

Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees
January 11, 2006
8:00 a.m.
Private Dining Room, Blazer Hall
Meeting Minutes

8:12 a.m. – Called to order by Marianne Smith Edge, Chair

Attendees:

Marianne Smith Edge, Chair
Jeff Dembo, Board of Trustees
Becky Ellingsworth, Board of Trustees
Russ Williams, Board of Trustees

Absent:

Phillip Patton, Board of Trustees (excused absence)

Marci Ches, Legal Counsel
Joe Fink, Chair, University Appeals Board
Richard Greissman, Assistant Provost
Gail Harriston, Public Relations
T. Lynn Williamson, Legal Counsel
Scott Smith, Interim Provost

Art Jester, Lexington Herald-Leader

Student Affairs Staff

Patricia S. Terrell, Vice President for Student Affairs
Mary Bolin-Reece, Counseling & Testing Center
Anne Coke, Student Affairs
Larry Crouch, Student Affairs
Jeff DeMoss, Dining Services
John Herbst, Student Center
Betsy Mahoney, Student Affairs Administration
Greg Moore, University Health Service
Rhonda Strouse, Student Activities, Leadership, and Involvement
Jim Wims, Residence Life & Dining Services

After a welcome and introductions of all present, Marianne Smith Edge opened the meeting by asking Richard Greissman to begin the discussion on Governing Regulation XI (GR XI). Mr. Greissman stated that the ad hoc committee was guided by three principles – to ensure that Student Government Association (SGA) has sufficient autonomy to function; to affirm the University’s responsibility for and authority over SGA operations relating to fiscal affairs and adherence to policies; and to incorporate into a Governing Regulation certain definitional elements of the University Appeals Board (its jurisdiction authority over academic and non-academic offenses; the selection of its members; and several general procedures). The phrase “whose decision is final”, pertaining to the Vice President for Student Affairs, under A, was stricken from the original GR. Russ Williams asked whose decision is final. Interim Provost Scott Smith said that the Provost’s decision would ordinarily be final, but there could be circumstances under which the President might want to review a disputed matter. Marianne Smith Edge asked if the Provost and Legal Counsel concur and they do.

Dr. Patricia Terrell noted that the Student Code has a section on student organizations, which SGA is one of, and if a student organization violates the policy, the Dean of Students notifies the organization, and it doesn’t have to go to the UAB. This will need to be further explored.

Ms. Edge said that three-fourths of the first page is fine and the bottom fourth will need to be clarified. Becky Ellingsworth said it would need to be clarified before the next Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting in two weeks. The Student Code Committee would need to convene to discuss this section, or the President could bring forth with feedback from the Student Code Committee. It was decided to put this on hold for now.

Mr. Greissman pointed out that on page two, the jurisdiction of the UAB is further explained when a student's rights are violated. On page three under 3.(c) the UAB's role is clarified with regards to the SGA elections. An earlier version stated that the UAB:

- (1) May affirm the decision of the Student Government Association appellate body;
- (2) Refer the matter back to the Student Government appellate body to correct the error identified by the UAB;
- (3) Affirm the election;
- (4) Void the election.

