Present: Voting Members by category were students Daniel O’Brien, Sam Pierre, Stephanie Van Veen; non-students Matt Hill, Eric Immel, LeeAnn Crist

Non-voting members: Rowland Hughes, Kelli Mutchler

Absence Excused: Student voting members Aurora Driscoll, Ashlie Franz; non-student voting member Dr. Sally O’Neill; non-student and non-voting Jana Ammon, Eric Yarwood

Absent: one voting student member, to be appointed by CSU

Audience Guests: Giovanni Barrios, intern for the SSC, from St. Peter Claver Ray Catholic High School; George McNary, Faculty member; Tamara Thibodeau and Robert Denney, staff members.

Welcome: Rowland Hughes called the Board to order at 3:32 p.m.

- Hughes thanked all members for appearing, allowing him to use the official quorum gavel instead of the non-quorum gavel.
- Hughes called for a review of the Jan. 20th meeting minutes. A moment was given for members to re-review the 6 pages of notes; seeing no objections or changes, the minutes were accepted on Houston’s Rules of Order.

Open Forum:

- Hughes welcomed guest audience members to the Open Forum session. He said this is the first such opportunity the Board has taken advantage of, due to a guideline passed by the Board in the fall 2007 and effective fall 2008; the guideline suggests inviting all campus members to come and address issues that they would like to have the Board discuss.
  - Hughes expressed his delight at McNary, Thibodeau and Denny’s presence.
  - He explained that in the fall 2007, the Board indicated that they would dedicate 45 minutes of one yearly meeting to an open forum. While guests can attend any other Board meeting, any items they wish to bring forward must be submitted to the board chair and members for pre-approval.
- Thibodeau started by expressing concern at the length of time it took of the policies and procedures process.
  - Matt Hill asked for clarification if she meant the length of time after a policy leaves the room. Thibodeau said she meant the process from the time it left Hughes’ office, to the Advisory Board, to Dr. Cernech’s office. She said that she understood the necessity of having policies and procedures reviewed by the Advisory Board, but wondered if the one month- two month period for review could not be sped up.
Thibodeau asked how long the Board spent on one policy. Hughes answered that 2-3 were usually assigned to the agenda for one meeting – as needed, they could be tabled as ‘Old Business’ for the next month’s meeting.

- Hughes emphasized that Pierre voiced similar concerns about the length of time spent discussing the historical perspectives of policies, and not visiting about what that policy is trying to accomplish.
- He said that at January’s meeting, all the policies brought to the agenda were discussed – only one was not brought to closure (due to debate on wording), and will be discussed today. The process to review the 23 or 24 policies has taken 3 years – the Board is currently 2 policies away from reaching that goal. Once updated, they will go to the Student Services Administration, Tanya Winegard and Dr. Cernech, for final review.

Thibodeau expressed excitement that the Board was that close to completion. She asked why all policies needed to be turned in to the Student Services administration together, as opposed to turning in individual policies as they were approved. Hughes explained that administration had specifically asked for all the policies and procedures to be submitted as one complete package. He suggested that in the future, though, they can be reviewed by the Board and submitted to the administration as the need arises.

Hughes asked if Thibodeau had any ideas to streamline this process, though the Board is only 2 meetings away from finishing the semester and the review process.

Referring to the original review process by the Skutt & Harper Administrative Office, Thibodeau suggested the possibility of dividing up the policies and procedures among Board members (based on personal interests, or random assignment); members could then review these on their own time, with the consult of their constituents, and return with their version of the best update.

Sam Pierre said that this was a good idea, but that he felt not all policy issues were relevant to all Board members; using room reservations as an example, he explained that in most instances it was best to have the experience of the entire Board brought to policy and procedure decision-making.

Hill added that while it took a while to complete the review process, the consultation and input of all Board members meant that it was done well. Hopefully, this will ensure less changes and longer lasting policies and procedures for the future.

Immel said it seemed inefficient to review all the policies and procedures as a complete package; if just one policy came up for review, were the Board members to go back and review them all over again?

Hill said he was unaware of the request to turn in the policies and procedures as one whole package.

Thibodeau agreed and asked if, once the process was done, the Board would start reviewing policies again. Hughes said that, should any need updating, they could, but he did not believe any were due for review at this time.

Pierre noted the calendar, hinting that it would be best for the Board to push through the remaining policies today and at the March meeting, so that none would be held off until the fall of 2009. Hughes agreed that they needed to look at the final policies, so that in case they were tabled, they could be completed in April.

Hughes asked for a halt to the conversation, for timing purposes, so the discussion could move on to the remaining two guests.

