

**Core Committee Meeting
7-18-17**

Attendance:

Will, Gabe, Robert, MK (call-in)

About 10 students & about 4/5 UF staff in attendance

Started meeting at 10:32 a.m.

1. Purpose (Will)

- a. Thanks everyone for being there and briefly goes over the agenda

2. Ground rules for the meeting (MK)

- a. Asks to respect the process to make the decision today
- b. 15 minutes for public comment; purpose is to hear feedback, not answer questions
- c. Space for comments only so business is not interrupted later in the meeting

3. Public comment (15 minutes)

- a. Student asks if this is being live streamed or recorded for others to see
 - i. Will says no
- b. 3 students come to the front and 1 student passes out prepared folder of "Institute of Black Culture and Institute of Hispanic/Latino Cultures Project Plan"
 - i. Student 1 addresses recent racism on campus and attributes to low retention rates; addresses the fear that spaces will contribute to a homogenous, multicultural center; says that students and alumni are willing to sacrifice programming space for a place to feel like home
 - ii. Student 2 explains research from national studies about recruiting and retaining minority students and the possible effects of collapsing specific centers into a multicultural center; addresses worries about how the centers will lose its true purpose
 - iii. Student 3 provides reservations that students have about the u-design building; separate buildings have more square building not including the large assembly space; addresses support for two separate buildings from people like: Commissioner Goston, UFAAS, Student Body President Smith Meyers, UFHSA, BSU, SISTUHS, PBM, LULAC, Dr. Paul Ortiz, National Executive Board of Lambda Theta Pi, Sabor Latino Dance Team, over 100 students, 1000 original petition, overwhelming support from MCDA's own survey
 - iv. Student 2 acknowledges budget to rework the design; mentions how at the first advisory meeting they asked about the budget and did not get full answer until two weeks later; says two buildings is still under budget; suggests decision be cautious of current campus climate
- c. Student asks who is on core committee, how many members, what are their names
 - i. Will says they are not answering questions right now, just taking public comment
 - ii. MK says herself, Mary Kay Carodine, Will Atkins - Executive Director of MCDA, Gabe Lara - Director of Hispanic-Latino Affairs, Robert Hacker – Program Manager, and the former Director of Black Affairs

- iii. Student comments on the lack of transparency because they cannot answer specific questions
 - d. Student suggests that whoever the decision makers are should take into account what it means to have 2 separate buildings; comments that some schools don't care enough for a single culture and acknowledge the fears of many students; administration/decision makers should take into account how we feel considering we'll be the ones using the building
 - e. Will concludes public comment at 10:48 a.m.
- 4. Process to this point and what our goals are (Gabe)**
 - a. Created a vision for HLA after the end of the year review and getting input from many conversations with different students: improve student engagement, program involvement, training, etc.
 - b. Wants to create something big that more students can utilize because there isn't enough space in La Casita and alumni don't use the space because they don't fit in there
 - c. Talking about the project moving forward: he wants more stakeholders to use the space
 - d. Initially they considered shared elevators with a skywalk to the two buildings because they're costly, but as the project went on, the programming spaces became an option
 - e. He comes from a multicultural center, he was also a student there and he advocated to not have it; he, too, was disappointed to see shared space but he was proud to see that they were able to still make it a home. As for the Institute Project here at UF, he still saw independent spaces and institutes.
 - f. As director of HLA, Gabe says everything they wanted to do was for the betterment of the students. He wanted programming space for a career center for professional development series; wanted to move UF toward a Hispanic-Serving Institution but more space is needed; but it is hard to look for a space in the union
 - g. Gabe then validates student fears and concerns of moving toward a multicultural center; he says he would not want it to be a multicultural center either. Addresses safety as a concern and comments on cameras & top notch security; acknowledges concerns about who reserves the space and says both directors will have the final say in those reservations like before; separate buildings will have more square footage but that doesn't mean more usable space in both buildings
 - h. Addresses why he wants to move forward with U-shape design: because it will have provide more space for organizational objectives like supporting and educating our students, especially when numbers of enrollment are getting bigger but I do understand the fear that it might take away the culture or history of the original structures, which is why we would work the original structure into buildings
- 5. Pause to get more input and created the advisory committees to do that**
 - a. Will:
 - i. Says he was aware of the petition in the Spring so he put a pause on the institute project to gain insight and engage with students and alumni through the advisory committees
 - ii. Realizes students made more requests for things to become more public: social media, webinars, etc. so they accommodated to best of their ability:
 - iii. Acknowledged purpose of advisory committee and gathered varying schools of thought to move forward with better insight
 - iv. After several meetings with advisory meetings, architects created plans
 - b. MK: There was no consensus but we have listened and have really heard the students throughout the process

