

>> Please stand by for realtime captions.

We will start with the role.  
[ Roll Call ]

Wonderful. We will start our meeting with an indication led by Regent holder.

It's great to be back together. I am humbled and a recognition of your wisdom and perfect knowledge. In doing so, we reflect on our own thoughts and frequent feelings. We bow in sincere Thanksgiving for your mercies and the overwhelming favor you have shown us as Americans and Texans. Stakeholders and trustees of this institution. We know as students of Austin University. We are grateful for the generations of faculty and staff and alumni. Their number and name are known by you. You have secured this reputation and given their time and energy/knowledge on this campus. To equip young people to build careers and families/school/businesses. Houses of worship that glorify you and enrich our world. Truly, you have given us a good heritage. We come equally to this important our in our school's history. As always, we seek your direction and continued favor. Your word tells us that before you, they are counted as a small desk in the scale. We come humbly. Your word further instructs us that to everything there is a season and a time.

A purpose under heaven. A time to be born. A time to dive. A time to plant. A time to pluck what is planted. A time to kill. A time to heal. A time to break down. A time to build up. Help us, O God, to know what season we are in. As we deliberate today. The significant matter before us. Give us wisdom and charity and ability. Clarity in both our expression and our understanding. Peace and unity. Also the courage and boldness to advance his University as we look to its next century. To further its purpose of training young people. Preparing them for leadership and service. Any society that honors you and his righteous, just and free. We ask all of this confidently. We pray in Christ and name. I mean.

I mean.

Think you.

This action item is the evaluation subcommittee for court and recommendation. Before beginning the report, I'd like to start with some thank you's. First, thank you to each of the core university systems that have offered an invitation for SFA to affiliate with their university system. The Texas State University system and Chancellor, vice Chancellor and CFO, Daniel Harper. The Tech University system. Ted Mitchell, Chief of Staff, David Fuller, vice chancellor and CFO --. Board of Regents leadership. Mark Griffin and Ginger Davis among many others who engage with. At Texas A&M University. Chancellor, John Sharp, Billy Hamilton, vice Chancellor, Dr. James Hallmark, vice Chancellor, Jimmy Jones. At the University of Texas system, Board of

Regents, Kevin -- , Jamie Mulligan, Jonathan Pruitt et cetera. Thank you to all of the systems and their teams. For their time, their energy, their commitment to this evaluation process. There offers of significant investment into SFA. It has been our honor and privilege to work with these systems. All on their teams. To engage in meaningful and sincere dialogue about SFA in their prospective university systems. There is great talent in each of these four systems. Great benefits offered to SFA. An affiliation with any one of these four systems. Each of these people and their teams are so impressive. They are dedicated to higher education. They all serve the state of Texas. The state of Texas is well served by their work. Thank you, also, to the subcommittee. Tom Mason, Jen Whitson, Jamie alders, Dr. Steve Westbrook's and participation by Holmes be . Thank you all for your time, energy, commitment et cetera. To this evaluation process. A well-defined process with Dr. Westbrook as it architect. Each of this group has complete dedication to the subcommittee's efforts. They each have significant time away from family. For our board members and without any complaint. Each member recognized the significance of the work. They each took their roles and responsibilities seriously, earnestly and with humility. Always with the best interests of SFA in mind. Finally, thank you to the board. For entrusting this work to the sub committee. It has been our honor to complete these efforts. We humbly present this report and recommendation to you. We will give the report. First, I will give the first portion of the report. Then Dan will give a financial analysis. We will give the entire report without taking questions. At the conclusion of the report, we will have time for questions and discussions. With that, we will turn to our PowerPoint presentation. There is great detail on the SFA website about the process. The steps that have been taken along the way. I urge everyone to review the website and its details. Hitting the high points. This process started in August. It was initiated with campus constituent groups. We engaged with faculty, staff and students across campus. As well as alumni. These groups developed and submitted 177 questions. After receiving responses. These groups developed reports to the board regarding each perception of the strengths and weaknesses of each system. We saw public input. There were 1683 comments submitted via online portal between August 27 and October 14th. These were all reviewed by the subcommittee. They provided this to the entire board. The board subcommittee conducted over 28 hours of face-to-face meetings with representatives of each university system in September and October. While these days included a wide range of topics. They were guided by 46 framing questions focused on governance, culture/fit, transition and financial matters. These meetings were preceded and followed by many hours of work by the subcommittee members. Both individually working on their own and the group working together. They prepared for the meeting and evaluate the meeting results. After countless hours of evaluating the written proposals of each system, conducting the face-to-face meetings with representatives of the system, evaluating the reports from campus constituent groups, reviewing the inputs submitted through the public portal, and working closely to clarify/ finalize the financial proposals. The board of regents subcommittee presents the following report. We had five key areas of focus. Autonomy, culture/fit, transition, intangibles and financial impact. We will touch on each of those. Concerning autonomy. With each system we learned that there is

significant autonomy preserved at the institutional level. There would be that at Stephen F Austin if we affiliated with any of the systems. Similar to those at the system institutions that are already in place. The SFA president retains the same level of authority that is authorized under the current governance structure. With each system, curricular autonomy continues to reside with SFA institutional faculty and academic processes. With each system, SFA continues to manage its own tenure and process.

Concerning culture/fit. All systems agree that there will be no change to our name, Stephen F Austin State University. Our mascot. Remained the lumberjacks and the lady jacks. There will be no change to our colors. Purple and white. All of the systems confirm that their respective campuses retain a unique culture and identity. All of the systems regard SFA unique brand, culture, traditions and rich history as benefits to be protected. All of the systems agree that the campus community is the guardian of campus culture. The SFA culture is cultivated and maintained by the SFA community. We spent time in discussions with each of the four systems about transitions. The logistics of what a transition two ways system would look like. We did on several topics. The first being presidential search. We have an opening down the hall and the president's office. While we are being ably served. We are so grateful to Dr. Westbrook for his service to SFA. He has made it known that this is a short-term engagement. Before system affiliation evaluation was even a normal topic for the board. Dr. Westbrook, when he accepted this roll, he said he would serve through the end of the legislative session. Heart stop. We use that as a timeline in our discussions with each of the board systems. Although the give slightly different search processes, each indicates that a new president to be named by May 31st 2023. We engage the four systems on discussions about the fiscal year of 24 budget. What that process would look like. The subcommittee believes it is important for the new president to finalize the development of the fiscal year of 2024 budget. Submit that budget for the Chancellor and Board of Regents of any system in which the University affiliated with. The normal quarterly meeting pattern of each system is November, February, May and August. Each system has indicated that having a new president in office at the end of the spring with a budget submittal in August, that is very manageable and continuing on to that transition. We had discussions about transition support. The governance transition will result in major change to some processes and procedures. These will occur over a period of time. It will require support from both SFA and systems. Each system has pledged to provide support with whatever is needed to implement a effective process. The transition that is as smooth and seamless as possible is in the best interest of both universities and the system. We discussed accreditation issues. We discussed how those are impacted through affiliation systems. Each of the systems has pledged to participate as needed and required in the development of the substantive change perspectives. All of its inclusion related to governance change. As well is the legislative work needed to affect a governance change that will meet the requirements. Finally, on transition, we discussed legislative supports. Each of the systems pledged to support the decision of the SFA board regarding affiliation. And to support the enabling legislation. We spent much time focused on intangibles.

