UNIVERSITY OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

+ + + + +

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

+ + + + +

Thursday,
January 16, 2014

The meeting convened at 6:00 p.m.,
Errol Schwartz, Chair, presiding.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEMBERS PRESENT:

ERROL SCHWARTZ, Chair
CHRISTOPHER BELL (via telephone)
KENNETH ISAACS
JEROME SHELTON

ALSO PRESENT:

MARIA BYRD, Office of Information Technology
JAMES CONTRERAS, Director of Financial Aid
JOEL LIMERICK, President and CEO of Document
Systems, Inc. (DSI)
SMRUTI RADKAR, Assistant General Counsel
MICHAEL SINDRAM
DENISE SLAUGHTER, Provost's Office
MARC STROTHERS, Interim Director of Residence
Life
CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM: PAGE

1. Call to Order
   and Roll Call 3

2. Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Minutes (Not ready)

4. Admissions and Enrollment 4

5. Financial Aid 5

6. Housing 24

7. Records Management 50

8. Testimony 75

8. Closing Remarks 83

Adjournment 85
PROCEEDINGS

6:15 p.m.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: The time is now 6:15 on the 16th of January.

Ms. Slaughter, could you call the rolls for this committee meeting.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yes, sir. Errol Schwartz, Chair.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Here.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Christopher Bell.

MEMBER BELL: Present.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Jerome Shelton.

MR. SHELTON: Present.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Kenneth Isaacs.

MR. ISAACS: Present.

MS. SLAUGHTER: That's four members, sir.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So we have a quorum. Thank you much.

The first order of business is to modify the agenda. We have someone who would like to provide testimony. So I'm making a
motion to modify the agenda, to add that item right after the Records Management presentation.

MR. ISAACS: Second.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: The ayes have it.

The agenda is now modified.

Item No. 3 is approval of the minutes. The minutes are not available this evening, so we will bypass that item, and we'll get on to Item No. 4, which is Admissions and Enrollment.

MEMBER EPPS: I will speak briefly on that topic. The semester enrollment is going well. The figures are not available for us right now because they're still enrolling students. Normally, the enrollment in the spring is slightly less than fall semesters. But we'll be reporting out the final numbers to you, once they become available.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And you're doing
interim reports to the president as--

MEMBER EPPS: Yes; yes.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MEMBER EPPS: The president receives, during this time, almost a daily report.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay. So I will look to the president to provide that at the next meeting coming up.

MEMBER EPPS: Yes.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Financial Aid?

MEMBER EPPS: Mr. Contreras, will you kindly provide us with a short report.

MR. CONTRERAS: Absolutely, Dr. Epps. James Contreras, director of Financial Aid. I provide a report regrading the financial aid disbursed for the 2013 fall semester. We've disbursed over $27 million.

MEMBER EPPS: Hold on. Trustee Bell, can you hear Mr. Contreras?

MEMBER BELL: Actually, I cannot hear him. I'm sorry.
MS. SLAUGHTER: I can't either.

MR. CONTRERAS: Okay. Do you want me to--

MEMBER BELL: It's not clear, right now.

MEMBER EPPS: Okay. Perhaps you need to come over here.

MR. CONTRERAS: Okay.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

MEMBER EPPS: Thank you.

MEMBER BELL: Thank you.

MR. CONTRERAS: This past fall semester, we disbursed over $27 million in financial aid to approximately--making 4900 student award offers to over 4,400 graduates, so we're two hundred--graduates, and over two hundred--and 293 law school students.

Normally, when I do the presentation I want to focus on, briefly, cash management, customer service, and program compliance.

I provided sort of a breakdown of
those numbers, in terms of how much federal
aid, institutional and industry gave, for your
review, and a pie chart on that.

This past semester, we continued
to look at process improvements in the
Financial Aid Office. We've put in a call
center, so that students weren't placed on
hold, or had delayed calls when we have a rush
of incoming students. So to balance the
student contact in person versus on the phone,
would be out of the call center. We also added
an online chat to our Web site, and we're
going to continue to make process improvements
in that area as well.

We are also having a number of
financial aid awareness sessions. We're
working with DC OSSE and the U.S. Department
of Education, where we will host, on March
15th, which is a Saturday, a FAFSA College
Expo. The intent of the expo is to encourage
students to complete the FAFSA early. We'll
have continuous online FAFSA completion
sessions, in addition to DC OSSE providing
updates on their programs as it relates to DC
Tag, the mayor's opportunity fund, and the
latest proposal on the DC Promise.

The U.S. Department of Education
will also provide a presentation on financial
aid, some of the changes, that include the
Pell maximum lifetime limit, the 150 percent
maximum loan limits, and other change and
updates to the federal student aid programs.

We also have DC-CAP promoting
their program, and we also have invited a
number of area colleges and universities to
participate in the college fair. We so we have
20 universities registered, to date. We look
forward to providing that event in March, as
well as having continuous sessions for
students here on campus.

In terms of federal reporting, we
did so at the phys-op. We are working on our
annual IPEDS report, which is due in February,
and we should have that finalized here in the
next coming weeks. We are in the process of also liquidating the federal Perkins loan program.

We recently completed our recertification for the program participation in the Federal Student Loans Program, Federal Student Aid Programs, and that certification was for three years, and I think Dr. Epps wanted to kind of sort of "chime in." I think we're going to have a separate meeting to kind of go over that recertification and what it means at a later time.

Is that correct, Dr. Epps?

MEMBER EPPS: That's correct.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Could you tell me something about the federal Perkins loan program. What's that?

MR. CONTRERAS: The federal Perkins loan program was a program that was a student loan program provided by the Federal Government. They stopped awarding the program, and universities only had the option of
reallocating, returning funds. So if the university had loaned out a $100,000, and students were making the minimum repayment of maybe $50, if, in a given year they had 5,000 or $10,000, they can reallocate that money, but there was going to be no more continued contributions from the Federal Government in the program.

The program had sat dormant, and upon my arrival, as director, about a year and a half ago, we decided, with the Finance Office, that it would cost more to operate the program as it's no longer receiving continued federal funding. So the intent was to liquidate it, which means we assign the loans to the Federal Government, and they collect on the loans, or the students send the loan payments to them, rather than us having a third party servicer, and they collect the money on behalf of the university.

In addition to that, students in the Perkins loan program had a higher cohort
default rate than the federal direct loan program. So the intent was, while we're having a harder time of having students pay this back, although we will continue to do default management, and that was one of my other agenda items, for students in this program, we decided to liquidate it.

We had 60 borrowers in repayment, and thirty of them were delinquent, or going in to default, which kind of led to the higher cohort default rate.

