

Student Life Committee Minutes
October 23, 1997

All members present. Committee Chair Mace opened meeting at 3:05 p.m.

M/S/A minutes of previous SLC meeting.

Chair Mace reported that he had been contacted by a student regarding the open forum on the orientation program. The student expressed concern that the schedule had been redone without input from the students working in the program. G. Piccardo said that she had also been contacted by a student with this same concern. Mace said that he believed that there would be a memo coming to Judith Kay regarding this issue and the SLC may be requested to look into the situation.

T. Mace reported that everyone except D. Balaam had received the materials from the Board of Trustees meetings regarding deferred rush and deferred residence as discussed from 1984 on.

J. Kay passed out a summary memo of what has been going on regarding various evaluations of the Greek system. J. Kay discussed the memo and reported that there is a Facilities Subcommittee of the Board which will be looking into the investment and renovation concerns having to do with the Greek System. She indicated that her goal of the memo was to try to get a single recognition document for the Greek system as a whole. She said that the individual chapters have adequate documents with annual review mechanisms in place; but no such mechanism exists for the whole system.

T. Mace said that we need to discover exactly what were the objectives of the Board for deferred rush. He indicated that he was surprised by the 1984 Board minutes which implied that deferred rush was a "club" to be used if four conditions were not met. It appears that the conditions were not met and deferred rush implemented.

J. Kay said that some of the objectives were very broad like a common freshman experience and others were very specific like those mentioned on page 7 of the 1984 Board minutes.

After a lengthy discussion T. Mace summarized his reading of the objectives of deferred rush as: to facilitate a common Freshman experience, to address concerns about alcohol consumption, to address concerns about academic standards and to increase inter activity between the Greeks and the independents.

J. Fitzhugh asked for clarification on exactly what is meant by a common freshmen experience. Did it simply mean a non Greek experience?

C. Washburn indicated that the goals of a common freshmen experience are to get students to align with the University as a whole before they align with smaller groups and departments, to get a strong sense of community and unity between the upper and lower classmen and the off and on campus students.

J. Kay said that at the time that deferred rush and deferred residence was being considered there was no freshmen orientation program as there is now.

B. Anton said that a common freshmen experience may be globally described as an experience which helps a student make the transition from high school to college. He referred to the Board minutes of July 8, 1987, item #5 for this definition.

J. Kay said that much of the information we have is outdated, since many of the concerns mentioned have to do with rush during orientation and that is no longer happening.

There was some discussion as to when deferred rush actually started. Was it 1986 or 1987? There was some ambiguity in the minutes and the question was not settled.

T. Mace again stressed that we must determine what were the objectives of the Board for deferred rush.

C. Washburn asked if the Senate was aware that the Board, in 1988, had evaluated the Greek System and decided that their goals were not being met and, as a result, imposed deferred rush?

T. Mace said that we were to review the objectives all the way back to 1984 to see if they had been met. We are doing the same thing that the Board did in 1988. He asked the previous chair, B. Anton, how to proceed.

B. Anton suggested that it is time to go back to the Senate for clarification of our charge and determine if our work has already been done.

J. Kay said that the work on deferred residence has been done but the question concerning deferred rush has not been answered.

Another lengthy discussion followed as to what were the objectives of the board.

T. Mace said that he was satisfied to use the criteria for evaluation of early rush as the objectives of the board.

J. Kay said that the 1987 concerns were a "fleshing out" of the 1984 concerns.

T. Mace pointed out that if we go back to item 1. of the 1984 criteria:

"That one or more of the national fraternities or sororities definitely commit to building its own chapter house at the University"

then the objectives have, clearly, not been met.

D. Balaam pointed out that the Board has already dealt with the objectives by imposing deferred rush. He suggested that we could go back to the Senate and say that there are two ways to read our charge. One way is to take it literally and find that the criteria have not been met and deferred rush has been imposed. The other way is to ask how well is deferred rush meeting the goals.

B. Anton suggested that we look at the subtext of the issue, which are questions of whether UPS should plow 8 million dollars into the Union Avenue houses.

D. Balaam said that the question is not "if" money was to be put into renovation of the Greek houses but "how much" was to be used in this undertaking.

J. Kay said that the Board didn't ask us take up this charge and that the timing was off for our decision to make a difference in the Board's decision. We have until April and the Board could make its decision in February.

Another lengthy discussion followed as to what were the objectives of the board and what constitutes a common freshmen experience.

The meeting ended at 3:55.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Smith