Through the subcommittees were, they became aware of the level of administrative overhead that our administration is tasked with that should SFA of the late with the system, it would be a compass at a system level. We came with all of these benefits and intangibles. We refer to them as benefits not found on a financial record. Some of these included subject matter expertise. Many of these board members have worked in the financial world. Over a period of time. They know that the compliance requirements in the financial world have changed significantly over the last 20 or 30 years. Higher Ed is not immune to that. The higher education roll has significant requirements that it did not used to have . The systems offer the subject matter expertise in the compliance arena. We spent much time discussing with each of the four systems. The shift of administrative burden that occurs at University affiliates system. The University system office is exclusively focused on higher Ed administration. This allows both local university administrations to work on campus operations. This result in greater efficiencies on campus. Streamlines administrative operations. We begin to refer to this in our meetings as a deeper bench. We have great people at SFA. We have dedicated employees, faculty and staff. We have talented people. They are stretched thin. In many instances, we have one person who is the go to person on a significant area. If that person has something in their life. A personal illness or anything in their life. If that person leaves SFA or another roll . They may receive higher combination. That leaves a gap. There is no one to fill that gap. When a university is affiliated with a system, there are processes in place and people in place that can fill that gap, that can provide the support needed to the campus. Where there isn't something that goes undone. Because of that one person. We spoke at length about collaboration. The opportunity to have cooperation at a university system instead of isolation. All four systems talked about opportunities for counterpart collaborations. For instance, systemwide meetings among presidents, CFOs and other roles. Both counterparts with thin systems are meeting regularly. Often weekly. Talking about current challenges that they have. S practices. It's an opportunity for people within those roles to collaborate and not just be making decisions on their own class doing I suppose. There is an isolation when submitting critical decisions. There's an opportunity for outside professional perspectives in higher Ed issues. Such as enrollment growth, faculty staff/conversation and other issues that are faced at other campuses. Given the opportunity to bounce things off of one another. After all of these discussions with each of the four systems about these intangibles -- it became obvious to the subcommittee that the administration and leadership benefit derived with any of the systems issuing invitations. It would be beneficial to the long-term health and growth of SFA. After reviewing the matters of autonomy, culture and fit, transition and intangibles. The subcommittee focus on financial impact. Particularly what resources are cost savings might be available to SFA . That are not available to us otherwise. Backing up and doing a process review. The subcommittee October meeting addressed follow-up questions from our September meeting. Discussion was largely focused on financial issues. All system proposals received in our September and October meetings, including financial proposals and written responses to financial questions were provided to all board members and subsequently posted to SFA's website on October 25th. Concerning general financial impact :

the subcommittee believes that SFA would benefit from system services. Including investment management, purchase bit , risk management, information technology and enhance bond rating for that service.

Concerning specific financial proposals . Following the subcommittees meeting. The system representative and the posting of all financial proposals -- the SFA worked closely with the CFO of each system to further clarify and expand upon each systems responses to financial questions posed . To receive the best and final proposal from each. This board focus on developing a concise comparison of the financial benefits offered by each system to SFA . Over and above what is available to university. If we should choose remain unaffiliated. At this time, I would invite Gina to review with the board . The review she conducted with each of the four systems.

Thank you. It really was a privilege to be able to work with the University systems and their CFOs. I personally witnessed the collaboration that comes from working together as a group. Being able to understand the different concepts and accounting procedures. Things we do not have here at the University because of the way we are funded differently. In particular, first, I want to thank Jamie, our chief audit executive. Also sat in on countless Zoom meetings and reviewed schedules. Worked on this project with us. It was a team approach. I think them both so much. I also want to thank the great leaders that are up here. Hamilton with Texas A&M University system. David with the Texas State University system. And Jonathan Pruitt with the UT system. As you can imagine, being a previous auditor for the University system, I can ask a lot of questions. Can Jamie and Judy. They came in. Over and over. Making sure that we understand all of the numbers. Understand the concepts. We came up with the questions to be asked financially. They all answer them in a different way. They all depended on how they were funded. How would they answer them too. Before I go into the detail schedule. I want to talk a bit about the difference in funding. Most of you are aware about the budget process for the years . We received capital funding through higher education fund. For a tenure. , We know we will receive almost \$11.3 million a year. Started the fiscal year of 21. The legislator can be re-looked at after things to see if adjustments need to be made. We know the capital is coming in. We rely on that funding here at our university for capital. We have other bonds processes that we have. But to find some of our basic equipment, our nursing mannequins and forestry lab equipment et cetera. Our library books. We rely on our higher education funding. We understand the higher education fund. Three of the systems , Texas State University system receives a funded system. Texas Tech as well. Texas A&M actually has some universities that participate in a higher education fund and some participate in the permanent University fund. All of the universities participate with trust funding. I wonder, since we are unfamiliar with the funding -- I want to talk about that for a little bit. Some of you have gone out to research this. I want to get to this understanding out there. The fund is an endowment . the University of Texas system and the A&M system benefit from. It was created by the Constitution. It is made up of 2.1 billion acres located in 24 counties. Primarily in West Texas. Plus the accumulative investments over the years get credited to the permanent University fund. Permanent University fund is considered to be the largest endowment by public

institutions of higher education in the United States. The way the work -- they produced two income streams. The oil and gas. Then the surface income. It comes from grazing. Solar and wind power generation. Actually have a commercial and a winery. Things like that are surface income. The minimal income is added to the corporate of the University fund. It is a positive thing and what is available University fund. The use of those funds can be used for the processes. For the bond they may be used for authorized capital expenditures of any dance institution of the two systems. Other than institutions that benefit from a constitutional appropriation commonly referred to as a higher education fund. You can do both. The system can do both but we --. As far as the available University fund. It is with the state treasury. It is by the public account. The public University fund is managed by the University of Texas and Texas A&M investment management company. Understanding the differences of those and the use. Especially with available University funds. Two thirds of the annual distribution of the funds is appropriated to the University of Texas. One third to the Texas A&M system. Then after payment of any service on tough bonds -- the remainder of the system's respective share is appropriated to the system for other purposes. So -- specifically -- other than that services -- it can be used for support and administration of UT Austin and system administration. It can also be used for things like general oversight and coordination of institutional activities. Planning and evaluating with the provision of services such as legal and financial services. The available University fund is appropriated by the legislator. It was a state fund. You can see the differences in how the IR education fund and the permanent University fund works. That became the main focus of how we will be funded if we became a part of a different system. How can we answer the question of what additional resources are available? If we choose to affiliate with the system. I'm going to go enough medical order. That is the way they were posted. The way we address them as we move this analysis. One thing is -- why did we do a four year analysis? We did the four year because it seems to be the natural break. You look at Texas Tech. They are in a deferred assessment for three years. You see the benefits in year four. You see Texas a and M. They offer services over a three-year period. Then UT offers over a four period. It's natural where we can look at. You can look at this in total. We thought it would be good instead of lumping everything in alum. Trying to see what would happen over a multiyear timeframe. If we look at Texas A& M -- this is a very important part. I've had this question and see some comments about this. When we prepare the schedules -- there are things we cannot give a certain value to. Regent red that we will have additional value at any of the systems. If they can bring it to us. Because of the system service and their expertise. That thing is the additional value that is above and beyond. It perceives the value of enhanced fundraising. They all have bond ratings above us. When we go to that market. Investment management -- we currently invest with the system so we would expect to continue. investment management. Being able to give the best investment product. Purchasing power. All of the systems have a level of purchasing power. Yes, we are members of certain co-ops and see purchasing programs but the joining together of the system resources provides them with purchasing power that we do not have here. Construction management is being able to help with our vast amount of property and building