So our numbers weren't high, proportionally, but percentage-wise, it appeared that they were higher than what needed to be. But we just felt that it would be best to liquidate, rather than continue to administer a program that was no longer being federally funded.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CONTRERAS: Segueing that in to the cohort default rate, this new year, just as an FYI, the Department of Education
will transition into what they call a three-year cohort default rate instead of a two-year cohort default rate, which means for a number of schools—as you know, student loan seem to be the "hot button issue" nowadays with $1.2 trillion in student loan borrowing, and there's an increase in student loan defaults, and students repaying, and UDC is a victim of that, and we see our cohort default rate rising. So as a result, we are enhancing our default prevention plan, which will include more sessions, one-on-one counseling sessions as students withdraw or graduate, informing students of their rights and responsibilities of repaying the student loan, repayment options, such as income contingent repayment, and depending on their programs, various ways they can pay off that loan, such as the Americorps community service, and teacher loan forgiveness program.

So we're going to kind a increase that awareness. There's really no reason to be
defaulting on this loan, and if you can't pay it, there's always deferment, forbearance options.

We did provide online sessions. In fact, the Department of Education has online sessions, and they sent an e-mail out informing students to take advantage of the new income contingent repayment. But we feel that--I think more one-on-one discussion needs to be given to the students.

And we are working with our loan servicer, through the Department of Education, to identify students that are on the delinquent list, so that we can provide them with these options, and give them a link that says, look, if you're having a financial hardship, it takes less than five minutes to go online, and say, hey, I'm having a hardship, I can't pay my bill, and get a deferment or forbearance, and there's various reasons and options, either in school, financial hardship, medical, and I think they
just need to be more fully informed, because
I really don't think there's any reason any
student should be on default. But I think
they're scared of the loan, or something, and
so they're not repaying, which is causing the
higher rate. But we're going to do what we
can, as part of the default plan, to make sure
students are informed, so that we can lower
that rate, not only to the benefit of the
university but to the benefit of the student.

And that's my report in a

nutshell. Any questions?

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: What's our
default rate at this time?

MR. CONTRERAS: Well, when we had
the two year rate, it was at 7 percent. Now
with the three year rate, it goes up to 14.2
percent, which is our draft 2010. The official
2011 cohort default rate won't come out till
February.

Now you'll notice too--you may
notice on my report, that in 2010, we had 12
million, student lending. This past 12-13 year, we had approximately 20 million. So that sort of the law of averages is, you know, the higher amount, there's going to be a larger proportion. But it could offset. So if we have more students in repayment, and even though there may be an increase in students defaulting, the number might lower. So it's really kind of "a numbers game" as to how that's going to average out.

But it did increase as a result.

And that's not uncommon. In fact, I gave a presentation to the president's cabinet, that shows that UDC's default rate is on average with what's going on in the nation.

So a lot of schools experienced a decrease, and part of it too--were a number of factors. You know, the recession. Students graduating, unable to find employment in their, you know, their related programs, so they're somewhat underemployed, and I think is why President Obama implemented the income-
contingent repayment.

So I think we'll probably see some leveling off. It may increase slightly, but I think once we get the word out on these options for repayment, we will see some level-

    CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Professor Shelton.

MEMBER SHELTON: I was going to ask a question about the students paying full tuition. Your numbers indicate that in 2011-12, there's 634 full-time pay tuition students. In 12-13, we had 483, and in 13-14, we had 501. Do we know where those--you know, who those students are? Are we looking at those students and trying to determine--because we spend so much time with the need group.

Is there anyone looking at the demographics of the students who are able to pay their own tuition, or who pay outside of the grants, and other support systems? Dr.
Epps?

MEMBER EPPS: Sorry. I was reading my report. You caught me that time.

MEMBER SHELTON: Dr. Contreras has been dealing specifically with the most in-need students, but we have 10 percent who don't apparently need support.

Is anybody looking at that number, to see where they're coming from, what they're registering for, and try to increase that?

MEMBER EPPS: We will. We do know that--and Mr. Contreras has made presentations on, and when anybody has asked me my ideas, we did pass on that we needed to have more scholarships for students, one, on emergency basis, and for those students who don't qualify for aid but still have a need.

MEMBER SHELTON: Well, that's why I'm asking, are these 10 percent, or, you know, 11 to 10 percent students--are they getting--are they scholarship? Are they athletes? Are they musicians? You know, who
they are. Because, you know, we started a
program for the first time in athletics, and
we didn't give scholarships, and when I saw
the number, I'm trying to figure out where
else are these tuition-paying students?

What brings tuition-paying
students here? because we need full tuition-
paying students. With Dr. Contreras' concern,
and our concern about the delinquency, you
have to be able to demonstrate an improvement
in other avenues of student enrollment.

MEMBER EPPS: And also the number
of--and that's very true in terms of like more
scholarships for students as well.

MR. CONTRERAS: But if I can
interject. I think one of the trends of self-
paying students are international students.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay. That's what
I was trying to find out, what--

MR. CONTRERAS: And we find more
students competing for that.

MEMBER SHELTON: --the sourcing is
for that group— that percentage. What's the
strongest source? I have no way of knowing. So
it would be something we have to look at.

MEMBER EPPS: Right. And I'll get
you those details.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay. We've got
to generate as much student population as we
can, so we can control our budget, get more
control of our budget. So if we have
something that works and brings in independent
money, we need to explore that, and try to
expand it.

MEMBER EPPS: Right, because our
institutional money that we were, you know,
able to contribute, is drying up as well.

MEMBER SHELTON: It's real out
there.

MEMBER EPPS: But I will get you a
breakdown of that 10 percent.

MR. CONTRERAS: Are there any
other questions?

MEMBER ISAACS: I have one
question quick. Why was the law school numbers excluded from the student loan under the 2013-14 financial aid disbursements?

MR. CONTRERAS: Yes. We listed the law school at 8.6 million, and law school eight. But I did provide, or you should have received a breakdown, that I'll be happy to give to you, if you didn't, that sort of shows the percentage, and all of the programs, as to how much is going in in each area.

The law school's a different branch. I mean, they have their own like branch and OP ID number. So we provide the numbers but we, yeah, we didn't include any overall totals. But just for your information, for the law school actually--I looked at that earlier myself--and their borrowing for the year is at, let's see, seven--they have about a little over 8 million in student loans.

MEMBER ISAACS: Well, is that 8 million the fourth item on this sheet?

MR. CONTRERAS: Yes. In terms of
law school aid? No. No. That was--

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: It was 3.9?

MR. CONTRERAS: Yes. This past year for the law school, yeah, they gave away 4.5 million in the unsubsidized loan, 3 million in the Grad Plus loan, and then the difference was foundation, scholarships, remitted tuition, and the work study program.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MR. CONTRERAS: So yeah, the majority of it was student loans, because that's--

MEMBER ISAACS: That's right.

MR. CONTRERAS: --what they're eligible to receive. But we did give away about a million dollars in foundation, remitted tuition scholarship programs.

MEMBER ISAACS: Okay. And if I could get a copy of that--

MR. CONTRERAS: Oh, yes. I'll leave this--

MEMBER SHELTON: My question in
support of that is why did you not do the same
type of listing for all the categories? I
mean, you did, two, four, six, seven, eight
distribution categories, and you didn't do the
same thing for each other. I'd like to have
seen all of them listed, so that I can see all
of them over the three year period you were
describing. Okay?

