros and cons with each candidate, some were a lot more obvious than others.

Mr. Stonecipher said he also rewatched Dr. Bonahue's interview because it seemed like it was a long time ago. Dr. Bonahue said that he would sell St. Pete College 24/7 and he was strong talking about personal touch, face-to-face, getting in the trenches, and solid about building a brand. Mr. Stonecipher stressed that Dr. Bonahue's onboarding process and navigating the college experience would work well here. He said Dr. Bonahue seemed a

little more rehearsed than the other interviews, and he is a very deliberate thinker, which is good in many ways, but can also be a hindrance. Mr. Stonecipher stated another concern that Dr. Bonahue lacked a little with his understanding of negotiating deals with multiple parties whether it is with the county, city, state, and business partners.

Mr. Stonecipher stated that Dr. Vittetoe had a great interview and was extremely polished, but he was focused on workforce all the way through the interview, and his concern was if they wanted to lean that much in that direction which would be a question for the Board. He added that Dr. Vittetoe obviously understands the college really well, has great relationships with people at St. Petersburg College, and is well respected. He shared that in some instances, Dr. Vittetoe did not get to a specific answer on questions, but he said he would be resilient as a president, and he may get a few things wrong, but he would keep moving forward in the interest of the college. Dr. Vittetoe mentioned that in the first 90 days he would revise and set a new course for the college, and Mr. Stonecipher expressed concern about needing an absolute new course.

Mr. Stonecipher concurred with Chairman Foster that Dr. Williams, by far, had the best interview. He stated he came into the interviews with his early rankings of the top five after reading the packets, but changed his mind after Dr. Williams' interview. He noted that she is extremely passionate, an outstanding speaker, inspires confidence, and expressed very specific ideas about how to move forward as a college and backed up her ideas with data, which may have been an unfair advantage as she has thirty years of experience with St. Petersburg College and it showed. He liked that she was aware of peoples' concerns that if she stepped into the role she would bring more of the same and no new ideas, but she made it clear she was full of new ideas and would seek input from others. He liked her recruitment ideas, and her thoughts about Phase 2 of the Success Plan focusing on retention and the classroom experience making sure that the faculty is engaged and involved and having more of a true collaborative effort toward those goals. He was impressed by her interview overall.

Mr. Stonecipher stated Dr. Henningsen was at the top of his list after reviewing his packet and resume, but his interview was not as strong and his answers were longer and not as detailed. He stated that Dr. Henningsen has a great understanding of economics, negotiating contracts, and his experience with Tallahassee, but his interview and vision of the college of what we can do moving forward were lacking. Mr. Stonecipher stated he did not like their conversation about the enrollment declines, and he did not feel Dr. Henningsen would press as hard to turn it around while the economy was doing well. As a Board, they feel they can close the gap and increase enrollment and retention rates. Mr. Stonecipher stated that Dr. Henningsen was very analytical, but almost to the point where he lacked the ability to paint a vision for the future without data.

Mr. Stonecipher stated Dr. Biafora was another early favorite of his and the only other person he had met in the past, other than the two candidates from St. Petersburg College. Dr. Biafora has a lot of university knowledge, but there is concern about his community college knowledge, and does he understand the concerns and hurdles going forward. Dr. Biafora stated he wanted to expand on taking pride in the brand of being a Titan and use that to tie the campuses together and increase alumni giving by having them be advocates for us in the community as they grow older. He noted that Dr. Biafora has creative ways to deal with budget cuts from USF St. Petersburg and he liked his vision of growing his way out of budget issues, but they have to take into consideration that USF St. Pete was growing as the

economy was growing. Mr. Stonecipher expressed that he liked their Compass program which is part of their student success program with positive results from that, and that Dr. Biafora was mentored under Dr. Law for a twelve-month period. Mr. Stonecipher expressed concern that Dr. Biafora had more vague answers than specific answers to the questions and he did not feel the excitement or overall true vision of where he wanted to take St. Petersburg College. Mr. Stonecipher stated that his top two choices were Dr. Williams and Dr. Biafora.

Ms. Cole stated she also compiled her notes from the videos but was unable to get back to her office this morning to retrieve them. She said she was recreating them, but they are fresh in her mind. She said she also struggled with the ranking because all five are really good candidates who all brought something unique and different to the table. She stated she wrote a short list including relationships, money, and students. She added that inclusive in the relationships would be with the community and the legislature, inclusive with the students would be both academic success and personal success.