projects on campus. Then the efficiencies. The economy and scale that we talked about. It would be gained through any of the systems. In looking at the schedules. It should be read that this is all videos, right? It's a vast amount of services that we cannot put a value on. We need to all understand that value is there. Even though we cannot convince it down to a one Paige four year summary for each of these. That is what I really want to get across. It may look like some values are larger than others. Even the smallest values adds all of this to it. You are getting a lot more than what is being shown up on these analyses.

The first one. Texas A&M. We look at. How would we fund under Texas A&M University system? Texas A&M if you read the documentation basically they said -- you can be a either or. Whichever way. We will hold you harmless your level of funding. You will at least get 11.3 million out of that. It is your decision of how you want to be in our system. They have examples of that. They did pledge transition support of three and half million in year one. Also year two. Financial aid is very important for our students. The systems that have programs set up to be able to offer additional scholarships to our students. Having different enrollment management strategies. That is so important. Texas A&M actually has a little over 1.1 million in financial aid. Affordability in action initiative. They actually have it in place. They pledge \$1 million over three years. That is doing things that will were torn to . Other ways to improve affordability and access. Some things that they are able to do at the system level to benefit all of the universities in their system. Then, Texas A&M University system has offered a shared services building. They have agencies located on their and M and around. The Texas board service. They have offered to host a office of those agencies here on campus. They would've built a building around 31 million. We use the higher value for inflation and everything. 31 million . They said their agency will use 51% of it. We would use 49% of the building. Due to the way it would be funded -- it would remain a system building. Carrying on Texas A&M systems accounts on their books. That is one of those benefits that we talked about. It would not show up. We would still have the value of this building being provided that we can use for 9% of. When we look at additional resources -- we subtracted the heat funding that we currently get. We put in there the difference for the funded university. A couple additional resources and estimated savings. This is where it is hard to give a value. We have some of these universities looking at all of our insurance premiums. All of our I.T. services to say what we can do in your wonder year two. We feel like we are going to be savings above what is in each of these. These have easily been identifiable once. Certain insurances paid by the system where I.T. services are provided by the system. You will see a difference in here. 3 of the systems. Texas Tech University system and Texas State University system actually assessed a fee to the University within their system. Or system services. They do not assess a fee. You will see that difference as we go through here. What that looks like of services that are going to be provided. Savings that are done. In this case , we are estimating the savings within this being paid too. We see a assessment for shared services. Things that they would be providing our audit services. Legal services and things like that among others. Then an estimated assessment for I.T. services. You

can see that we made the savings and the assessment the same because it is all choices of SFA. If we choose to use these products that they have then they will provide them. We get assessed. That was a difference from the subcommittees. We thought we received a whole assessment. As you went through these conversations with the CFO. They were available and provided that. The hope would be to achieve all of those system efficiencies that you would move to those combined products. That would be an evaluation that has to be done in the future. You can look at the savings and the total additional value in year 1. You can look at the total after four years. \$33.7 million. That is the announcement of Texas A&M system. Over and above all of the other services and value that will be provided.

That is Texas A&M.

Next I will move to Texas State University system. Working with Daniel Harper on this analysis. You can see being a funded school, we show that will be the funding. Then we show the difference in funding coming out that we already receive the level funding. The one thing is that there could be an adjustment in the future to the level. To be determined. Trying to work that into the analysis. We will perceive that if we say SFA is an independent University or affiliated with one of the funded schools. Our estimated savings is a case where they look at all of their insurance and I.T. We would also have the estimated audit General Counsel board. In addition to what we Artie talked about. There is an assessment that they calculate and gave it to us.

As you can see, the educated savings are offset with the assessment. Showing the additional value -- they may not have mentioned the transition funding of \$5 million. They do pledge that additional transition funding in year 1. We appreciate receiving that through the analysis. For year one, additional value will be \$5.6 million. We are looking at a four year value and looking at seven million dollars. That is Texas State University system. The next one is Texas Tech. The University system. They are funded through a higher education fund. We would basically see the same type of funding that we are seeing now. Not any additional resources they are. They are saving and how the board is treated. One thing that Texas Tech University said was that we will operate how we are for three years. Looking for savings and looking for improvements. Changing other policies. We will not come in charge. You will keep paying your people that you have. In the first three years. While we figure it all out. Is the type relationship that they had bringing Midwestern into their system. To those who looked up how that system affiliation work. You probably seen this. You keep paying your people and we will figure out what the assessment will be starting at year four. We would hope to realize more savings. In year 1, we see the additional value is one 86,000. Total over four years is 370,000. In addition to all of the value that we receive from being part of the system. I don't want someone to take this spreadsheet and think -- that's only value that we put on paper for Texas Tech University system. If you don't read ahead. Read the pages but for that. They talk about all of the value. The investment management and the debt. All of that with it. You can't take this on its own. I want to make sure that is understood. Moving on to the last one. The University of Texas system. The University of Texas system -- we worked with their CFO, Jonathan Pruitt. Clarifying one of the things which is in their

initial offering. Those of you have read the document and know that right there they said they would be \$65 million building funds. There wasn't really -- there is an understanding of how that works. They came back and clarified that they believe out of the proceeds. They would need to go to four. We have so many academic programs of the University.

Other programs that would be universities choice as we follow a strategic planner . Using \$45 million. Also, for the forestry lab and agriculture tech shop. That would need to be replaced. That would also be from bond proceeds.