The Senate Council recommended that the latter two options be stricken. Ms. Ellingsworth had asked Provost Smith and Richard Greissman to take the language out whereby the UAB selects the SGA President and instead have language whereby the UAB can base their decision on a fair process. Mr. Williams said that the original language was clear and favored going back to it; the present language weakens the decision process. Ms. Ellingsworth said she was against doing so because the SGA President has a BOT seat. Mr. Williams said that he has seen just about all of the SGA elections contested every year during his fifteen years at the University. Ms. Ellingsworth said that the processes for election violations should stay with the students to be corrected and not go to the faculty. Mr. Williams said it should go to the best group to protect the interests of the students and the issues are protecting the rights of the students. As a Board member, the best outcome should be guaranteed. Ms. Ellingsworth stated that Mr. Williams' viewpoint is a loco parentis attitude. SGA is currently revising the constitution and they are more than capable of fixing the problem internally. Dr. Jeff Dembo said it was important because it is a student voice on the Board. It must be adjudicated in a clean manner. Therefore, it should go to a separate group for a hearing. Ms. Ellingsworth agreed with the current language in the GR and violations should go to the SGA Supreme Court. Ms. Edge asked if the election violation process is going on, is SGA recognizing the President. Ms. Ellingsworth said the election results must be certified by the Student Board of Elections. Provost Smith asked if the UAB could deny certification. Discussion continued with the aspect of loco parentis and the sanctity of the SGA organization. Mr. Greissman asked if Provost Smith's language should be included. It would be explicit that the election is in abeyance while it was in the appeal process. Ms. Edge asked Joe Fink if the committee if the language should be kept. Mr. Fink stated that the UAB hears 25 cases per year. This case came to the UAB in a different matter—through the Dean of Students Office. Mr. Fink preferred the language in the previous draft. The UAB is made up of 30 members. All members are of equal status. The focus is on the facts of the case. He has never seen a vote outcome of students versus faculty. Ms. Edge motioned to move one way or the other. She asked if the committee should vote on each change or vote on the whole. The committee members said they would like to vote on each. Mr. Williams asked to have the original language restored in 3C, third line from the bottom. The UAB should affirm the election or void. Dr. Dembo second the motion. Strong discussion continued amongst the committee members. Ms. Edge stated that she stands with the original language and it will specify that the election results are suspended. Mr. Williamson said "during the appeal, results are suspended unless the UAB decides otherwise." Ms. Edge motioned for going back to the original statement. Three members (Smith Edge, Dembo, Williams) voted in favor; one member (Ellingsworth) voted against. Mr. Williamson again stated that during the election appeal, all results are suspended unless the UAB orders otherwise. Ms. Ellingsworth said she didn't like it because it gave too much power to the UAB. Ms. Edge said it was passed, but would like to clarify. Mr. Williams stated that during the appeals process the election results would be suspended. Provost Smith said he would like to go with Becky's statement. This could open the door to trivial appeals. Mr. Greissman suggested that it should be explicit about the status of the SGA President. Ms. Ellingsworth explained the election process and the certification process. There was discussion on the time frame for appeals. Mr. Williamson mentioned that this academic year, one student served on two areas during the certification and appeals process within SGA. Mr. Williams suggested that part of Ms. Ellingsworth legacy could be getting more students engaged in the election.

Mr. Greissman moved on to Section D, number 2, the Composition of the University Appeals Board. The hearing panel will now consist of nine members to avoid tie votes. Under number 3, Mr. Williams asked that quorum be more specific. Mr. Greissman will clarify by stating “A quorum of the hearing panel....”

Mr. Greissman stated that the language in Section E was cleaned up to state “All questions of the law, either substantive or procedural, and all procedural questions shall be addressed to and ruled upon by the Hearing Officer.” The earlier language referred only to cases involving original jurisdiction, although the intention was to give the hearing officer authority to settle question in cases involving either original or appellate jurisdiction. Ms. Edge asked the committee if there were anymore questions. There were no more questions. Dr. Dembo moved to present Governing Regulation XI to the Board of Trustees for its first reading at the January 24th meeting. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Ms. Edge asked for a vote. Three members (Smith Edge, Dembo, Williams) voted in favor; one member (Ellingsworth) voted against. It was motioned to the next Board meeting.

Ms. Edge asked Dr. Terrell to discuss the Dining Services meal program and facility renovations. Dr. Terrell reminded everyone that Mr. Williams had asked for figures on the meal plan and talk about the current and proposed renovations.

Betsy Mahoney went over the factors that led to creating the different meal plans for students living on campus. For the first time, commuter students can participate in their own dining plan. Money on the dining plans cannot be used in any of the campus convenience stores. The goal is to create a sense of place and belonging and create a community for all students.