MR. CONTRERAS: Okay. Actually, I
have it like in this summary sheet, and then
I have the breakdown of all the programs, in
great detail. I apologize. I did send that
off, but I apologize if you didn't get that,
cause that would have provided you with the
detail of what we disbursed, and what's
pending disbursement for the spring semester.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: We would
appreciate getting a copy of that by e-mail,
if you will.

MR. CONTRERAS: Absolutely. I'll
send it.

MEMBER SHELTON: And there was
somewhere, we were mentioning the default rate. There hasn't been a significant in the default numbers, or it hasn't had the analyzing of--you know, at one point, I think we were around 13 or so percent.

MR. CONTRERAS: Yes. We were actually at 7.2 percent in the two year cohort default rate. Now when it goes to three year, and it's going on the draft 2010 year, it jumps to 14.2 percent.

Now as I mentioned, that's as of 2010 when we only have 12 million in student loan debt. Now for 12-13, we had approximately 19 million. So when the 2012 comes up, we're going to sort of see a change, and there are a lot of variables that can result, either in an increase or decrease. Just more students borrowing, if there's more in default, but because we have more borrowers, that can lower the default rate, economy improving, people getting jobs and being able to repay it, the income contingent option. So I think there's
a lot of variables that can tip it, either way, but I think with the university's approach and the default prevention plan that we're implementing, I think our efforts will be instrumental in lowering, at least at the university level.

MEMBER SHELTON: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

MR. CONTRERAS: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Our favorite topic, Housing.

MEMBER EPPS: Okay. First of all, I would like to announce that Tawanna Lee, who was our director of Residence Life, is no longer at the university, and has moved on to the University of Notre Dame. We certainly wish her well.

In the meantime, we had Marc Strothers Marc, will you stand, please--who has picked up the torch, and is running the Residence Life on a interim basis, in addition to--as part of his other responsibilities.
We do have a wonderful RA staff, and our lead RA is a student from the law school, Travis Bills, and we have several other, at least three other RAs, and they are doing a wonderful job.

I have not had to get up at 3:00 o'clock in the morning, and run over to see what's going on. They have certainly done a excellent job in assisting the students to move in.

Currently, even in your report, it says we have two vacancies, but we do have three vacancies, and those are for women only. So I think we are doing well with that, and we have posted the position. We have formulated a Search Committee, and we are reviewing--they've gone through their training, had to be trained to serve on the Search Committee, and they all have gone through their training, and they will probably start interviewing student candidates next week.
MEMBER SHELTON: Are we doing anything--I'm sorry.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Go ahead.

MEMBER SHELTON: --doing anything to work on the three vacancies?

MEMBER EPPS: Yes. We are. We do have a waiting list.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay. That's what I was--we have--

MEMBER EPPS: Yes. But, you know, some of the students don't tell us till the last minute, that they're not coming. And so we do have a wait list and they have been calling--

MEMBER SHELTON: To contact--

MEMBER EPPS: Yes, to contact students to let them know that we do--

MEMBER SHELTON: And that would be on a half-year, or whatever it is?

MEMBER EPPS: Yes. Absolutely.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay.

MEMBER EPPS: We're also starting
to market for the summer, and we have had some
interest in groups, more of a interest in
groups who are interested in talking about
coming to the university for camps, or
internships. One group was even inquiring
about 2015, and that is how far they like to
schedule out, which is a good thing for us, to
help us to be better planners.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: What's our fill
rate now for the rooms that we have.

MEMBER EPPS: I think it's 44.

Marc, we have 4400? Yes. For students.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: No. Rooms.

MEMBER EPPS: Oh. Rooms? We have a
total of one hundred and--

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: We have the
Archstone.

MEMBER EPPS: We have ten rooms in
Archstone, and we have, I think it was like
31--31. Yes. That is 31 units. I'm sorry. Ten
units in the Consulate.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Consulate. Okay.
MEMBER EPPS: And 31 units in the Archstone. And the staff is certainly--I've asked them to prepare for us how many males, females, how many are local, how many are international. So we'll get those statistics to you. I can say, of those students that are in there, 70 are student athletes. We have 58 athletes in the Archstone and 12 in the Consulate. So out of the total students, we have about 144, as of today, that have checked in, and so we can see the distribution is really equal. Almost equal.

MEMBER SHELTON: I'm sorry. Could you clarify? How many units do we have available in the Consulate? I heard you say that there was 31 students but--

MEMBER EPPS: No. 31 units.

MEMBER SHELTON: I'm sorry?

MEMBER EPPS: There are 10 units in the Consulate. Eight are for students, and two units for RAs.

MEMBER SHELTON: And how many
students did each unit accommodate, of those eight units?

MEMBER EPPS: In the Consulate, would accommodate for students, five per room, except for the two RA rooms.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay.

MEMBER EPPS: So we have forty.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And the Consulate? How many

MEMBER EPPS: In the Consulate--

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: I'm sorry. The Archstone.

MEMBER EPPS: Archstone. That's okay. I get confused too. In the Archstone, we have four students per apartment, except for there's one apartment that has three beds in it, because it's a smaller one.

MEMBER SHELTON: And you may have said this as well. This is Trustee Shelton again. But so there's a few vacancies in the Consulate. Is there a wait list for those
vacancies? Do you anticipate having a problem filling those remaining spaces in the Consulate?

MEMBER EPPS: We are contacting students on that list, on that waiting list, and we are very hopeful that we'll be able to have 100 percent occupancy.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay.

MEMBER EPPS: So we're hopeful.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So how many vacancies do we have?

MEMBER EPPS: We have three vacancies for women.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Three women?

MEMBER EPPS: Yes.

MEMBER SHELTON: And just one more question on that point.

MEMBER EPPS: Sure.

MEMBER SHELTON: When we approved the Consulate, I think we gave you guys the latitude to go up to 15 units, if the demand was there. But what you're saying is, is that
you chose to rent 10 units at this time; right?

MEMBER EPPS: Yes; at this time.

MEMBER SHELTON: Okay.

MEMBER EPPS: Yes. We were trying to field the interest, and make sure that we say we can do, when we decide to, you know, to add other ones. But we will be talking with the staff, seeing how the applications are coming in for the next year, before we ask you, or commit to any more. So we will be reviewing that very shortly, just as soon as we get our students in, so that we can--if we need more units, we can work with Facilities, do that in a timely manner.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And you have the approval to--

MEMBER EPPS: We have your approval to do it; right. But if we have the interest, then we will work with Facilities to--

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And say again.
What's your waiting list looking like?

MEMBER EPPS: Marc, can you tell me how many students are on the waiting list?

MR. STROTHERS: There are--

MEMBER EPPS: Come up to the mike. And introduce yourself, please.

MR. STROTHERS: I do apologize. There are exactly--

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Your name, please.

MR. STROTHERS: Strothers. Marc Strothers. Assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs. There are, as we speak, there are 28 students that we have on the waiting list for housing.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So they're currently enrolled, and they're waiting for rooms.

MEMBER EPPS: Rooms. That's correct.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So you can exercise the option of going out to those five units at the Consulate at any time?
MEMBER EPPS: Yes.