Those are the building components of what the University of Texas system presented us. Then, through those programs that we talked about, through the way that the public funding works. They have a funding which is library, equipment, repair and rehabilitation. It is a lot like what we use in our higher education fund. It will be where we pay for those equipments that are talked about early. Educational whatever it is. To be used for academic equipment. 4.2 million dollars. Then they have assignments and technology acquisitions and retention. Science and technology acquisition and retention. That is a program where, yes, it is used for equipment but it is used to help recruit, retain and build faculty. For laboratory or recital. Help recruit and retain our faculty. That is a separate program. Then, the financial aid program to help our students with additional scholarships. The University of Texas University system. They put in their initial offer of additional support. It is to be determined. They identified a five and half million salary gap that they felt was needed for our faculty. They came back and quantify that they meant five and half million over each of the four years. 22 million that could help us either with salaries . However we needed it as we move forward. It was specifically identified in the first offer. That was the gap in salaries. An additional support is any form of a grant. 500,000 the first year and then to \$1 million. The whole forestry program would have those resources. Then, we look at the additional value to SFA. If we went out and issued this fund. We would have to pay the interest on those funds. Those systems pay that interest for us and they will never show it on our financial statements. It's paid at the system level. I wish they estimate in year 2 or 3. They have a system sponsor mental health program. You can read more about that online. They estimate the value of 250,000 a year. Cyber security initiatives. They also have 200,000 --. And direct campus support. That is where they pay for I.T. services. They pay for the enterprise resources. They pay for these services. In addition to receiving the leader that we have used. They are paid at the system level and don't show up on our University systems expenses. Or University nonsystem. Then they also have advancement services that they provide . They selected endowments . Training chairs in Dean's. Fundraising. Valuing that at 200,000 for University. Then we subtract out our higher education fund. Our current level to get additional resources. Then we try to estimate our savings. The University of Texas system pays for all property insurance. Then other types of insurances. They will make sure that your property is insured. Then the I.T. savings, again, this will depend on what services we choose to implement and how we would save them. We try to estimated over a period of time.

That can be even more. I know the things that they provide is an additional assistance. We currently spend like \$1.1 million on these. That is purchased by the system and used by all of the institutions within the system. We have estimated -- we worked with some of our other administrators to find out what the mental health resource savings would be to us. That is approximately -- million. Then our board of relation are in their but they remain at the campus. All of that provides a total additional value. Going into the first year. We have the buildings in the first year. Then over a period of four years of \$124 million. That is the University of Texas system.

I think that completes presenting the analyses.

Thank you again. We appreciate your efforts for your team. We appreciate all of your efforts on that.

Based on our reviewing analysis of the questions from and the responses presented by our constituent groups. Our rear and review is proposed by our subcommittee. Our face-to-face meetings with representatives of each system. Our review of public input in the analysis of financial resources are available to SFA through the University system. The SFA Board of Regents and system affiliation subcommittees recommends the acceptance of the affiliation and invitation from University of Texas. That is the report from the subcommittee. So far, you have only heard my voice. I think it is important before we open this up for questions and comments. We want to hear from the other subcommittee members on their impressions of our time spent with the four University systems and recommendation. Regent Mason.

Thank you. I have a few comments to make. I fully support the subcommittee selection to affiliate with the University of Texas system I want to reiterate how appreciative we are to each of the four systems that took time and great effort to meet with us in September and October. Provided by our interest groups. Each system has been very impressive. They have professional leadership. During the last few weeks we want to talk a little bit about my process going through this information. I went back for all the questions and answers with financial reports. Going about faculties, students and alumni. And the matters of greatest importance to our community. It has been mentioned that we found important similarities in all four systems. Our name and logos /colors don't change. Our curriculum is controlled and we received autonomy in the local university as president./Ministration. In the culture identity is in the local community and does not change. The financial resources -- when compared to other systems document they are significant. They are the only system that does not charge its member institutions for systemwide services as they have mentioned in her report. Those services from the board and the Chancellor office. Financial management. Financial aid support. Mental health programs. Systemwide insurances. Information technology costs.

The UT presentation in our face-to-face meetings included the written materials and answers to our questions. They were very professional, thoughtful and thorough.

The proposal never wavered or changed from the very point of our first meeting. We have a lot of clutter and details that were provided

for further discussion. The information in the financial presentation did not change or waiver during that period of time. It demonstrated through their questions and answers that they

have the same level of support for all of their members and institutions over the last 10 years. I believe the UT system will provide competitive wages and salary equity for faculty and staff. An opportunity to collaborate among systemwide faculty and staff to benefit teaching methods/research. Roman growth will be enhanced through scholarship and financial aid. I believe they will support our president in faculty to strengthen our unique colleges and programs. To become world-class in facility operations. Finally, I believe the UT system, will allow SFA to grow in our region. For workforce preparation, household income, healthcare outcomes, increasing college going rates and enhanced quality of life. Thank you.

Thank you. Regent Winston?

I've learned a lot from this process. At least I did for fair amount of minutes. I associated with what it looks like. How moving through independence would be. It became fairly obvious pretty early on. As Madame chair stated. We would be better served by any of the four. It's never the strongest that survive nor the most intelligent. Not only is a survival of flourish meant. The things that are probably the most important thing is Sally salary equity. The investment in mental health. We have a program that is relatively new. It is not something we talk about a lot or see a lot. I love that they have identified the problem from that. In the 99 years and we have over --. Right now, our program serves about 300 units. In addition to that \$1 million a year is a minimum -- serve 232 of those. That's a fair amount in this room. That would be a game changer. I think the students would have great changes. There are amazing opportunities for growth, collaboration. We have noticed the campus tours in the lot of dates on the buildings. All built during that time. We are sitting on the edge of something like that. An opportunity that we do not have otherwise. We have these opportunities without sacrificing being lumberjacks. Will be lumberjacks forever. There is a quote in the UT presentation. Preserve and protect all things. The same thing. Including the name, the mascot and the colors. I think we will have some better representation and it will allow opportunity. I will reiterate

about the issuance and thanks to the system. Everyone took this process seriously. They were respectful. We had 100 77 questions and they answered every one. Thank you temperance at the time to submit those questions. We could only see what we see. We couldn't see what other people thought were important. So it helped our decision. That is so helpful in this process. It was nice to see that -- to see or have someone else the R-value. We know our value and we love the school. In my opinion, we would be feeling our duties as members of state to not make this move. Thank you to all of you to allow me to serve. I could almost get emotional about the opportunity. We all know I won't cry.

Thank you regions.

Regent holder.

