Golden Rule Review Committee 2/18/2016

10:38: Meeting called to order

Roll call: Rodolfo, Lauren, Sara absent Quorum reached

Minutes Approved

Agenda Approved

Announcements from the chair: Greek forum administrators are in favor of the medical amnesty so that can be pushed through without any issue because it keeps students safe. Dr. Jenkins is approving authority. We can meet with him beforehand so we can make sure that we have good changes.

Jorge: I met with Matt Betz and approved the research we have and will come up with a draft that Christen will help me make. The biggest point I found was a piece of legislation that came out last year granting medical amnesty under Florida law. However this can't be entered into the Golden Rule just like that because of the implicit wording of the alcohol amnesty so we have to mirror that.

Gilmer: This is because of the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, which lines up with our funding in terms of federal aid. Essentially we have to make it without condoning or approving.

Clay Coleman: It might have the opportunity to be revised and be practiced better. Also I just want to say that my perspective today is my view, and I am not speaking on behalf of UCF. My advisory group has said that we need to look at principles of group responsibility because it's too broad. I personally like UF's policy. My advisory board also recommends that we get rid of inactive from the language because it is very difficult for us to be able to hold a current RSO accountable for the actions of inactive members. Second part of (F) had an issue but the change you all made seems good. My question is what are the UCF risk management policies and procedures? We need to know what they mean.

Gilmer: We don't have anything that includes risk management. That's where it needs to be tied back to OSI.

Clay: The board and I agree that it needs to be further reviewed and looked at. But we tend to agree with the changes made so far. Matt Betz would be the best person to go through.

Jacob: I want to clarify that if one person committed did something and the whole organization is being punished then it should at least be an executive member.

Clay: I would suggest that you look to build collaboration up to other administration. That could be a point of contention.

Gilmer: Otherwise supported activity is very vague. I want it to be a little more concrete because that ties into the officer part. In all reality it doesn't matter if it's an executive board member or ordinary member because what we're talking about are events. There may be some more discussion with that.

Clay: A looks good, B sounds reasonable regarding guests versus invitees. My suggestion is to look at UF policy because it provides a different viewpoint and language

Jorge: I've noticed posters going around about alcohol that say that UCF PD may still enforce the law. I feel like that shouldn't be there because of the Florida statute. It does say, "may" but that is my concern.

Gilmer: The issue is that I don't know who prints them I think its wellness and health promotions. It's supposed to be a marketing poster.

Jorge: I think the idea is great but the wording.

Vote on Section 5.007: 4-0-0 passes

Jacob: Know your Rights event is coming up.

Christen: What about the iPads so we can show students how to navigate the website?

Gilmer: Yes I can bring some.

Jacob: I included an organizational chart so that we understand who everyone answers to.

Advisors report: Again continue the conversation particularly about academic conduct. Some parts don't sit well for me and we want to tighten up our language. My task is looking at process itself and recruitment of faculty. Currently we have 24 that serve on academic misconduct panel and for each panel we need 2 so its stretching them past their limit. When we can't get 2 we have to collapse the panel. We need processes to recruit faculty and increase their incentive to join. We run the same problem with conduct when we don't have quorum and we have to collapse because we're bound by Board of Gov to have 2 students on panel. That's what we're looking to do. The other piece is the organizational cases and having a

separate process for organizational cases and moving away from our 4 person model so we can have an additional student. This way that person can be Greek if the organization is Greek, giving a student majority and some perspective. I expect that if that doesn't happen this year it will happen next year.

Taylor: Are there any students on the subcommittee?

Gilmer: No because we're only looking at the student process. However we will reach out to students who have gone through the process to see their opinions.

Gilmer: Last piece is what I brought up last time about other changes that we're looking to do with practice not written part. Make sure to do compliance with Title IX so that victim complainants are entitled to rationale as part of their outcome. Back to the conversation about when we release our rationale. Still looking at the policy of when we release it. So just because it doesn't state it doesn't mean it shouldn't be clear.

Jacob: If Clay was taking a night class would he be considered a student?

Gilmer: Yes, but it isn't clear and we would want documentation from the other party that they agree with that stance.

Jacob: Should we clarify it as full-time student?

Gilmer: Then we would need to clarify faculty as well. This could mean that it sandbags the process. I like letting the organizations sign off on it.

Taylor: Would you consider offering more training for students and advertise it?

Gilmer: We tried to make it 2x a year but we were short staffed. We currently have 170 trained.

Jacob: Do you know how many are student gov?

Gilmer: I think it's advantageous to have them trained but not to have them serving on panels.

Iorge: What's the rationale for that?

Gilmer: I see SGA being for all students and being approachable and not have boundaries. I think it's a lot to carry if they made decision on panel because it can separate them from other students. However these are just my thoughts. Another thing that we do in training is make sure that everyone knows that their name will be released in the documents.

Final roll call: Same as initial.

11:21: Meeting adjourned

Next meeting on March 3,2016 in the Siesta Key Boardroom, room 225.