George McNary, faculty member, said that he was selected to represent his fellow faculty members, who spend a large amount of time dining in the SSC. Over a period of time, McNary said that the quality of
food has decreased in Jack & Ed's. He and his faculty members notice a decrease in student usage, which they think may correlate to the change in food quality. He said that students were being drive away because they weren’t being offered good food.

- McNary said another part of this was involved pricing. He cited several instances where food prices, as listed on the Web, were not wrung up appropriately, or Dining Service employees were unaware of the correct prices. He said that he understands the difficulties in training new employees, but that there should be a more cohesive understanding of prices by employees.

- McNary said that the offerings in Wareham Court were very limited too. And when a diner approaches one of the various spots in W.C., there is often no employee there to serve them. He understood that some times of the day would be busier and the wait was expected then.

- He also cited Blimpies’ employees as needing more training, since their skills were lacking at sandwich-making. McNary said this was a training issue that Dining Services needed to fix.

- Overall, McNary emphasized that if these trends continued, students and faculty would be driven off-campus to find cheaper, better food. While this was easy for faculty, it was not fair to students who may be “stuck” on campus.

- Hill asked if there were specific foods they had quality concerns with. McNary said it was the food offered, in general, but particularly in Wareham. He acknowledged McNary’s comments about Blimpies, saying he only ordered a sandwich when the one official Blimpie’s employee was behind the serving counter.

- McNary added that he and other faculty members had attempted to contact University Dining via email on several occasions, but had not heard anything in response.

- Stephanie Van Veen said that while the SSC was closer to eat at, her friends now prefer walking the distance to Java Jay or the Diner, because they prefer the food there. They’ve even started going off-campus for better meals.

- McNary said that while the SSC is a great place for students, faculty and staff, problems with food will affect how many people look at the facility as such.

- Pierre talked about the conflict of high individual product prices and low amounts for meal exchange. He said that it went against the CU’s cura personalis that juice was cheaper than milk, though milk was better for your body. Also, it was difficult for a student to buy food and drink and stay within the costs of meal exchange. He said there was no distinction between menu items listed as meal exchange and non-meal exchange, and so it is a guessing game whenever a student orders. Finally, students using a Flex Plan are only allowed to eat meal exchange once in a day- all other food purchases come out of Jaybucks.

- Immel emphasized that CU is the client of Sodexo Catering; in this relationship, they should be meeting our needs. If they are not, than efforts needed to be made or the contract should be cut. Costs shouldn’t be sacrificed for quality. He said that Sodexo may have staffing issues, but there were larger problems that should be looked at in review of the contract.

- Pierre suggested maybe bringing in a new venue, instead of Blimpies. He said his friends wouldn’t eat Blimpies on campus, but enjoyed it off-campus.

- O’Brien said that last year, he had been a member of a board to review the Sodexo dining contract and services. He believed that there were 5 years left in the contract and that Sodexo was willing to make improvements. While there have been some changes, he recognized that these were slow and not always easy for other students to see.

- Van Veen agreed that while she could see some changes now, they weren’t this fall (2008). She thought that maybe employee services had improved, the quality of food wasn’t noticeably better.
O’Brien said, due to a changing of positions, he is no longer on the IRHG board and thus is no longer aware of the specific changes being made. But Shara Mahoe was a student member and was working hard to solve these issues with Sodexo.

Hughes wrapped up the discussion, saying that from the Administrative side - which is working closely with University Dining Services - this is a very volatile issue at the moment because U.D.S. has 5 key positions open on campus right now. (These are: general manager, catering director, retail manager, marketing manager and third-line chef that are very important to the operation of Billy Blues Alumni Grill.)

- Hughes said there was a termination of the General Manager position, but hiring for this position was now in process. The administration is very considered about what is taking place in food services, as this is one of the key components in recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff. While students may come for many reasons, it’s the amenities that keep them wanting to stay at Creighton.

- Hughes said they were hours, if not days away from going out to search for a new provider. Correcting O’Brien, he said CU is 8 years into a 10 year contract with Sodexo. As liaison with University Dining Services on retail and catering, Hughes said that it was the campus leadership that drives the quality of food services. This leadership is the primary position the General Manager’s position is now open.

- A second issue with UDS, Hughes said, is the shuffling of current staff. For example, Todd Matthews- Becker and Brandais Manager- has been everything from retail manager to interim catering manager, etc. Many staff have stuck with UDS over a time period that feel the same way.

- Hughes said with a new general manager, we’d have the opportunity to turn some things around. If things did not change, the University may be out to bid for a new contract next year.