Thank you , Madam chair. I decided to translate some thoughts. I will overlook the important principles and questions that I had for my self in this process. First, I have a few introductory comments before getting to the heart of the matter. If you'll allow me and the rest of the board. A moment of personal privilege. It is too often goes without saying that you should not go without saying that this board and this university owes you, Madam chair, and warmest gratitude over the last two years of your wonderful leadership. You have represented us with preparation . A level of class and professionalism that is shown is in the best possible light. Two leaders of higher education in Texas. I know your father would be extraordinarily proud of your contributions to this university. Where he taught for many years. I reflect on my conversation with you in the halls of the Capitol in Austin almost a decade ago. You were in a leadership role in the alumni Association. I encourage you to fill out and be on the board. I am sure it was already on your mind and through many contacts. I never want to not take a small sliver of ownership for that. Thank you for your wisdom. Your even temperament. In difficult situations and not just in this process but over the past two years. Your exemplary leadership in this particular matter of system affiliation. As a committee, we often remark of how we would like to have the entire board sit in the conference room of community development . We engage in discussion with representatives of these four systems. We do regret that this is not possible. I want to thank the board for trusting us with this great responsibly. Your interests, inclinations -- are always top of mind as we approach questions. Throughout this -- you have inspiration and upheld loyalty to this university. Thank you. We mentioned already that we owe the key members of our administration for their 100 of hours of labor and endeavoring to give us an objective summary by which to evaluate the various offers extended to us. The thanks are due to them. The thanks are due to Dr. Westbrook in designing this process. His wisdom built on many years of service here and they have certainly surpassed my own in this regard. I am glad his design carries today. My system affiliation is not only three months but the entirety of my almost 10 years of service around this table. I have long thought that the governance model by which we operate is certainly deficient. I am a part of collection of men and women who put this institution above our own. We all take this job very seriously. Yet, as nine diverse individuals with full-time jobs , family and civic commitments. Our ability to exercise affect of and consistent oversight/accountability in this ministration is understandably false shorts.

Exercising the effective oversight and the compliant statute is challenging. I've come

to be convinced that they can be much more effective by system Chancellor. Daily engage in the competitive marketplace of higher education and understands first the pressing issues. You can measure it by the performance of the administration of peer institutions. Both within a particular system and also within the broader higher education contact. I don't delight in admitting defeat. It's just that the structure of our model, I believe, it is inadequate. Versus a system model with a competent Chancellor. All the chancellors that we spoke with were highly competent. Overseeing by a system-level of regions. First, as an almost tenured Regent, I believe the system affiliation

affords SFA more effective governments than our president that's my present model towards it. Secondly, during our conversations with various system officials, conversations that included numerous peer university presidents. It became apparent to me that there is not a single university in the state that is currently funded through the higher education fund. Those would not jump to become a permanent University fund eligible institution. Share in the available University fund that is downstream. It is not the brass ring of Texas higher Ed. It is the gold ring. There is certain calamity and it is the closest thing to a past too short, medium and long-term financial security. To be clear, the permanent University son fund is the second largest university endowment in the nation. It is projected by blooming bird to overtake the largest. Which is Harvard. Every one can give their proverbial right arm to be here today. It is an amazing influence of circumstances. Including but not limited to the value of the industrialized economy and their availability under 2.1 million acres. As was the fact that we are almost the last independent universities standing. A solid reputation over the last century. We are located in a strategic Regent of the state.

We have, for years, discussed the realities of steadily facing state funding. How nice it would be if in some fantastical world -- we a modest sized university does not could secure a piece of the pie. This slice of that pie is being presented to us on a silver platter. I think it will represent a grammatical -- dramatic -- to not accept this. This offer represents a huge opportunity for new investments and hike all of the learning environments and technology/equipment. To which our faculty and students do not have access. To bring faculty compensation packages to a competitive level. Corralling us to recruit and retain outstanding faculty. To attract scholars who want to pursue an advanced degree here at SFA. Third, this affiliation will provide a major boost to our scholarship program. In the amount of at least \$1 million per year. On top of what we offer. Track the caliber of high school graduates and we have this for years. They consistently choose other colleges that have a more generous financial aid package. We and every system we engage, believe increase scholarship funding is a sure fire need to turn around our negative enrollment growth. There are enormous savings that have been outlined that will accrue to the benefit from the assumption by a system office. Many of the back-office possibilities and services that many universities must perform. The UT system proposal and savings amount to over \$11 million over the next three years. I am convinced that joining a system will allow SFA to attract the attention and interest of a much larger pool of more talented and experienced applicants. For the position of the University president. Finding a superior talent to fill this role. That will be job one for this. They have indicated a willingness to provide compensation package that is more than competitive with our peer universities across the state. During our discussions and our committee was impressed with the professionalism and obvious competence of the various university presidents whom we met. Westbrook has been the right man at the right time. On more than one occasion in our history. He is a self-confessed -- old short timer -- who will lead SFA after May?

It will be in great hands with our board. It will be crucial to our success. I have greater confidence to lead this matter to those who know better. They can make decisions. There are other advantages. Some of

which have been mentioned and are of lesser value than my own information. For example, it seems reasonable that our affiliation will afford more opportunities for our academic leaders to engage their system colleagues collaboratively. Find mentors on other campuses and that will address problems/challenges that will affect our campuses. Our status is a very important constituency. It would be a substantial boost. What is more, we can never contemplate having an influence in Washington or other agencies, whether I like it or not, they allocate a lot of resources to colleges and universities. The University of Texas system has an established and highly respected present. That will be the benefit to this campus.

We really do not focus on the downstream benefits of system affiliation or local economic development. It is not lost on any of us of what that impact of our growing student body for local residents. A significant capital improvement would be for this local economy. As a proud former student of Texas A&M, now make a living in agriculture, many of whom I respect in my field, have reminded me that they have the service or the board service. They are a part of the system. It is a great university. Certainly. There is a natural fit there for for strained agriculture. But the academic offerings are quite diverse. For every professor that lunges to the idea of joining the A&M system. There is likely a music or theater professor that evaluates culture from a very different perspective. Culture and fit are important considerations. We must recognize that they are appraised objectively. I would note the -- much over the years we have limited our limited resources and unlimited demands for resources. While this affiliation will not annul this economic issue. It would take our right to lament. We would have to live alone with inadequacy. In coming years, they will find themselves in expectation that has been heightened. Bars have been raised. This, ultimately, will enrich the learning experience. Also produce expanded opportunities for faculty. Personal enrichment and development. I hope that we will embrace the higher benefits that are on the horizon. Today is probably the last -- either as a student or a staff. We have a tremendous opportunity. Totally unanticipated before the false conversation. Advance Stephen F Austin as no other board has ever had. But this university that we are also invested in on a new and higher tier. Exalts his status. Put in a fashion where we can scarcely imagine today. I look forward to growth and success. To seeing future historians of this university point back to November 29th, 2022.

A simple Tuesday. A pivotal day that launched SFA to greater heights and greater achievements. It's a obvious thing that I endorse the committee's decision.

This is the reason that I go towards it.

Thank you Regent Aldrich for your thoughtful analysis and comments. I would like to open this up to the board for discussion. Questions comments or anything that you would like to address in response to this report.

Have a comment. I would like to thank the subcommittee and you in particular. Dr. Westbrook. Everyone. Everyone who participated in this

process. It is so . thoughtfully done. It was a great process and so transparent. I think I speak for the board members who are not on the subcommittee when I say thank you so much for doing this. We really appreciate you.

This is a hard act to follow. Two things. I am an emotional person. I don't want to shed tears on all of you. As Judy said, our heart, as a committee, they go out to you. The right person at the right time. You are fearless with your leadership.