Jim Wims discussed the recent renovations in the Blazer Hall dining area. All of the campuses dining areas, like the residence halls, have had no renovation since they were first constructed. Ricca-Newmark, a design firm for dining facilities, was hired to evaluate the facilities and design a plan. The Blazer dining area has had the first of a four part renovation. The renovation process also improved the HVAC, electrical, and plumbing infrastructure. Future renovations for Blazer will include a pizza area, deli, and soup and salad bar. The final phase will be to expand the grill area. After talking to a student advisory group and surveying students, it became evident that students want fresh foods and enjoy watching the meal preparation. Recent additions are a Chick-fil-A in Student center dining facility and a Starbucks at the Kentucky Clinic. A fourth Starbucks is going into the William T. Young Library.

Jeff DeMoss discussed the infrastructure and the challenges for the future. The rise in utilities, a 53% increase in electricity, and the rise in construction costs, a 40% increase, are having a huge impact on the costs of renovations. Mr. DeMoss shared that students want more convenience such as being able to grab their food and go. Dining Services are incorporating more health choices. They are working closely with UK dietician and nutrition staff to ensure those students with allergies and certain health conditions have choices. He also stated that there are themed food events, with free food, at different campus locations to showcase dining services. In essence, Dining Services is looking at all strategies with food choices and with the meal plan, to make it work for students.

Ms. Edge asked if the renovation plans are on hold. Dr. Terrell replied yes they are. Ms. Ellingsworth said that the SG Senate voted against the meal plan. The 123 meal plan is the fourth lowest of the benchmarks. Is there something we can do to promote it? Dr. Terrell said that it is the choice of the student to take advantage of the option they contracted for. Mr. DeMoss said that extending the hours of operation in the food areas will help.

Committee discussion moved to the alcohol reduction initiative on campus. Dr. Terrell stated that in 1990, the number one issue on campuses was alcohol abuse by students. Dr. Todd appointed a committee to look at this issue. He met with the committee who brought a list of areas to target. There are two questions—is the policy clear and is UK being consistent. Currently, a department can have a special event on campus and the UK football game days. UK was chosen as one of two universities to be a part of a

national project called Genesis. Genesis is made up of two groups at UK, one group of faculty, staff, and students; the other is students only. Out of these group meetings, it was noted that students need alternatives. One such alternative is a new initiative called Wildcat Wildnights that started in the fall. It is late night programming that occurred on four different Friday nights from 10:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. at different locations on campus. Many of UK's benchmarks currently do this, but it is very expensive.

Peter Lake, a lawyer, university law professor, and national expert on alcohol issues, visited UK for two days last semester. He met with many diverse groups of faculty, staff, and students. As a result, he issued a 100 page report. The Campus Community Coalition was to meet with Dr. Todd in December, but a conflict arose. Before the Coalition publicly issues the report, it is out of courtesy that Dr. Todd has a chance to review it and meet with the group.

Alcohol has a huge impact on students and their lives. They are vulnerable to becoming victims of crimes. It is disruptive to the student population living in the halls.

Ms. Edge asked when Genesis started. Dr. Terrell replied that it started in Fall of 2004. Mr. Williams asked about its funding. Dr. Terrell said there is no funding for the group. It is a program out of the National Interfraternity Council and [?????]. The other university that Genesis is supporting is DePaul University. The President is very supportive of this effort. A survey was completed last year. Ms. Edge asked that the survey results and program outcomes be share with the BOT. This could be done at the March meeting after the Coalition has had a chance to meet with the President.

Ms. Ellingsworth said that the Wildcat Wildnights went over very well. Rhonda Strouse said it was a pilot year for the program. Attendance for the events was between 500 and 1000 students. Dr. Terrell said it cost \$100,000 to have the four events. Ms. Edge asked if there will be events for the spring. Ms. Strouse said that they may be one event. The Committee needs to meet and discuss the feasibility.

Ms. Edge asked if there was anything else. She thanked everyone for attending. Mr. Williams motioned to adjourn. Ms. Ellingsworth seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.