Pierre asked if there could be better general accessibility to a comment box, or a place where the campus population could voice concerns. He said that if this was more obvious, or more commonly seen- whether as table tents, more of the candy-bar-for-surveys, etc.

- Robert Denney, interim director of Campus Recreation, asked how- with the addition of the Harper Center- our policies and placements for renting tables had changed.

- Hughes answered that there had been no changes to the related policies. The reservations and event planning office of Skutt and Harper Centers still process most outdoor event requests.

- Denney said he brought it up because more and more often, Campus Recreation and the KFC were getting requests for space and table usage. (Campus Recreation recently received some older tables from Skutt).

- Denney said that the Campus Recreation office would like to coordinate policies and information to better deal with these requests. This way, the offices won’t have to send clients back and forth but can work together to meet client needs.

- Hughes clarified that the reservations and event planning offices does not control all outdoor space- it has no jurisdiction over the renting of Morrison Stadium, and the Campus Recreation fields.

- He said that Lennis Pederson, Associate VP Finance and Administration for Facilities Management, is working through a slow process to pull together a resource committee (made up of Tanya Winegard, Hughes, Jana Ammon, Lou Marcuccio, Therese Bohnet) to get a head start on creating a more cohesive all-campus event planning/reservation process.
• It’s the hope that one office could help clients reserve and plan an event for anywhere-the law school, the Lied Center, etc. and wouldn’t have to go to multiple locations to organize it. Hughes said this will take time and cooperation from the top down, starting with the administration of the University.
• University VPs would especially need to buy into this, because every VP has space that could be available for usage. Hughes said that this proposed planning/reservations office wouldn’t take control of these spaces, but they would become the conduit between the client and the venue’s stakeholders.
• Hughes said that along with this would come an inventory of equipment, so that the University doesn’t spend large amounts of money on renting equipment.
  o Hughes noted that the open forum had run over its 45 minute suggested limit, and, hearing no other points of interest from audience members, thanked them for attending. He said that it appeared more open forums needed to happen, in order to address concerns and take care of issues. Audience members were invited to stay, but were allowed to leave if they needed to.

**Housekeeping Topics:**

The following items were reviewed:

• Hughes gave an update on the AKOO interactive digital board: It will be installed sometime before the end of the semester, as the contract is currently moving through Creighton’s legal system.
• Ammon was not available for a marketing update.
• Mutchler shared the final results of the silent auction. She said the turnout was wonderful, with nearly all items getting one or more bids. To date, $134 dollars had been raised.
  o Hill voiced disappointment that he had not won the racquet, white tshirt or Puma shoes.
  o Discussion about the highest bid item, a purple stone ring going for $35, led to the suggestion that next year, jewelry items be evaluated for worth prior to the sale.
  o She asked for any extra used phones to be turned in, so she could take them to the YWCA.
  o All non-sold summer gear was sent to the DR; winter gear was donated to Lutheran Refugee Services.
  o Overall, she said that it was extremely successful, and hoped that it would grow for next year.
  o Only one item was claimed by a person: Pierre’s friend recognized his Puma shoes, so they were purchased and given back to him without making him pay.
• Referring to McNary’s conversation, on the topic of open UDS positions, Hughes said that two candidates were interviewed last week, though nothing had been offered yet. Two more interviews for general manager were yet to come.
• Hughes mentioned the handout with the ongoing list of Student Center updates.
  o Pierre asked about news of placing a Red Box in the SSC; Hughes said Ammon would have to answer that question.
• The final item, which was not printed on the agenda, was that the Harper Center was submitted to the January issue of the ACUI magazine. This issue is yearly dedicated to new construction and renovation within the college union field- not only did the Harper Center receive an entry, but was also on the cover and primary lead page.
  o LeeAnn Crist requested additional copies.
  o Hill suggested a copy be framed for the building.
Old Business:

- **Policy 7.3- Reservable Space**: At the past meeting, the Board had some difficulty deciding on the correct terminology for the opening sentence of the policy (which indicated who was eligible to reserve space in the Skutt Student Center.)
  - Hughes proposed amending this to read: “The privilege of reserving the Skutt Student Center facilities is extended to registered student organizations and University departments, faculty, students, alumni and any non-University individuals or groups which are concurrent with Creighton University’s mission.”
  - “Registered student organizations” was changed from “Recognized student organizations”; also, the wording now better clarifies the eligible non-University organization category.
  - O’Brien asked for further clarification, to explain who/what determined whether groups and individuals were concurrent with the University’s mission. Hill suggested adding “as determined by the director of the Skutt and Harper Centers.”
  - O’Brien motioned to accept the January meeting discussion on this policy, with the new introductory sentence (as printed on the agenda of the Feb. meeting), with the addition of his friendly amendment. Pierre seconded.
  - Policy 7.3 passed with 6 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 opposed.