It has taken this process to an ease that has been very difficult. We all know the weight of this decision. For those of you , don't think we couldn't take this to heart and read one of those words on those 176 questions. More than once. In each one of the financial documents. We have conversations with other institutions and other board members from other universities. Were trying to be well-equipped for this decision. It's been hard . A hard decision. Emotionally, physically, economically et cetera. I am confident that you guys have done a incredible job in bringing this information to us in a concise and well constructed manner . We can support the decision that you have put before us. Thanks, again to you for your leadership. Dr. Westbrook for always coming through for the University. Each of you who have worked so hard on this. Tom, Jennifer et cetera. Thank you.

Other comments ? Questions?

To be appointed and anything else would be redundant for me to say. I'm very thankful. For all of those that participated. Thank you for being a part of this. For the process .

Everyone has certainly said it more articulately than I could . I'm appreciative of your hard work. Thank you.

>> I appreciate the group and the board. I appreciate the other systems and all the things they have put together. Unfortunately, like a lot, I am new to the board. Each one of you have people in the four princesses that you know personally or you have been introduced to. I don't have that . I've had that luxury. I do not know different people from the system. I said that I like to look at basic operating numbers and facts. I do have a few questions that I'd like to ask the members and perhaps even Gina to help me clarify a few things. Since we are focused on public. Like David mentioned earlier. I do believe the time is for our university to go into a system. I'm very clear on that. I probably was the slowest or the least likely to agree with our early on. I hadn't looked at the numbers. I say this many times . Being an independent -- we are not lacking in our sources of funds. I am confident in that. I have all the information and I can sit with whatever group. We have sources of funds. It is our uses that we have problems with. As I go back and look from 12 to 18. I've looked at from 12 to 18. We maintained our own. I will stop for a moment to just say that I think the doctor did a great job managing this university. He kept it stable. We did not have the enrollment growth but when you look at SFA compared to others , we were not behind. We have two markets we

are competing. I want to at least point out that the University had performed admirably.

Obviously he passed away and a lot of things shifted honest. The system probably has that ability. I look at Texas State and they really have a handle on their sourcing. You look at the three major schools. They are close each year. They've done well. We can learn from that. Based on the approach and what we've been able to do. We look at Texas Tech and they are growing. They are doing well. I want to start with that. I think it's important to note that there's been areas where we've had unrestricted reserves in 2012 and then 2018 and have grown to \$91 million. It literally had grown, excluding the investments, and that is over that. We were doing things right. Worry giving raises? Not necessarily. Pointed out that we had to maintain a certain reserve. We don't have that back stop that other systems wait. It would be easier to deploy those funds. People asked why we wouldn't deploy those. We would have to make sure that we were solvent it had to meet our bond rating requirements. Start looking at the couple of questions there is a committee that shows are we confident that we will be able to provide legislative. Are we 100% guaranteed on that? My question -- help me here. We have to have a two thirds vote.

The legislation would be a dissolution and a recreation as a member of the system. So we would still have to have a two thirds vote?

The system says we will be unable. We may not be politically. There is an unknown there. Correct or not?

Anytime we have legislation. It's unknown. The University of Texas system has assured us that this is the proposal. They believe the words used in our meetings were -- we do not want SFA in our system as a -- school. We only want you as the public school. That is how we can provide the resources to SFA. Elevating it to the levels of other UT university systems.

My follow-up question is, for whatever reason, if we, -- then they would not want us.

We would be a -- school. They will carry the legislation. This is not on us. I wanted to clear that up. They will do whatever they can to get it through the legislation. For them to handle the enabled legislation and carry it through the process.

I want to be clear.

It and believe that to be an issue at all. The state wide reach of the University of Texas system is --. I'd mentioned, also, every one of the systems is put on record. Not only as object thing but supporting the legislation.

I want to make sure that when we go through this that we are clear there will be access for us. You gave a compelling speech about what it is and how important it is. I want to make sure we do have that in the process. Gina pointed out earlier that there is a fund and a available University fund that is administered and pass through. One of the questions I have from the group with these systems in particular . If you go to a report . Prepared by the Texas system. It outlines what the bonds and allocations are. The debt service for schools. It aligns somewhat with what we are presented at the system as well as the others. When I looked at it. My number comes directly from these reports. Over a ten-year period from 2012 the 2021. I'll call out a couple schools. UT received debt service payment of 10 5 million over that tenure. We swap out

that. It's about a \$5 million adult and they are about three times size. If you look at the health science tower. Based on this reporting, which shows UT Tyler received \$38 million in service. They received 39 million in bond issued. Did they have any comments on that? My question is, how did they allocate the funding at the system level? There's a pool and based on certain numbers that you are allocated a certain amount. How do they allocate those funds? Is it on a as needed or requested basis? Is it based on the population of the schools? What did they say in that?

>> It was how the UT system allocates the funding.

I know it has to be approved at the board level. How do they actually allocate those? How do they approve it? They tell us we will get 20 million debt service money. Beyond that, what are the measures that says we will get additional funds each year?

I think it's from their office of budgeting and planning. They have a multiyear plan. We would be able to say that we want to apply or have funds from whatever building. They came up with how much we will get in the first year. It would be up to us and our president to work with them to raise the capital plan for our university over a certain time period. We have a capital plan claim here.

I think it is a more robust planning process. They actually have certain measures. They can only use certain percents of this fund or that fund. They have to have a plan to do that. We would participate in that process. In one of our conversations , he talked about the difference too the funds being appropriated and allocated just like higher education fund. We have that appropriated but we don't spend it all every year. Some of it carries forward. The difference in the reporting and what you expended -- we are still appropriated with 11.3. The allocated funds that have been used but were set-aside for planning to go to our final. That is an example of the funds being set-aside. They were appropriate by the legislator but have not been expended. I feel like it would be that same sort of process. A lot more robust planning of our capital projects than what we are used to as a standalone university.

I was trying to get comfortable knowing that if we give up this fund then how would that be allocated? Would we have to go to the board and say, we need these for this reason. They only have a certain amount. It seems to be a huge amount though. We have numbers that are staggering.

It goes back to what David was saying before. Over the last 10 years, the net divisible income of the distribution for UTA NM in 10 years with \$9.3 billion. And I've received \$3.1 billion.