Ms. Cole said she considered Dr. Law's mantra that student success is getting the student to their own finish line and whatever the students' goal is, that is where we need to get them there. She stated that resonated with her when she considered the candidates and tried to determine who will have a vision for the college that is the students' vision, and is particular to our community and our college, with the distinctions between north and south county and how to capitalize on those opportunities.

Ms. Cole said we obviously need growth in our student numbers and where would our AA programs grow versus our baccalaureate programs, and who could make those introductions. She stated she worked backwards from there and she was overwhelmed by all of the candidates' credentials and experience.

Ms. Cole stated that Dr. Bonahue's interview was engaging and entertaining and he was almost a showman which is great when you are trying to shake hands and raise money. She thought he lacked some on budget and finance side which is so crucial now, but offered creative ways to bring in private sectors.

Ms. Cole said that Dr. Vittetoe stated he wanted to increase the faculty and student success which is what most people would want to do, but is a disconnect with their current financial situation on how to address solutions within the confines of the budget. She liked that he said his vision for the college is to fill the need but also create the need, which is both a positive and a negative, because she feels they have created a great product and they do not need to shift their course but just refine it and determine what is the need in today's market.

After Dr. Henningsen's interview, Ms. Cole stated she walked away somewhat confused because it was a long interview and he had somewhat long answers. She said she liked that he was very data driven and talked about metrics. She stated she liked his familiarity of the college system, his participation in Tallahassee, and his experience with different community colleges. She stated she went back and looked at his short video and resume to put together a complete picture. She stated her concern is that he is not as student focused and is more administrative in that he is creative with his budget and operations, but she did not get clear answers with respect to his student focus.

Ms. Cole stated that Dr. Williams was clearly the most known candidate to most people in the community along with Dr. Vittetoe and she received a lot of correspondence from community members about her. She stated she was relieved at how well her interview went in relation to the correspondence and number of people supporting her. Her rankings from community members was very high and she has a lot of knowledge about the communities in which St. Petersburg College operates. She liked her specific ideas about recruitment. Ms. Cole stated she would be remiss if she did not acknowledge the faculty rankings and their concerns with her and how that translates to a successful career, because they do not want to position anyone for failure.

Ms. Cole stated she watched Dr. Biafora's interview with the other Board members and she was impressed with Dr. Biafora's vision of pride and how the community and students had to be prideful. She said it seemed odd that he would want to take a position like this coming from a university but he answered it well in his interview. She stated she did not rank him higher because of his lack of community college experience. Ms. Cole stated her top three candidates were Dr. Bonahue, Dr. Henningsen, and Dr. Williams.

Ms. Bello stated she feels a lot better after listening to the other Board members' comments. She stated those are her top three candidates as well. She stated Dr. Bonahue was their first interview and she felt she was uncomfortable and not ready. She stated he talked a lot and had long answers, and used a lot of "I" and "me" and not "we" and he did not seem to be focused on partnerships in the business community. She thought what he said about finding an employer "when they need to grow and can't" was smart. She was concerned that he did not seem to be focused on benchmarking and tracking. He was focused on international, but is not part of their vision of how they are going to grow. She liked his focus on strategic marketing with the use of social media and video and he understood the new generation of up and coming students. She said he is from a small town with single campus, and she did not think he could be ready to lead St. Petersburg College.

Ms. Bello stated that it was difficult because she knows Dr. Vittetoe through SPC, but tried to be objective. She was impressed with his answer to the partnership question and his understanding of SPC meeting employer needs. She expressed frustration that he did not answer all of their questions and in some cases, they repeated them to get answers. She stated he was out of touch with the legislature. He said everyone gets the same treatment regardless when he was talking about faculty and staff, and she disagreed with that.

Ms. Bello agreed that Dr. Williams had an amazing interview, with a ton of excitement, but reiterated that it is difficult because she knows her and likes her as a person. Dr. Williams talked about looking at additional revenue streams, mining data and the importance of that, which Ms. Bello feels is important for their success moving forward. Dr. Williams stated that SPC is the plan and not the fallback. She talked about being the conveners of economic development, career source, new business, and county commissioners, and Ms. Bello feels this is a role they can be strong in and help SPC. Ms. Bello expressed she liked Dr. Williams' "student ready college" branding idea. She stated Dr. Williams was a little negative about their current situation and that bothered her. Dr. Williams also talked about their business footprint not being in a good spot, and Ms. Bello wondered why she has not done anything about it before now.