New Business:

- **Continued policy review: Policy 7.6- Vendor Lobby Tables**
  - Hughes further explained the “cosponsored by a for profit group” sentence with the example- if Ford Motor Company sponsors IRHG, because Ford is for-profit they’d be charged $50 for one table, $60 for two tables. However, they’ve made a deal that for IRHG support, they’ll donate $100 worth of products. Because that group is receiving more than what the Reservations/Event planning office would receive in fees, those fees are waived so that the group benefits.
  - Confusion ensued as to how this policy distinguishes between “for-profit” and “non-profit”. Hughes said that in the past, for example, the Girl Scouts were charged to use a table for selling cookies, even though they are a non-profit organization.
  - Immel suggested changing “for-profit” to “non-Creighton affiliated organizations”. Hill agreed that this would thus cover both “non-profit” and “for-profit” organizations, which were “profiting” from the use of a Creighton table, but were not Creighton-affiliated.
  - O’Brien and Immel asked how this would work if a Creighton affiliate- ex. Pierre- wanted to use the tables for the profit of a non-affiliated organization- ex. Computers For Africa.
  - Immel said that it’s Student Activities policy that all individuals must represent or belong to a recognized student organization.
  - Hughes disagreed, pointing out that the University heavily depends on the student fees paid by all students, many of whom might not belong to registered organizations; these fees would entitle them to the same rights as student organization members.
  - Van Veen pointed out that any CU individual who was not affiliated with a recognized student organization could always contact and work with a student organization in order to rent a vendor table.
Immel pointed out that a CU-affiliated individual couldn’t just reserve a room—ex. Pierre’s Connect Four Club. Hughes drew attention to the 7.3 policy on reservable space, which did allow CU-affiliated individuals who were not members of a registered student organization to rent a room.

The Board broke into discussion of what type of event Pierre’s Club could have in the ballroom; whether or not it required the attendance of another CU student; what if a CSU candidate wanted to rent a table?

Pierre said this was part of a larger issue, but not necessarily relevant to the discussion for the policy. Hughes asked if the Board was still looking for the definition of “for-profit”.

Hill pointed out that this was explained in the third paragraph of the policy. Hughes suggested moving this definition—“financial gain/advertising/display/recruiting”—to the Purpose paragraph, to better clarify the policy.

Mutchler asked to add quotation marks around “for profit groups” in the third point under Priority.

O’Brien motioned to vote only policy 7.6, Immel seconded.

Policy 7.6 passed with 6 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 opposed.

- Policy 7.7- Wall of Distinction (No updates needed). Hughes said they were added to the agenda to let the Board members know they exist.

- Policy 7.8- Amplified Noontime Events

  Hughes said this policy has faded into the woodwork over the past years, but could still be enforced as needed. It was created at a time when Program Board had regular noon-time events; it was written to control the frequency of these, as well as the noise level that permeated the building.

  This was a co-policy between CSU Program Board and the SSC Advisory Board.

  Immel asked if this policy than allowed for amplified events at 8:00 am, since it only specifies the time between 11:00 am and 1:00 pm. Hughes answered that this did not cover any transit people in the building playing piano.

  O’Brien asked how long it had been since the policy was used; Hughes answered that it would not have been used since the aforementioned active noontime events.

  Immel added the idea that Creighton create a lunch-time musical period, based on a similar program he saw on a program for a Chicago hospital. Immel said that this supposedly reduced stress at the hospital, and he believed that it would have the same results here. At his previous university, there was a time period where students could play piano, acoustic guitar, etc. He suggested that the Board look into creating a program where Creighton’s talented students could showcase their talents and receive a lunch voucher in return.

  Pierre suggested making it over the dinner hour; Hughes acknowledged that it was a great idea and told him to take it to the next Student Activities meeting for further development. Students could volunteer, or try out, etc.

  Hughes added that the administration of the SSC could use this policy as an open forum to share their expertise in the fireplace lounge, as well.
Open Session:

- **Drawing**: Two prizes were awarded, one for Thibodeau (the only audience member to remain for the entire meeting) and one for Crist. O’Brien challenged the “3 x only” win, saying he just couldn’t win 3 x in a semester. Mutchler, referring to previous minutes, read “no board member may win more than three times.”
- Hughes added that Hill is part of a dancing Budweiser beer commercial at the Qwest Center Omaha that plays prior to the men’s basketball games. Hill added that he had been in it for one year.

**Adjournment**: The meeting ended at 5:05 p.m.