UT received 6.3 billion. Part of that set up is read restricted. It could be allocated for the debt service. If you look at them, both of them over the last 10 years -- they were about 28% of the puff funds were to debt services. About 20% were dedicated to the system. Over 53% was given to UT Austin directly. Well over half of the puff went to UT Austin. If you look at a and M. A third went to A&M and then a third went to all of the other services. It's a third, third and third. And then UT Austin took about half. I want to make sure that if we go into puff and it is that thing that can help. I hope that there are people who have discussed this. They are committed to giving us the funding that we need in order to accommodate our university. I have to make my decision based on what I've been told or being told by the people that had this conversation. I haven't looked someone in the eye or had this conversation. I am trusting that there is a commitment there. We will receive significant funds going into the UT system if we show and you like to do that. It is not necessarily financial. It is something that is important to the University. That is enrollment. We all have discussed the enrollment and desire to increase. I have this question. I can find a number here. I apologize. Give me

a moment. Enrollment is key to this university and others. I want to make sure I state this correctly. I look at full-time student programs. I don't look at headcount. You have some universities that have a student with one class and they look at them as a enrolled student. The state had the calculation and they put it back into full-time student equipment. Based on how many semester hours you have and how many undergraduate, upper and doctorate. The numbers are full-time students. This is what the coordinating board and all of these numbers that I have here are from it. From 2011, 2021. The state average had increased 18.5%. Enrollment had increased 18.5% in the state level. The University of Texas system had increased 17.5%. They actually underperformed with the state of Texas on average did. Texas A&M system had an increase of 26.4%. They did well above the state average. The other was 22%. Both and them and Texas performed higher than state average. SFA was a -6.1%. Texas Southern was 24. My question is, were talking to the board systems, what did they feel like were there growth reasons? Why did they receive it above state average? >> I think we can address that to the University of Texas. We had detailed conversations about how there areas maxed out. They are trying to go through tens of thousands of applicants every year. There was something about that aspect we don't want SFA to be a theater school. We engaged the system on that topic. The University of Texas said that we do not want feeder schools in our system. We are developing

independent universities of excellence. We don't have room to be a feeder school at UT Austin. We are turning tens of thousands of students away every year. With the model is -- they recognize the grit that they have. Not with puff but two thirds of it. They talked about the responsibility that they see with the wide use of those funds. To invest them not just in UT Austin but around the state. They feel that is their obligation at the UT system. They are going to have access to the funds and they need to demand higher education statewide. That is what they will do if Stephen F Austin was a part of it. They will invest heavily

over the short and long-term so that Stephen F Austin , as a member of the system, would rise to the level of the other systems and universities within their system. Their goal is investment. The university itself and the system finds its mission. They say it is your choice, SFA. We will not tell you what you need to be like. You need to find that. That is why hiring a president is critical. A president will define that mission and carry out that mission. Basically, their role, providing the capital and resources to make that mission self defined. >> I want to say that I am very concerned with our enrollment growth. I think it's important that we increase enrollment in this university for the quality. When I saw that number, I want to make sure -- we question it -- the Rio Grande Valley is a growing area and they are up 6.2%. If I look at someone like Texas A& M they are up 49%. Some of the schools that look like us are -- I'm trying to measure what it would look like compared to others systems in schools. What do we look like compared to others? Some of these numbers fall in that area. Looking at grand Valley in particular.

-- They said in their documents that we look more -- they measure them in the same way. I will come back to that in a minute. One of the questions that is very concerned for me is our employees here at the University. Faculty and all of the others that we mentioned. 1650 and now plus employees here. 650 are full-time faculty. What we determine our equivalents.

If you look at this. You look at the core angles. In the calculations and how many student /instructors teach. I'm very concerned with this. If we don't get it right then people -- they won't benefit from this affiliation. I want them to know to at least ask the questions and we are comfortable with what the numbers are. If you go to the board and you look at what our average full-time faculty pay is . I will apologize for the rest of the people on campus and employees. All I have is faculty numbers. I don't have the other thousand individuals. Our full-time faculty equivalent average salary is \$53,700. The state average is about \$64,000. I think UT used that number when they say we need to get another five and half million dollars to get to that level. One of the things that I am questioning and I hope we can get answered here with the different systems -- look at the University of Texas and exclude Austin. Austin is an outlier. You cannot use it. The salary in the numbers is way off. There average is 22.96 students per instructor. They are pretty well across the board. Summer 25, 28 or 21 et cetera. We are 15.86. If you do the calculation, our 653 faculty -- if we go into the UT system and they manage us like the UT system. I know the president will have the ability to do what he does. What however he sees fit. If they manage just like the others -- on average -- we would go from 653 two 451 full-time faculty equivalent. That would be 200 individuals left There would be a saving to the University of \$6 million. That is a number and calculation that needs to be reviewed. If you look at cottage Station -- looking at college station -- there's 152 less employees versus 202. The savings is 4.4 million. These are business cognition. I'm looking at it from that aspect. How would we fit in with the system? Documentation supports that they will help us close the gap by five and half million. Did they say, as far as reducing faculty or how they would do it outside of that? Did they say, we know

that you operate at 15.86. That will be fine with us. Even though the others are higher numbers. Any discussion on that?

Reality held discussion .

Is started out in that initial proposal in September and October. We are going to look at faculty and staff compensation. A number of 5.5 million was given. Then they said that we will have to evaluate staff . In those proposals, there was a comment about that being done over the next two or three years. The final process they had bump that up . Making it available immediately.

In addition, I think this is really important. We will talk about this after a vote --, now is as good of a time as any. Because of the proposals that the University of Texas made and because of their comments concerning compensation . It opened the door in our subcommittee to talk about compensation on our campus currently. The fact that they have stayed well two or three years. We had candid conversations about our reserves. We said that some -- we are over reserved at SFA. There are a lot of different reasons for the number that we have for reserves. They can look at two categories. Will have more money to pay our people. Number two, we are an unaffiliated university. We don't have a safety net. There is a bigger savings account. We don't have the savings of the university system. We engage the University of Texas on the compensation discussion plan and said, because we are reserved, if we were to affiliate with the University of Texas, would you be able to immediately turn to our reserves ? Would you have a presentation from the demonstration about how compensation increases that could be made in fiscal year 23 to implement? They said, yes, absolutely. They want us to use the reserves immediately if we affiliate with them. So that we can have compensation increases. They are familiar with this topic. Part of the meeting today . Once we get tax action on item number one. If the board chooses to vote on affiliation with the University of Texas. They will immediately turn to Westbrook and asked that his administration to vote on a decision as a whole for the use of those reserves in fiscal year 23. That is fantastic. It's exciting. It's a great opportunity for us to not affiliate with the University and the University of Texas system. We can look at all of the possibilities. Have an immediate impact. That was a bit of a big topic discussion.