MEMBER SHELTON: If they're available.

MEMBER EPPS: Yes. We will have to check with Facilities, to make sure that they are available, and that the students are still interested.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MEMBER SHELTON: There's got to be a plan in place for checking to see what next year's residents will be, I presume, and is there a written plan for recruiting for the next fall semester? How are we in the discussions about looking for students who want housing in the--next fall? Is there--

MEMBER EPPS: Marc is at a disadvantage at this point because Mrs. Lee's resignation was just effective December 31st. So we have practically new staff, in terms of the RAs, as well as the director, we lost some RAs, along with Mrs. Lee. But like I say, we do have excellent candidates in the pool, and
we're hoping with our--not hoping--but I know that with the expertise that I saw among the candidates, that we will be making--we're hoping to have some great new ideas for recruiting and marketing.

MEMBER SHELTON: We have to plan for the next group that's coming.

MEMBER EPPS: Absolutely.

MEMBER SHELTON: That was the direction of my question. Because--

MEMBER EPPS: And we are working very closely with the Office of Admissions, to make sure that when students apply for admission, that they know that we have housing available.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Yes, and I'm trying to get ahead of the demand, trying to see what the demand is, and if we have students on the waiting list, and we have an option to increase the rooms by five, and it looks like there are five persons per room in the Consulate.
MEMBER EPPS: Yes.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So that's 25 persons we can take care of.

MEMBER EPPS: Absolutely.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And we need to know, before coming to the board of trustees, to know, if there a demand for rooms.

MEMBER EPPS: Right.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And how many. And start negotiations with the Consulate, to see if we can increase our capacity.

What's our relationship like with the Consulate and the Archstone? Are we--

MEMBER EPPS: I'm laughing at that because you're so timely. I think the Consulate management is much more student-friendly than that of the Archstone, and if I were to say there were a plan, that I would work with Facilities about, it would be--one of the plans would be to decrease the number of units there, slowly decrease the number of units that we have in the Archstone, and
increase in the Consulate, or another property on Connecticut Avenue, or close to the university. That's what's in the back of my mind. Because there was a meeting that the Archstone staff had with Mr. Strothers recently.

MR. STROTHERS: Tuesday.

MEMBER EPPS: Tuesday. And it seems like they would like to be more strict, or stricter, in terms of our students, and enforce a--

MR. STROTHERS: That's right.

MEMBER EPPS: Three strike policy.

MR. STROTHERS: Policy.

MEMBER EPPS: You want to say a little bit about that, Marc?

MR. STROTHERS: Yes. Three strike policy. If there's any type of alleged violations to the Archstone's policies, then they want to--you know, some implementation for having them removed from the premises.

MEMBER EPPS: And their staff used
to investigate, if there was something, like
a noise violation, that--

MR. STROTHERS: Right; right.

MEMBER EPPS: --if one of the
neighbors would call.

MR. STROTHERS: Right.

MEMBER EPPS: They no longer want
to do that. They changed management, by the--
not management. But they changed the manager
that we were working with, and so this was a
brand new thing. They have a list of new rules
that they want to implement.

MEMBER BELL: I'm sorry. Just for
the sake of clarity. This is Dr. Bell. Did
you say that if there's three alleged
violations--

MEMBER EPPS: Yes.

MR. CONTRERAS: --or three
confirmed violations?

MR. STROTHERS: Well, as we say,
confirmed violations.

MR. CONTRERAS: Okay. Thank you.
MR. STROTHERS: You're welcome.

MEMBER EPPS: But our students do go through training and orientation. In fact, there is one scheduled for tonight.

MR. STROTHERS: 8:00.

MEMBER EPPS: At 8:00 o'clock tonight, for all of the residents, and Marc will review what the rules are in terms of occupancy and--

MR. STROTHERS: Safety.

MEMBER EPPS: And the safety regulations.

MR. STROTHERS: Rules, regulations, policy, safety, hygiene, health.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And these rules are in line with the management's philosophy of occupancy?

MR. STROTHERS: Yes. And that was part of the purpose of having that meeting with the Archstone staff on Tuesday. We wanted to make sure that we were "all on the same page," of, you know, discussion, and to
reiterate to the students, you know, just
community--you know, community awareness,
safety, health, noise violations. I'm going to
talk about the code of student conduct, and
the results of, you know, the code of student
code of student conduct, since I do that.

We're going to cover everything
tonight.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MEMBER SHELTON: The violations at
the housing are in violation of our code of
student conduct?

MR. STROTHERS: That is correct, sir.

MEMBER SHELTON: And we have a
three strike rule for our code of student
conduct? Or we have a hearing process?

MR. STROTHERS: There's a hearing
process for the code of student conduct. There
is a hearing process.

MEMBER SHELTON: The management is
asking for a eviction for three violations of
the code of student conduct?

MR. STROTHERS: No. Three of their.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Are their conduct rules in alignment with ours?

MR. STROTHERS: That's something we have to tweak, and to, you know, to further look into, because the way it's looking, it's a little off-kilter. So we're going to have to, you know, make sure that that's all aligned.

MEMBER EPPS: I will be meeting with them on that.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Our code of student conduct is our process for dealing with student behavior.

MR. STROTHERS: That's correct.

MEMBER SHELTON: We have a rental agreement or a lease agreement with a entity--

MR. STROTHERS: Right.

MEMBER SHELTON: --that is identifying violations of our code of student conduct, or identifying violations of their
code of conduct. In the District of Columbia, it is very difficult to remove a resident from housing, and for us to be moving down the line of suggesting that we would be moving students out, puts us in, I think, potentially in violations of the laws of moving people out of your house. And especially when they've paid us their--you know--paid us.

MR. STROTHERS: The money. Sure.

MEMBER EPPS: That's right.

MEMBER SHELTON: But if they're in violation of our code of students conduct, that is a different process.


MEMBER SHELTON: And so I guess we're negotiating because we want to stay in the Archstone. But don't we have--we only have a one year agreement with the Archstone.

MEMBER BELL: No. We have a one year agreement that's subject to, I think up to four renewals, and I'm not sure--I hear
your concern, Trustee Shelton, but I'm not sure that even if a student was removed from the housing, that that would be a per se violation under our code of conduct.

But if they were removed for failure to pay rent, or what have you, or not timely payment, I don't know that that would automatically mean that they would then be removed for non-academic performance at the university. I think it would have to be reviewed.

MEMBER EPPS: Some of the things that one of the RA--well, one of the things that one of the RAs stated, as well, was this violation could be like in the computer room, or somebody could say, if they were too noisy, they'd ask them, what room are you? and you know as well as I do, if you were making noise, you wouldn't tell them your right room anyway.

And so we don't know--I mean, it could be a guest there. It could be someone
from another room. So we will have to sit down and orient the new manager to our university policies, because she is brand new. The management, in the past, has not been as strict. So that's something that Marc and the RAs had a meeting with this person. I have not met with her yet. And that was just--

MR. STROTHERS: Tuesday.

MEMBER EPPS: Two days ago. Yes. Two days ago. We have a little friend-making to do, and orientation to the university's policies.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And what I heard you say earlier, Dr. Epps, is that you will be meeting with her soon.