Ms. Bello stated that Dr. Henningsen is great on paper and is the only candidate who has been and is currently a president which is why he was in her top three. She stated some of them were harder on him in the interview than others, and he handled that well and did a good job. Dr. Henningsen stated in his interview that when the system is down, we are down but we do not have to be at the bottom. Ms. Bello said she liked that he said “they did not have to be at the bottom,” but did not like that he said “when the economy is down, we have to be down.” Dr. Henningsen focused on meeting the needs of the employers in the area, which Ms. Bello stated does result in student success because they will be able to get a job. She stated he was focused on fundraising, saving, and looking at the success of programs which is important for them with their current budget, and with three years of declining budget and no dip in reserves is impressive. She also liked that he was focused on fundraising and building relationships.

Ms. Bello stated she was concerned that she did not know Dr. Biafora because he is local, but she has received at least ten emails from business leaders stating that he is involved. She stated they were all impressed with his team spirit, pride in the Titans, and giving back to your community college rather than where you get your Bachelor’s degree. She felt he was a great orator, very articulate, and very engaging. She liked his idea of student success programs for first time college students, and when she asked him about older students returning to college after receiving their AA degree, he answered it strong. She stated he was likable and handled difficult questions confidently. Dr. Biafora stated in his interview that “we grow our way out of budget concerns” and had a specific plan with new minors and certificates which she liked. He also shared ideas for profit sharing for summer enrollment and migration to online classes which she liked and thought was strategic. She liked his idea of faculty going to the students which is definitely serving our students. She stated Dr. Biafora lacks relationships with the legislators as do some other candidates, but it is not a deciding factor for her. Ms. Bello stated her top three were Dr. Biafora, Dr. Williams, and Dr. Henningsen.

Mr. Gibbons stated he learned a big lesson from Mr. Terry Brett during the last time they went through this process, who stood and did what was right at the end of the day and made Dr. Law the President of St. Pete College. He stated they could not have had better leadership over this past years and he thanked Dr. Law. Mr. Gibbons stated he has served on this Board for many years, and there are people who have become very instrumental in his life as a result of meeting them on this Board. He stated two people are Cecil King, who has since passed and one of their centers in Midtown was named after him, and Ken Burke, who counted every minority student who graduated and walked across the stage. Mr. Gibbons stated he received a letter from Ken Burke, Darryl Rouson, and Renee Flowers, who is a School Board member, all supporting the same candidate which he thought was interesting because they come from different walks of life. He stated Ken Burke is from Clearwater and would ask Mr. Gibbons for support of his area, and Mr. Gibbons would ask him for support for St. Petersburg.

Mr. Gibbons stated his general point is that Mr. Cecil King said you do not select a president, but you determine your core competencies and see who is the most qualified and can hit the ground running. Mr. Gibbons stated his list of core competencies: core constituency – the students, faculty, community, career services, fundraising and legislative agendas, budget, management of multiple campuses throughout this county which all different and diverse needs, and bachelor programs. He stated he looked at every video and

it resonated with him that they do not have time in this economic climate related to the legislature to have someone who cannot hit the ground running. He stated he evaluated each of these candidates and read every comment about every candidate. He said two things resonated with him. Mr. Gibbons, keeping the author anonymous, read a comment he received about a candidate:

“I went into this session with some doubt of hiring someone who has only ever worked at SPC for the position of President, they, by far, were the most engaging...an impressive candidate who was prepared, enthusiastic, and thoughtfully responded to each and every question and concern, withheld personal opinions and bias when necessary in order to really listen to the faculty and what they were saying. I appreciated and believed this, in and of myself, demonstrate a characteristic of a strong leader despite minimal faculty experience. I was really convinced that this person understood challenges that the faculty face in the classroom and wants to work collaboratively to address those issues in order to promote student success. I felt this candidate was authentic in the responses and passionate about leading SPC, which is something I felt the previous candidates lacked. I believe that this candidate really wants to move SPC forward, increase the presence in the local community, and work collaboratively to make this institution great, and is aware and mindful of some of the faculty dissatisfaction, and I believe that this person will work to increase satisfaction among the entire college community, meeting and listening and truly allowing someone to stand amongst them and other candidates, in a way that the previous materials did not communicate about this individual.”

Mr. Gibbons stated he read more comments about this person who had nine pages and seven of those nine pages had comments that were all positive. He stated that the next person had four pages and it was a 60/40 split. He stated that there is not time for “on the job” training. He noted the other Board members had two or three top candidates.