6. Review of feedback and input:

- a. Pros of shared design that we have heard:
 - i. Gabe: pro of shared design is space that will have greater opportunity for organizational objectives and programming/educational opportunities
 - ii. Will: I have not worked in those space so from what I heard is the need for big picture initiatives; considering the space needs, square footage, and budget, it seemed solid to have 3 separate facilities under one roof
 - iii. Gabe: reestablish relationships with stakeholders and bring them back to the institutes
 - iv. MK: says advisory committee being able to come together about different issues and community building in a new way
- b. Cons of shared design that we have heard:
 - i. Will: Students fear that it will dilute spirit of history; makes it feel and look like multicultural center
 - ii. MK: Recruitment, retention climate
 - iii. Will: Fear getting into shared space only by going through the institutes
 - iv. Will: Remembering the campus climate and what's been happening this spring; the need for separate individual spaces was more important than programming space
- c. Pros of separate design that we have heard:
 - i. Will: Buy in from both communities
 - ii. MK: Diffuses fears; symbol of commitment to minorities
 - iii. MK: Staying true to and honoring the history at UF
- d. Cons of separate design that we have heard:
 - i. MK: There's less program space for students and MCDA to do work
 - ii. Will: We have to consider using classrooms and other spaces and required caterers and other things; have to reserve the union for large
- e. Discussion
 - i. MK: What are key factors we are ensuring to stay true to in the design?
 - ii. Gabe: When discussing pros and cons, he thinks about the buy in that is needed from stakeholders; we could have this big building but if no one goes in then that defeats the purpose as well
 - iii. Will: Considers the climate that they are in and peace is really important to me; but he has heard some things/tactics that are not in line with what MCDA values; he recognizes passion is there; we need for students to feel heard and that the university is taking their considerations into concern
 - iv. MK: Addresses the need to improve campus climate; lack of commitment is concerning; current students feel wanted and heard
 - v. Will: Suggests moving forward with 2 buildings
 - vi. MK: Agrees
 - vii. Gabe: Says u-shape is the greater option for programming but buy-in is extremely important moving forward so he agrees with separate buildings
 - viii. Robert: Comments that as the project manager, he has listened to everything and he wants everyone to understand that given the program that was written and the budget given, they did the best they could to fulfilling the programmatic needs given the budget. He says he is fine either way and he has no stake in it. Moving forward they will do the best they can; says that the U-shape design was the best use of the programming; a lot more money will be spent on electrical

rooms, etc. and less money on programmatic space but with the outpouring of emotion its best to move with two separate buildings

7. Course to take moving forward

- a. Will: Says demolition needs to start as soon as possible; buildings are not and have not been usable
- b. MK: Comments that demolition will happen before move-in; addresses CITF funds that there will be extra money (an extra million) so now there is \$6.3 million for the buildings
- c. Will: Keeping in mind the recommendation to restart the entire program, architects will look at the original organizational program. He is going to restart this process as a new program so we don't further delay. Will asks if that is fine with everyone on the Core Committee
- d. Unanimous agreement
- e. MK: Adds comment that the \$1 million had to go through the BOT – so they just learned about this this last week; she says she appreciates the views that were shared and emphasizes the importance of this process because so many people were engaged
- f. Will says he is closing this phase and we will start over with the 2 separate buildings
- g. Will thanks the audience for joining their meetings and adjourns the meeting