MEMBER EPPS: Oh, yes.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Trustee Isaacs.

MEMBER ISAACS: So what's controlling here? Is Archstone able to just tell our students: You violated our policies and you have to leave?

MEMBER EPPS: No.
MR. STROTHERS: No.

MEMBER EPPS: No.

MEMBER ISAACS: It's we're still in control of--

MEMBER EPPS: We're still in control.

MR. STROTHERS: Yes.

MEMBER EPPS: Yes. And we have been using the judicial hearing method--

MR. STROTHERS: Process.

Absolutely.

MEMBER EPPS: --to discipline our students.

MEMBER ISAACS: I just wanted to make sure, because if they were able to put our students out, and that creates--

MR. STROTHERS: Yes, not--they can't do it arbitrarily. No. They just can't do it arbitrarily. No.

MEMBER ISAACS: Okay; okay.

MEMBER BELL: I think we should be careful, because I don't think that we've
denied them their ability, if a tenant is violating apartment procedures, to be removed or evicted. But that doesn't necessarily have to correspond with a removal or eviction from the university as well as the student.

So I would imagine there are things that a student could be in violation of their lease, that would not necessarily lead to their removal as a student from the university, or conversely, if they're doing things at that apartment that violated the lease, it could result in the removal as well.

I think there would be have to be a hearing under those circumstances, to see, but I do think they have the right, for violations of their community policies, to have a student removed. And I think even if a student is removed, we're "on the hook."

MEMBER EPPS: Well, what we've done is to, if students like "tear up things," and is to charge that back to the student. But we do have a hearing. But thank you very much.
We'll also check up on that as well.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay. Any other discussions on housing?

MEMBER EPPS: That's it.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MEMBER EPPS: Unless Chairman Bell, or Trustee Bell, chairman of Facilities Committee—-I don't think that Trustee Schwartz was attending the Facilities meeting. But at that meeting, you did speak about the Facilities meeting--the Facilities Committee supporting the solicitation of the Facilities team working on a developer--to find a developer for possible on-campus housing.

Did I state that correctly?

MEMBER BELL: Yes. That's correct.

There was concern stated by Barbara Jumper, as well as the president, that they were a little unclear about what the board's commitment was to housing, and what I tried to make clear is that the board of trustees has always been committed to student housing, and that
commitment is evidenced by the master plan that has been approved. Barbara wanted to know, that based on that approval, if she could have the ability to go ahead and start discussions with the State Department and city council members about future plans for housing.

And we all agreed that that is allowable, that that's a prerogative and operation of the university that doesn't have to come to the university's board of trustees approval.

But that if you were taking concrete steps towards how they, you know, wanted to expend dollars, in an amount that was above, or that required board approval, that you would have to come back and do that.

And so we didn't want her to think that there was a lack of commitment to housing, but, rather, the board is concerned that there is an adequate supply of students, and the student population would be able to
support housing, if it's one day approved to be built on the university campus. And so that's what we gave her the authorization to do, was to pursue that, knowing full well that it would have to satisfy certain criteria for it to become a reality.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: And that's in line with what we voted on, and I think that's a good thing. My area questions--we're looking at a number of students participating in the housing plan, and I wanted to make sure that there was enough students to support that action, and then we can talk about sizing, or footprint for housing, to make sure we are building housing with a capacity to support the need.

MEMBER BELL: Exactly.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay. That concludes the discussion on housing. We'll now move to Records Management.

MEMBER EPPS: Trustee Schwartz, I would like to invite Maria Byrd to the podium.
1 She has been very instrumental in working on--
2 working with me--
3
4 CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Maria, if you
could just come to the mike here. Have a seat,
5 please.
6
7 MEMBER EPPS: --on records
management. We have a consultant here tonight
8 that will also--that she will introduce, who
9 has been working on updating me, and the
10 president's cabinet in regard to what our
11 Records Management needs were. And so we've
12 had a team of people working with the
13 consultant, and we will follow up, after you
14 hear the results of his presentation, with our
15 university staff, in terms of helping them to
16 realize where we are in the process of
17 streamlining and making sure that our Records
18 Management program is up to par with the
19 federal, and also city rules and regulations.
20 Also federal laws.
21
22 CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Thank you for
23 being here.
MS. BYRD: Thank you. Good evening.

Maria Byrd, Office of Information Technology.

First and foremost, as Dr. Epps has stated, we're starting our way on a Records Management project, which, for the university, is a "very big deal," a very big process. Not only are we looking at bringing those records that are in warehouses, and also in various buildings across campus, but looking at our current information that we have, and data we have, and paper we have, to get those scanned in the system.

So we're looking at, really, how to address some documents that could date back to the early to mid 1900s, all the way to those documents that we're working with today.

We do have a current scanning process, which is used with our Banner system, that we're looking to keep intact. But we do have other documents, such as board resolutions, maybe president speeches, some documents that might not fall in to what we
currently scan our Banner system, which is mostly financial aid information, admissions, finance, and things of that nature.

So we had a consultant come on board to review kind of where we are, and what do we need to do? What are we not complying with?

We all know Middle States is coming up very soon, and I know Records might not be a big part of it, but being able to know that we've filed our records appropriately, indexed them appropriately, that we've stored them accurately, that we have a retention policy, that we know how long things need to be stored, even though for universities a lot of things are indefinite cause of people's records.

But this will really ensure that when we get FOIA requests, we're able to respond with those in a timely manner, and also that we're not hit with any fines for not providing things that we're legally obligated
to provide. So I will now call up Mr. Joel Limerick of DSI, who conducted a couple week review, his team did, on our Records Management process.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Sir, please press the button and introduce yourself.

MR. LIMERICK: Certainly. My name is Joel Limerick. I'm the president and CEO of DSI. We were, as Maria mentioned so eloquently, and Dr. Epps also mentioned, we were engaged for a couple of weeks to come on site and review the current state, and make some recommendations for going forward in terms of the next steps.

And so I wanted to first, just clarify the objectives of the study. The first was to identify and recommend steps required to modernize the UDC Records Management infrastructure and policies, and the second was to recommend, make recommendations for restarting the Office of Records Management, their scanning operation,
based on best practices and a modernized infrastructure.

So I do want to say that we were heartened to find that there were already some good things going on.

For instance, in 2009 and 2010, there was a draft Records Management policy statement that was created, which was moving in the right direction. There was also a pretty well-thought-out records retention and disposition program document, that it looks like the university has already sort of made some movements towards designing the program.

There are some things that we would recommend, because right now, the university is not in compliance with certain executive orders. That designed program was never implemented, and so the university is in a situation now, where the mayor's order, 2007-50, the university would not be in compliance with that.

So I did want to just say a quick
summary of what the report found. That the--

MEMBER BELL: I'm sorry. This is

Trustee Bell. I'm sorry to interrupt you, but

I did want to get confirmation.

At the last meeting, I had asked

whether or not our independent agency status

meant that we have to comply in full, or in

the same manner as other agencies that were

subject to that executive order. So I was just

curious. Or that mayor's order. I'm just

curious as to if the Office of General Counsel

was able to look in to that.