Mr. Gibbons stated that Dr. Biafora is a very nice man and a very good Dean at a university, but he has no college or budget experience. He stated that Dr. Biafora was not familiar with SB 1720, and Dr. Biafora talked about developmental education after Mr. Gibbons corrected him. Mr. Gibbons stated that SB 1720 did a lot of things and Dr. Law could tell him what they were because he is a community college guy. Mr. Gibbons stated that SB 1720 created the Education Accountability Program, K-20 office, created a Board of Education that oversees the college system, and Mr. Gibbons said that these are the foundations of a community college that Dr. Biafora did not know about. Mr. Gibbons continued by saying this bill includes submitting accountability reports and pathway programs which are things colleges have to do on a regular basis, and while Dr. Biafora is a very nice man and a very qualified academic, he is not qualified to be President of St. Petersburg College.

Mr. Gibbons stated that when he reviewed Dr. Bonahue’s video, he was in his top two. He stated that although Dr. Bonahue did have areas to work on in terms of local government and partnerships, he was data driven in terms of what he knew and he is a community college person. He also answered the questions they asked him. Mr. Gibbons stated he is in his top two.

Mr. Gibbons stated that with Dr. Henningsen, he had very high expectations, but Mr. Gibbons was a little underwhelmed. He reminded the Board that they have bachelor

programs not because they wanted to but they were forced into that role. He stated that Governor Bush went to the University of Florida and asked them to produce nurses and they replied with “give them a million dollars and they will study how they can produce nurses.” He stated that Dr. Carl Kuttler went to Jeb Bush and said “give him five hundred thousand and we will produce nurses.” Mr. Gibbons said SPC responds to this community. He stated that when Dr. Henningsen talked about bachelor programs and a Council of Presidents he oversees and he has to go with how they vote, he steps out of this every time and they need a leader of St. Petersburg College, someone who represents this college and sells it every single day. He stated that his interview question about the plant or the pencil was not a gimmick, because they will not get to decide when they sell the college, because the president will have to do it every waking moment of the day. He stated Dr. Law has to constantly defend and stand up for St. Petersburg College every single day with community people all the time and that is why they need someone who can hit the ground running.

Mr. Gibbons stated that Dr. Stan Vittetoe did better than he thought he would interviewing as a provost and he agreed with Ms. Cole that was very well prepared and he did an excellent job. He stated that Dr. Vittetoe talked all about workforce, and Mr. Gibbons needed to hear more data and information about how Dr. Vittetoe would move St. Petersburg College forward. He said it was a very good interview.

Mr. Gibbons stated he would go on record stating that people called him with concerns that he has known Dr. Williams all his life. He stated he is a businessman and he does not let anything cloud his judgment; he looks at what people do, how they respond and how they react, and how they do their job on a daily basis. He said that is how he evaluates people and how he would like to be evaluated. He stated that Dr. Williams does not like it when he makes calls to her about anything related to the college because they usually do not agree so the impression that he would do something or he would move someone forward because of a personal relationship is crazy, and you can throw those concerns out the window. Mr. Gibbons stated that when he compared the competencies to the candidates, several candidates came close, but none were as close as Dr. Williams.

Mr. Gibbons stated there are two people who he respects in this state as community college presidents. He stated the first is Ava Parker, who is the President of Palm Beach State College, and she is a strong, good president who set up the Lakeland Polytechnic University as the COO, and before that served on the State Board of Education for the entire state of Florida. Because he respects her, Mr. Gibbons asked Ms. Parker if she thinks Dr. Williams is prepared to be a president, and she responded that she is beyond prepared and surprised she has not been selected as a president yet.

Mr. Gibbons stated that the second president he respects is Dr. Bill Law. Mr. Gibbons said no one has thought to ask Dr. Law what he thought. He shared that Dr. Law responded that there has been nobody who he has ever worked with who has been more prepared to be a president right now, and he has been a president for over twenty years. Mr. Gibbons stated that after reviewing all of her information and Dr. Law telling him she could hit the ground running, he does not have two candidates, he has one. He stated she has the education experience, and although she was low on the faculty survey, they would probably vote Dr. Law low on his survey today, because he has a vision for the entire college, not just for the faculty. He stated the president has to do all of these things, not just a few. Mr. Gibbons stated that he likes Dr. Williams as an individual, she has integrity, she knows this

community, and she is qualified to be president. He stated this college has not had a president who was a woman or a person of color. He stated she is a very detail oriented person and gets back to you and the folks in the community in a timely manner. He stated that the comment he read was a faculty member who was not enthused about going to her interview session, because of what she heard from other people on the campus, but when she got there, she changed her mind. Mr. Gibbons stated if you can change the mind of your critics, what more do you want? Mr. Gibbons stated that although he came with two names, he is only submitting one candidate, Dr. Williams.