I can appreciate that. I will be all for whatever we can to tap into the reserves and pay compensations for our individuals. I've mentioned that before. After that before. I've often felt that we did have plenty of reserves. One of the -- I won't go into details -- I know there's been questions about our budget and our actual expenses. For some reason, for years, we did not get our budget and expenses in line. We do not do a zero-based budget. I understand the difficulties of it but we need to employ it for a better message for this campus. We do not do that. It's unfortunate that we are at this point now with this. The other thing that I have -- I have a lot of information. I'm not going to go into those details because there's been a lot of effort/time spent trying to get to the right answer to support this university. I

heard in our last presentation about the name /culture in the lumberjack. I've heard people express that they want to keep the SFA pride. That is huge for people. It is more important than the monetary value. I'm confident. I looked at the financials. I will say that going into a system would be great for this university. I think because of how the union and the company's use of back office so I do recommend it. I do want to be clear that even if we did not go into a system -- SFA is very capable to maintain and to do better. We performed in the past while they can do it again. With that being said, I will make the statement, to me -- the people I've listen to and spoken to -- they say the name is critical. When I look at the UT system. I look at all four systems. I have a lot of confidence that the name will say the same. I have the a and M system . They have had some schools where they changed the name. The University of Texas -- I have a difficult time with the SFA staying SFA and lumberjack . My question to the group is -- the most recent history is the UT Rio Grande Valley. If you go back and look at the history of that -- I think when it was Pan-American. It merged with UT and allowed to keep University of Texas Pan-American. Then the Board of Regents recently change the name to Rio Grande Valley. It was a decision made by a board of regents of the University of Texas. I cannot sit here and tell the people that have asked me to preserve the name -- I cannot say here and say that I will agree to vote for UT because I cannot assure them that the name will not change. The people you discussed with say it won't happen. 12 years

-- we all know business -- a brand is very valuable. If you look at UT. They have Arlington, Tyler et cetera. That is the brand. That is their brand. Someone could say that we will get more value from SFA if we change it. If the name changes in 10 or 20 years. People will get upset. I can't say that I knew that the possibility that the name will change but I still voted. I have to look at this and say, there are three that I feel comfortable behind it. I'm not comfortable with UT. I'm asking the individuals here. Are you comfortable with the name change? If so, we move on

At the outset, I cannot participate in any of this if there is any risk of Stephen F Austin losing its name. That was a guiding line in our process from the very beginning. We have a C and received assurances that they will not change the name of the University. If this board chooses to affiliate with the University of Texas system then we will enter into a memorandum of understanding. Much like what Texas Tech and Midwestern did when they went through their affiliation process. That memorandum will incorporate all of these and be a part of that memorandum of understanding. It will include it as the memorandum . It will clearly say that the name of our university will not change under the affiliation with University of Texas systems. >> That memorandum is not binding.

In terms of certainty. Our university is name is established by statute. They meet every two years. As an unaffiliated

university we are at risk of our university name changing. We can only operate under the assurances that we have. I think that just like we have said -- if they affiliate with any systems we are still the

guardian of our culture and on this campus. It will be our job in this campus is job to remind the University of Texas system that that is important here and that is a number one item that we went into this discussion. We said to many systems that we will not affiliate if there is a name change. We have received those assurances. We will have those assurances in writing. We will be the guardians of those promises going forward.

Madam chair. Briefly. As the chair said, that was a priority in this entire process. Nothing in the future is certain. There's nothing certain. Affiliated or not. While we have them on the record, publicly. Retaining that name of Stephen F Austin. We need to bear in mind to understand the benefit of retaining the name but also incorporating -- I expect they will do -- some reference to being a part of the University of Texas system. That is the highest ranking brand in Texas. Probably in the country. I think we have to examine the great benefits in terms of talent acquisition and student recruitment. Having that brand as a part of our identity on some level. Not to replace Stephen F Austin University but showing us as a part of the University system. I expect that there will be some reference to the fact that we are apart of the University of Texas system. I also expect that we will adjust.

I can appreciate what you're saying. I do appreciate the board and all the effort you put in. I want to be clear. Looking at the numbers overall. There's a lot of things that are important. They would be successful for the size of this university and this community. Either system. I do. I think additional benefits. If I can see SFA going into a system that is puff, I would like it. With the systems that are out there. With UT and and M. Then based on the history of the names and my feelings. I'm saying it. I cannot vote for University of Texas. I would be happy to entertain the University of Texas A&M. I will leave it at that. I know that the name has changed. I know Pan-American reserved their name in the documentation. It was a four-year legacy. Then it was removed. I know that is not important to some people. To me -- the name is not important as this university being successful. I heard the people that we represent want the name to be critical. Who we are is critical as lumberjacks. I cannot -- there's a greater likelihood that it will change if we go into that system. It will be 10 years. To be 15 years. More than likely -- it will happen at some point in time. The likelihood. I can go into why I think Texas A&M is a better fit from who we are in East Texas. How many students go to Texas A&M? How many go to Texas A&M schools that are not college station? I could go into that. Texas A&M is greater. I think from a funding standpoint, SFA doesn't need a tremendous amount of money. I have a lot of suggestions on where we could go to cut that gap or where it will be cut. They will make about four or five major changes in it will work better. Right now that is what I see and what I look at. I don't know the personality. Someone said that they are not.

I don't know the personalities. I know based on numbers and what I see in past histories. That is my position.

Live Captioning - Board of Regents Meeting #359 – November 29, 2022

We can counter the points for the rest of the day. I believe that is your position in those counters and it would not matter at the end of the day. Is that correct?

Okay.

Thank you, Madam chair for me the opportunity to speak and outline my concern. I want to make sure everyone was clear. I have nothing against UT. I think they are a great system and they have offered monies. If they come true and do honor those that would be great for this university. In 10 or 15 years if they name change then I would know that that possibility exists greater than the others. I've heard too many people say that I do not want to see our names changed. History has shown that they will change the name. In the last 20 years. >>'s as well as the Texas A&M system.

No one at this table will support a name change. Just to be clear.

[ Captioners Transitioning ]

Other comments?

Other comments? Thank you to each of you for your participation in this and for your input. If there are no other comments or questions then we can entertain the notion.

Madam chair, considering the subcommittees report and the discussion and conversations among Board of Regents members, I move that the University affiliate with the University of Texas system and the president be authorized to take any action necessary in collaboration with the University of Texas systems to effectuate that affiliation.

We have a motion. Do we have a second? Second from Regent Winston. Any discussion? All those in favor of this motion say aye. Those opposed? One opposition from Regent Floras. The motion carries. Thank you from everyone for your anticipation in this. At this time, we recess to executive session for consideration of individual personnel matters as stated in the board agenda. We will take a break because we have been going for a while, then when we come back we will be in executive session. Thank you. [ The event is on a recess. The session will reconvene . Captioner on standby. ]

We are returning from executive session. We have [Indiscernible] . >> Rules and regulations for the schools were outlined in the process to use [Indiscernible]

With that in mind, I move that we suspend section 11 of the board rules and regulations and that the University of the Board of Regents [Indiscernible] University of Texas system Board of Regents selection will serve as the recommendation for the S of a Board of Regents. We shall announce the names at least 21 days prior to [Indiscernible]

We have a motion

from Regent Alders. Do we have a second? All those in favor say aye. Those opposed? The motion carries. That is our last action item on our agenda today. And the other topics? Regent Windham. >> Chair Gantt, I just wanted to express my appreciation. I want to recognize and thank you for his decision and his trust. We have been charged to protect and enhance and take care of SFA and I want to thank you for the honor to have been bestowed [Indiscernible] so I want to be supportive of public service and this has been a great exercise [Indiscernible] I do want to say thank you .

Great I want to thank you very much for expressing that. If there is no other business from the board, we have a motion to adjourn. Motion from Regent Windham. We have a second. All those in favor say aye. Motion carries. This meeting is adjourned.