MR. LIMERICK: No. We did not get

an official comment from that, but the

independent status--the university can--the

mayor's order is directed to executive

agencies, and so technically, UDS could--it's

not--UDS is not an executive agency from what

I understand.

But there are some pretty good

guidelines in that order, as well as federal

directives, and that pretty much baseline,
some things that the university ought to do in
order to have a records program that protects
the university from liabilities.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So we are not in
violation, but there are some best practices
that we can--

MR. LIMERICK: That's a better way
to put it; yes. And--

MEMBER BELL: And thanks for--I'm
sorry. I clearly want us to have a retention
policy, but my concern is that we might have
retention requirement that might differ, based
on grants and other things that we have, where
we'll need to be more expansive, or whether
the template that the city is providing may
not fit our needs.

So I just wanted to make sure that
we're mindful of that. So that's why I raise
the question.

MR. LIMERICK: Absolutely. And
these orders, from the president's executive
order, President Obama, to the mayor's orders,
they're very broad and general. I think if I was going to really summarize what we discovered, is that UDC is very close to having a well-functioning Records Management Program, but there are some implementation steps that, for some reason, have never been taken. And so there is a design. You do have an Office of Records Management. There is an ERP system, which can be leveraged, and there is some technology, which is outdated, which could be upgraded.

And so the university is not--it's not as far away as it may seem, but there are some basic things, like making sure that every department has an actual records coordination who's trained, making sure that the retention schedules are delineated and made official, and adopted, in an official way, by the leadership of the university, and also upgrading some of the technology that's outdated.

So that's kind of a--that's really
the overview of sort of--and I can skip over
some of the slides here. I'm going to go down
to the Current Challenges, just to maybe
reiterate those. There's no approved
university-wide records policy, or records
schedule for retention or destruction.

There was a design, as we
mentioned. We have included in the actual
report, in the appendix, some forms. But the
actual implementation of that would require
the different departments to fill out a
survey, appoint a representative who's
responsible for coordinating with the records
manager. These are basic things that the
university ought to move quickly to do.

The student records, in
particular, are in multiple places. You have
some records, as Ms. Byrd mentioned, in
Banner. You have some records in Legacy
Imaging System, and there are also records in
over a 1,000 boxes, 1052 boxes in Building 1.
multiple rooms in Building 41, Taylor Street,
in a warehouse. They're also in some of the
other warehouses available to UDC, and also in
the Learning Resource Center.

And so these records ought to be
cataloged, indexed, and digitized, I guess in
the form of backfile conversion, so that you
can make sure that you have the best available
copy, those are available for court, those can
be your official copy, and make sure that
you're not vulnerable to have unauthorized
access to student records, or fail to find a
student record based on some legal, or some
sort of inquiry.

Also the Office of Records
Management has a scanning system which has
been held up, and we estimate there's about
853 boxes of documents related to just about
every function in the university, from
procurement to legal. I think there's four
boxes related to the board of trustees.

There are admission records. There
are student records. All of these are--the
plan was to scan them, but they have been unable to scan, based on some relatively simple technology issues that could be fixed. And so in terms of opportunities, there are standards on the federal side for electronic recordkeeping, that have been sort of adopted in to the civilian world. The Joint Interoperability and Technology Command, within DOD, set up a standard for electronic recordkeeping. Industry has mostly adopted that. It's DOD 5015.

Implementing an electronic records management system, that would then supplement the functionality of Banner, would be something that we would see as an opportunity for the university. Defining the records management policies and procedures, the disposition schedules, and also educating staff, so that every one of, I think there's 36 different parts of the organization, would have someone that was aware of records management policies, what is a record, what
their obligations are, how it should be indexed, and how it should be retained, and when it's time to dispose of it, what that process is.

And so there's an opportunity to make sure that every department, or every office in the university has a trained person who coordinates with the Office of Records Management.

And obviously, there's also these boxes that are on paper, which effectively make them lost to some of the things that you all are looking for, and to restart that scanning effort, which has sort of atrophied, over time, from the technology side, would be something that we would strongly suggest.

In terms of the implementation team, we wanted to put, elevate this from the report, because it's not rocket science, and really, what needs to happen is there would be a project manager. We estimate it's about a year-long project.
You would have an actual records manager, subject matter expert, who would work with you to finalize and update, and get these retention schedules made official, and signed off on, and also to help train some of these representatives that would then report back in to the Office of Records Management.

And someone who understands the technology enough to integrate with the good work that you've already done with your ERP system, and connect the records management functionality to a lot of the data that you're already creating at Banner.

The legal counsel would have to be involved, at least a couple of steps, for certifying that these are the disposition schedules, and also doing any updates along the way. And then we have a couple of suggestions in terms of someone would have to be on site in the Records Center, scanning.

And so we've had discussions with a couple of strategies. One would be having...
contracted support for a period of time, and
then rebuilding the actual Scan Center, so
that it can function on a day forward basis.
Or maybe doing a larger backfile conversion,
and then turning the keys to that system back
over to the Office of Records Management.

And then perhaps the most
important cast of characters would be these
records management coordinators, who would be
positioned inside of each organization within
the university in order to maintain this
program.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So it seems we
have a couple of tasks at hand. First of all,
the numerous boxes of records to be scanned,
and putting in place a retention and
disposition policy that talks to the duration
of keeping records, etcetera.

Is your recommendation that we
filter the paper records before scanning, or
scanning and then filter?

MR. LIMERICK: Yes. It's a good
question. So time is money, often, and so it's a matter of whether it's worth allocating time to sifting through the records, or I mean, the process of scanning these days with certain equipment is less than a second, and so depending on the quality, and there's a lot of factors that--but, you know, storage is pretty cheap.

So I would suggest getting it all digitized. That way, you know it's in a digital repository. You know you can get rid of the paper. D.C. is a jurisdiction that has allowed the best available copy to be a digital copy, and so that can be admitted in to court. So it would be hard for me to sleep at night, knowing that student records, and other records are strewn throughout the university.

MEMBER SHELTON: The question is: How much and how long?

MR. LIMERICK: One year and--

MEMBER SHELTON: You suggest that
in a year, that you can bring us up online, digitally?

MR. LIMERICK: Right. So there are 2.6 million pages, we're estimating, across the entire universe of stuff. One scenario that we were thinking is maybe, we are a vendor, would help out with 750,000 or so pages, and then depending on what the leadership decides, turn the rest of the project over to Office of Records Management.

But at that point, you would have benchmarks and quality control, and a bunch of stuff that you would know about the data. Another scenario would be to just get rid of all 2.6 million pages, and then turn it over for scanning, a lot of which would be done through Banner, and then also at the Records Management Office.

MEMBER SHELTON: How much?

MR. LIMERICK: Yes. Someone did suggest that you might mention that. It was about an $893,000 number for a one-year
1 project.