Chairman Foster asked each Board member to name their top two candidates. Mr. Gibbons responded that he only wanted to select one.

This is the result of the Committee members' vote:

Candidate Name	Check Marks
Ed Bonahue	2
Tonjua Williams	5
Frank Biafora	2
James Henningsen	0

Chairman Foster asked Mr. Gibbons if he would like to select a second choice to break the tie. Mr. Gibbons stated he did not. Chairman Foster stated that the final three candidates for president are Dr. Bonahue, Dr. Williams, and Dr. Biafora.

Chairman Foster asked if there was any more discussion needed about these three candidates, but he still likes the idea of having a top two. Mr. Gibbons asked Chairman Foster if he would like him to select his second choice so they can move forward. Chairman Foster stated it does not matter, but Mr. Gibbons said he will submit his second choice as Dr. Bonahue.

This is the updated result of the Committee members' vote:

Candidate Name	Check Marks
Ed Bonahue	3
Tonjua Williams	5
Frank Biafora	2
James Henningsen	0

Chairman Foster stated that the top two candidates are now Dr. Bonahue and Dr. Williams. He directed the Board that it is a clean slate and he would like to have one more round of comments just focused on these two candidates.

Chairman Foster said he could not disagree with any of Mr. Gibbons' remarks and with his comments about the legislative and hitting the ground running as his top priorities, he thought Dr. Bonahue was stronger in that, and he did not sense that Dr. Williams had those relationships in Tallahassee where she could hit the ground running. He said Dr. Williams was strong on students and relationships, and he liked her transition team idea, her emphasis on students, naturally with her background, recruitment, barbershops, Little League dedicated team, and her program review was very thoughtful. He stated that she was very

honest, but he asked her what was the biggest negative or perceived negative, and she answered that she might be perceived as stale, or with a lack of vision, but she stated over and over in her interview about tilling the soil. He stated it comes down to one external, very experienced candidate, and one internal candidate. He stated the pros on Dr. Bonahue is that he is strong on faculty and student relationships and better legislatively, but he does not have the local relationships since he lives in the Gainesville area, but he has strong relationships with the University of Florida. He insinuated that Dr. Bonahue's interview sounding rehearsed was due to his multiple degrees in English.

Chairman Foster stated there are pros and cons with each candidate. He said he could be swayed. He thought he was balanced in meeting the needs of the faculty and the students, and would bring a freshness, and agreed with Trustee Stonecipher that as Dr. Bonahue said, would bring the world to St. Petersburg College, college offerings, employment centers, making sure they had classrooms at employment centers which relates to Mr. Gibbons' economic development, faith-based partnerships, heavy on recruitment with STEM-based programs, and he had a great answer on achievement gaps. Chairman Foster said his idea about having graduates who represent the population was unique, and pushing to make sure their graduates look like the community we serve. Dr. Bonahue talked about return on investment and high cost versus low enrollment, and their number one mission is meeting the needs of community and student, so not all of that would be data driven. Chairman Foster stated that Dr. Bonahue's response to the question of what his greatest strength was that he would have a unifying vision, and his response to what sets him apart, he responded that he speaks our language of the students and faculty, as well as team building, and building the brand. He stated he agreed with Trustee Gibbons' list of seven or eight criteria. He summarized by stating they have one candidate who is strong, internal, and knows this college, community, and budget, and one strong external candidate who could bring a unique perspective and a freshness.

Ms. Bello stated that if it has come down to these two candidates, it is a clear choice for her because she was not impressed with Dr. Bonahue.

Mr. Stonecipher stated that had it not been for the faculty responses, Dr. Williams would hands down be his number one choice. He said his decision comes down to if he believes Dr. Williams, if chosen as president, will take time, as she said in her interview, to reach out to every part of the college and work collaboratively so people are heard and understood, not always agreed with, and will she do that. His decision revolves around having faith that as president of this college, if she was chosen, she would reach out and speak to everyone and try to pull us together as a team and move us all in the same direction. He stated it was the only way they would be successful as an institution if they all get on board together and walk in the same direction.