2 MEMBER SHELTON: A million dollars
to fix it; right?

3 MR. LIMERICK: That's exactly
right.

4 MEMBER SHELTON: That includes the
equipment?

5 MR. LIMERICK: That includes the
equipment, the software, the integration and
conversion.

6 MEMBER SHELTON: And it would be
integrated with Banner? All of it would be
integrated? Or it would be two separate
systems?

7 MR. LIMERICK: No. So that the--it
would be integrated with Banner. Most people
in the university would not know that you had
a Records Management system behind Banner. But
obviously your Office of Records Management
would still be updating things, and then in
the agencies that--or the parts of UDC that
are using Banner, they would also be updating
things.

MS. BYRD: So just to clarify,
Trustee Shelton, within Banner, we have a BDMS system, and so basically you would have these two repositories, one that is actually Banner, and then the other one that's Records Management, and so when someone would retrieve the data, they would be retrieving it from that top layer, which is the BDMS, and so both of those systems would feed in to BDMS.

So they wouldn't know that it's as Joel has mentioned.

MEMBER SHELTON: And what is the strategy for corrupted paperwork? You know, eaten, digested. You know. Wet.

MR. LIMERICK: Right. There's only so much that can be done if a hard copy is--we did a project, a few years ago, for the recorder of deeds, and those records went back to the beginning of the jurisdiction. And so there are different scanners--from what we found, you don't necessarily need some of
these more advanced scanners for delicate documents. Most of your documents could go on a roll feeder without being destroyed. But of course if you have 2.6 million pages, there are going to be some instances where--

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: You have a question, Trustee Bell?

MEMBER BELL: Yes. I'm sorry. It was breaking up a little bit towards the end. I assume that within the scanning protocol, there's a way to distinguish private, nonpublic information, so that we don't have to worry about inadvertent disclosures, and things like that. Is that included within this?

MR. LIMERICK: Yes. Yes and no.

MEMBER BELL: You're breaking-- as you're speaking, I can't hear you, so maybe that is--

MR. LIMERICK: Oh. Yes and no. Is that--so we were doing some--that particular
issue impacts the amount of time it takes to
prepare the documents for scanning. So if you
would imagine, for scanning at the folder
level, that's the fastest, and therefore the
least expensive. If we are opening a folder
and classifying particular documents--so let's
say there's a five or six page application,
there's a ten page student loan document,
there are health records. If we're classifying
at that level, it increases the cost because
there's more time to prepare for scanning.

But it also enables you to do a
more elegant security layer, so that you can
say these records are health records, so
they're HIPAA, they're locked down. But this
application, maybe a wider range of people can
see.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: A word about the
software and the upgrades that may be required
in this network you're proposing. Is it
proprietary software? Or it's not?

MR. LIMERICK: No; absolutely not.
We haven't done any proprietary systems since the mid '90s. These are all off-the-shelf packages.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MR. LIMERICK: Banner actually has some modules that could be exploited, so--

MEMBER SHELTON: So Dr. Epps, what are you asking us to do today?

MEMBER EPPS: I'm asking you to-- there are a few other documents I'd like for you to read, in terms of where we are as a university and the policies that we already had in place, that were draft and were never adopted. So I'd like to bring all of this together. I'd like to survey offices, and also have them take a look at the policy and see what we need to add, and what their recommendations are, and probably bring together our team again, and then come to you with a full-blown proposal, to make sure that we've addressed all the issues.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Making sure that
each office has the prescribed number of personnel for implementation of this proposal, and we'll have to procure the equipment, the scanning equipment, because that's not in place.

MR. LIMERICK: Yes. That's correct. It's aged out of usefulness.

MS. BYRD: So for the back project, you're saying that's included in your project, but after, once we're turning the keys over and when we're developing our office, yes, we would need to--

MEMBER SHELTON: You need to consider how much it will save us in rental space, as part of your submission, since we have it in so many unique places.

Also I agree that we definitely need to step up the Records Management recovery, because there's a lot--there's too many places that it's housed in, and I worry about Dunbar's history, that I used to control. So I'm worried about where it is now,
that the new Dunbar has been established. So I'd hate to see the UDC teachers' history get misapplied somewhere, and Washington Tech, and all those--

MR. LIMERICK: There's a lot of history here.

MEMBER SHELTON: Yes. A lot of history.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: I guess we look forward with the full-blown proposal being presented to this committee first, and then to the board of trustees.

MEMBER EPPS: Right.

MR. LIMERICK: We thank you for the opportunity to work with the university. It's been a great pleasure.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Thank you much. Thank you for you being here.

MS. BYRD: Thank you.

MEMBER BELL: Thank you.

MEMBER EPPS: Oh. I'm sorry.

Stacie was looking at me. I think she--was
there something that you wanted to add, and to
the question that Trustee Bell had.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Do you want to
step forward and just--

MS. MILLS: Hello, Trustee Bell.

This is Stacie Mills from the Office of
General Counsel. I just wanted to confirm the
answer to the question that you raised
regarding the university's obligation under
the mayor's order. As stated, I'm confirming
that the university is not subject to the
mayor's order that was cited, the 2007-50. But
that order was essentially direction pursuant
to the Public Records Management Act.

So while we're not subject to that
specific order, there are of course retention
policy, and statutes that dictate the length
of time that we need to keep certain records.
So what I understand this process to be is a
synthe--

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: That word.

MS. MILLS: That word that I--of
all of those retention record policies in to
one university policy, and just organizing
that. But just to confirm. You're absolutely
correct. The university is not subject to
mayor's orders, generally, and we are
certainly not subject to that mayor's order.
But it's an order pursuant to the code, and a
statute that is in force.

MEMBER BELL: Okay. Thank you very
much. I appreciate that.

MS. MILLS: You're welcome.

MEMBER EPPS: Trustee Schwartz,
I'd like to recognize Wayne Sparks, who is the
manager for the Records Management Office.
He's practically a one-man show, and he has
operated, the best he could, with the
equipment that we had, that often went out,
and had to buy a new server. One time, we had
so much soft--I mean, we were so full, in
terms of the server, that he couldn't even log
on to copy anything else. So that's the kind
of shape that we're in, and we really do--
we've just been doing temporary patches, and
he's done a great job with the staff that he
had, which are all part-time people, about
three or four part-time--two. He corrected me.
About two part-time people who are students,
I believe.

Title III. They're higher than the
Title III, part time.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Let me thank you
for the work that you're doing, and hopefully
help is on its way. Thank you.

If there are no more questions on
Records Management, we will move to item
number eight, which is the testimony.
Customarily, we would have a written testimony
but none was provided to the Board. Therefore,
you're allowed three minutes to present your
case.

Mr. Michaelson. Either one is
fine. Just go ahead. State your name for the
record.

MS. SLAUGHTER: No, sir. Press
that middle button. The green light.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay. It's on.

MR. SINDRAM: Good evening, General. all those within the sound of my voice. Michael Sindram, disabled veteran, who served our country more than most. In preparation for this session, I had Councilman Mendelson's staff, committee, forward hard copy, written documents, and I'd like to go through them briefly.

We have a fall 2006 transcript. 4.0 GPA. I was in the paralegal studies class. Four classes, enumerated accordingly.