Mr. Stonecipher said that when he walked into the interviews, Dr. Williams was not first or second on his list. He stated she moved up for two specific reasons, one was her attention to detail in the answers to their questions, and she knew exactly how she wanted to respond, and she was great at communicating to them. He stated that she also had a lot of fresh ideas, because his concern was if she would be stale having been here so long. He stated that the other thing that set her apart for him is that she did not have to sell him on St. Petersburg College, even with the plant question by Mr. Gibbons. He stated he was more excited about being a part of the institution after hearing her speak about it then perhaps he has been in the

past few years. He said she is passionate about St. Petersburg College and it bleeds out of her, and if people in the community and people in Tallahassee and business partners she is meeting with do not feel that, then there may be something wrong with them, because she is so passionate about this school. He stated he is leaning toward Dr. Williams, although he liked a lot about Dr. Bonahue, but he thinks Dr. Bonahue does lack putting together more complex deals within the business community and maybe with municipalities. He states that if Dr. Williams is serious about reaching out to everyone on our campuses and within our college, then she is his number one choice.

IV. SELECTION OF PRESIDENT

Chairman Foster referenced a comment he heard from a judge that when you win the argument, do not say anything else, because you may talk me out of it. He stated he was willing to entertain a motion, unless anyone else wanted to speak.

Mr. Gibbons moved to make Dr. Tonja Williams the next President of St. Petersburg College. Ms. Cole seconded the motion.

Chairman Foster did a roll call and all Board members voted aye. The motion passed unanimously. The attendees applauded the decision.

Chairman Foster stated they do not need a second motion, and they have selected the next president. He turned the floor over to Board Attorney, Mr. Lang, for instructions.

Mr. Lang stated that before he discusses the next steps in the process, he would like to personally compliment each of the Board members for their wisdom, integrity, and thought evidenced today. He added that he stated this is a déjà vu experience for him because forty years ago, he was the young man and newest trustee on the Board. When the vote came down to a 2-2 split, he was the last vote. He understands the uptightness to make these choices and he appreciates it and thanked the Board.

Mr. Lang stated that the next step is to place Dr. Williams under contract and it would be awkward and impossible for the five of them to go through the bargaining process. He said that in the past, the Board designated the Chair to lead a small group comprised of himself and those members of staff he would like to have to support him, to negotiate the contract with Dr. Williams, and bring back an executed contract subject to their approval, at the June 20 meeting.

Chairman Foster stated he would entertain a motion. Ms. Cole made the motion, and it was seconded by Ms. Bello. It was approved by all Board members.

Chairman Foster stated they have already looked at comparable salaries and benefit packages and said it will be within reason and budget, but also competitive and indicative of the job that is before Dr. Williams.

Chairman Foster asked if there are any comments from the Board before they close the meeting.

Mr. Gibbons said it is hard to see Dr. Law leave and he struggled with this decision because he had two or three candidates he thought were very strong. He said what resonated in his mind is they have such a competent leader who is leaving us, and when he had their conversation this morning he realized that there is no other candidate. Mr. Gibbons thanked Dr. Law for his strong and sound leadership, and he said when people talk about return on investment, they will see it ten to fifteen years from now because of his leadership that he has shown. He said he appreciates his wife, Pat, and his kids, for sharing him with them, and people do not know what you went through and they had some tough, hard talks but through it all they have maintained their friendship. Mr. Gibbons thanked Dr. Law for his leadership. Dr. Law received a standing ovation.

Chairman Foster stated he echoed those comments. He said that he became Mayor at the same time Dr. Law became President of St. Petersburg College and he recognized his commitment to St. Petersburg and the entire community was immeasurable. He said he would be saddened if Dr. Law was not so giddy and excited about retiring. He added they are big shoes to fill, but Dr. Williams has had an incredible mentor, someone to follow, emulate, and the things he did well to keep doing. Dr. Law would be humble enough to say he did not bat a thousand, but he came close, and he did it nine times out of ten and then some. Chairman Foster said they have a lot to be proud of at St. Petersburg College and he could not be happier with this decision today.

V. NEXT MEETING DATE AND SITE

June 20, 2017, EpiCenter

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Foster adjourned the meeting at 10:24 a.m.

If any person wishes to appeal a decision made with respect to any matter considered by the Board at its meeting May 31, 2017, he or she will need a record of the proceedings. It is the obligation of such person to ensure a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, §286.0105, Florida Statutes.

Items summarized on the Agenda may not contain full information regarding the matter being considered. Further information regarding these items may be obtained by calling the Board Clerk at (727) 341-3241.