Spring 2007. Again paralegal studies, four courses, 4.0 GPA. That means, General, straight A. I took my studies here very seriously. Attended class religiously, did all the written assignments. No excuse about "the dog ate my homework."

You have here a letter from Dean Petty, having made the dean's list. You have a letter from a
wheelchair nun, Disabled Catholics in Action, and her name happens to be Mary Jane Owen. And I want to highlight, briefly. This letter is dated September 10th, 2007.

[Reading from Ms. Owen's letter:]

Upon arrival a few minutes before the scheduled meeting I introduced myself to Mr. Strothers and a security officer sitting with him. I gave both my business card and told them why I was there. Mr. Strothers immediately suggested I had a negative impression of him. Mr. Strothers immediately arose from his seat and in a shockingly harsh voice told Michael he had an envelop for him and as I turned I saw him thrust it into Michael's hand.

Mr. Strothers began to scream loudly and the security officer to write up a report asserting that Michael had just threatened him with bodily harm. He repeated those demands repeatedly as he stood over Michael yelling at the top of his voice and he
wanted the security officer to take action
against Michael. Michael had made no move
toward Mr. Strothers, who stood over him
apparently threatening that he, himself, had
a gun and a knife. Quote, unquote.

    Suddenly, his tantrum focused on
me--speaking about Strothers. He asserted I
had no right to be there and should get out.
He was almost incoherent in his abuse. I then
reminded him I was a witness to his
unprofessional behavior which further engaged
me. Him. I felt personally threatened and
afraid.

    Again, General, we're talking
about a wheelchair nun, had no stake in this
dogfight.

    This exhibit is a memorandum from
the Disability Resource Center, and it's
marked off, Extended time for testing (double
time) and Hard copies of all class material,
in parens, (Disability Resource Center can
assist in this task). That's where the snafu
came in, and that's where Strothers continually ran interference.

Specifically, there was a commercial law class, and the instructor was borrowed from the law school. She was taking her bar exam. Bar exam is very in depth, and it's very time-consuming. So the instructor—and commercial law is very hypertechnical had no time for students. What that instructor had orchestrated was an online course, and I actually "pushed the envelope." I'm a disabled veteran, cybernetically-challenged, and I paid for tender moments of bonding in the classroom. Not for online.

Well, it came to the point that Mr. Strothers ran interference. And it came also to a point for me to remain in the university, I had to undergo a psychiatric evaluation. You have an additional exhibit from Dr. Richard Rosse, chief of psychiatry, the VA Medical Center.

Now the game that Strothers was
playing was, well, we got the report from the psychiatrist. It's the wrong date. Gotta do it again. And I want to read the relevant part on the record.

[Reading from cited letter:]

This letter is written by Richard B. Rosse, MD, Board Certified in Psychiatry and Chief of Psychiatry, Washington, D.C. VA Medical Center. This writer has been practicing in this Medical Center for the past 25 years.

Mr. Michael Sindram, a patient at this medical center, has signed a release of information allowing this writer to discuss his current mental state, and, quote, certifies to his emotional mental status is such that he is not likely to become physically or verbally aggressive with students, staff and or faculty on campus. Unquote. I so do certify to the above.

The patient has no history of violence against self or others, which is the-
-which in the mental field is thought to be the best predictor of future violence. He provides multiple letters of reference from faculty attesting to his meritorious and appropriate behavior in their classrooms; hence there is no pervasive pattern of violence or other inappropriate behavior.

It is clear that the behaviors described in the University of The District--and so on, so forth.

He does not consume alcohol. He has no history of substance or alcohol abuse in the current medical record.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay. Mr. Sindram, you have one minute to summarize.

MR. SINDRAM: Thank you, General.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: You have gone four minutes so far.

MR. SINDRAM: There is a--there's a letter from Councilmember Bowser dated February 6, 2008. It mentions Clifton Coates, who was the veteran representative at the
time. To my understanding there's been on response thereto.

I took it upon myself to write to President Sessoms, at the time, March 12th, 2009. Falling on tin ears. No reply.

January 29, 2010, to President Sessoms.

The point I raise is the Student Handbook--I've heard it here--and I carefully listened too to Mr. Strothers about the housing--that if you have three violations, where it had to be corrected--actually, the time that I extended--and I understand the Student Handbook clearly indicates that the vice president of Student Affairs is to orchestrate and oversee any kind of disciplinary action.

Strothers, in my case--and this boils down to a personality clash--said: I'm going to take over. And so he did.

But the handbook, at the time, clearly indicates it's the president, and
president alone, has to make the final
determination. That has yet to happen. You've
got an affidavit from one of my classmates for
one of the courses. It's self-explanatory,
where a instructor failed to show up, I made
noise, and hence was kicked out "under the
bus."

You know, there was a time,
General, you had to go to the back of the bus.
I can't even get on.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Ten seconds.
MR. SINDRAM: I'll pass up,
Veterans of Foreign War, for you.
CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SINDRAM: Spiritual vitamin.
And remember me, the veteran. I don't know
what we're going to accomplish here--and I
trust that you have the hard copies--we're
going to accomplish here. But I'm telling you--
-I see the same demon in this room--right--
that demonized me, a 4.0 GPA student, a
disabled veteran who has served our country
more than most. General, leave no veteran
behind.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Thank you much.

MR. SINDRAM: You're welcome.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: That concludes
item number eight. Dr. Epps, any other
business for this evening?

MEMBER EPPS: No. But I would like
to recognize Jane Darko. Jane, will you stand.

Jane is the director of our Student Health
Center, and she has resigned her position at
the end of this month. She is moving on to
private practice. But Jane has given us--how
many years, Jane? Twelve. Twelve years of
service.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Thank you very
much for your service to the university.

MEMBER SHELTON: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Did you sign the
order?

MEMBER EPPS: Not yet.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Thank you so much
for your support. Thank you.

MEMBER SHELTON: Good luck to you.

MEMBER EPPS: And we do currently have a search going on that is posted on our Web site, and we have a committee, and we have completed our interviews, and will be making a recommendation.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Does that search committee--needs to be trained also?

MEMBER EPPS: Yes. They were trained. They were certified.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Is this vacancy number four? You wrote two. Then you added one. Is this a fourth vacancy?

MEMBER EPPS: We have many. That might be the fourth one. We have two RA vacancies, and the director of the Health Center, and then also Jane. So that you're right. That's four.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: So should I be concerned about the Office of Civil Affairs and making sure that it's fully staffed? Or do
you have that in hand?

MEMBER EPPS: We have that in hand.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: Let the record show that Dr. Epps stated that she has it in hand. Okay.

MEMBER EPPS: Thank you. That concludes my report.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: I want to thank all of you for--Trustee Bell, are you there? He left us. Okay.

MEMBER BELL: I'm here. I'm sorry. I was talking. It was on mute. I'm here.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: I want to thank all of you for participating tonight. I want to thank all of you for being here. Thank you very much and good night.

MEMBER BELL: Thank you.

MEMBER SHELTON: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHWARTZ: We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 7:37 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.]
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