



**The University of New Mexico  
Board of Regents**

**Governance Committee**

**Meeting Agenda & Minutes**

April 27, 2022

1:00 p.m.

\* \* \* Virtual Meeting \* \* \*

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
April 27, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

**AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order**
  - a. Roll Call and Notation of Quorum
  - b. Revision and Adoption of Agenda
  
- II. Adoption of Minutes from February 28, 2022, Special Meeting** **TAB A**
  
- III. Comments from Regents**
  
- IV. Public Comments**
  
- V. Discussion and Possible Recommendation—Revisions to Regents’ Policy** **TAB B**  
**1.5, “Appeals to the Board of Regents”**
  
- VI. Discussion of Board Retreat**
  
- VII. Other Discussion**
  
- VIII. Adjournment**

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
April 27, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

**SUMMARY & MINUTES**

**Committee Members Present:**

Regent Rob Schwartz, Chair  
Regent Kim Sanchez Rael, Vice Chair  
Regent Doug Brown

**Members from Administration**

Terry Babbitt, Chief of Staff, Office of the President  
Loretta Martinez, General Counsel, University of New Mexico  
(Note: Due to an announced, then amended, time delay, each entered the meeting slightly late.)

**Advisors in Attendance (in alphabetical order)**

Teresa Costantinidis, Senior Vice President for Finance & Administration  
Randy Ko, Regent  
Greg Romero, President, ASUNM  
David Saavedra, GPSA President  
Scott Sanchez, President, Staff Council  
Ariadna Vazquez, Deputy University Counsel

**Support Staff**

Mallory Reviere  
Brian Jones

**I. Call to Order (1:06 p.m.)**

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:06 p.m. After a roll call, the presence of a quorum was noted.

The Chair asked if any member would move to approve the agenda. Vice Chair Rael made such a motion, which was seconded by Regent Brown.

**Motion to Approve Agenda:** Vice Chair Rael  
**Second:** Regent Brown  
**Vote:** Voice vote, unanimous in the affirmative  
**Motion:** Approved

**II. Adoption of Prior Minutes (1:07 p.m.)**

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
April 27, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

The Chair next asked if any member would move to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of February 28, 2022 (See **TAB A**) and noted the draft minutes used the word “remaining” where “remanded” was likely intended. Staff noted that the appropriate change would be made. (Staff note: *The minutes as modified and approved are reflected at Tab A.*)

**Motion to Approve February 28 Minutes, As Modified:** Vice Chair Rael  
**Second:** Regent Brown  
**Vote:** Voice vote, unanimous in the affirmative  
**Motion:** Approved

**III. Comments from Regents (1:08 p.m.)**

Vice Chair Reel noted that there had been a prior agenda item for the approval of contracts and asked for clarification on its status. There was some discussion as to whether the item had been tabled by the Governance Committee for further consideration or taken up by the full Board of Regents. The Chair said he would review the minutes of prior meetings to determine the precise status of the item. (Staff note: the item in question is *Regents’ Policy 7.4: Purchasing*, which was formally adopted as amended by the Board on October 22, 2021.)

**IV. Public Comments (1:08 p.m.)**

Staff informed the Chair that no members of the public had registered to speak at today’s meeting.

The Chair recognized Scott Sanchez, President of UNM Staff Council, who thanked the committee for its work on the review draft of Regents’ Policy 1.5 and expressed concern that Staff Council had need been given adequate time to review the draft language. There was some discussion on when the E-book had been posted for review. Staff noted that relevant materials had been posted online in advance, but that an e-mail notice had not been generated. The Chair asked Staff Council to review the language, as the Chair wanted to ensure Staff Council had adequate input that was fully considered. President Sanchez informed the Chair that while he appreciated that the current language seemed to reflect input of the Staff Council, he regretted the perception that Staff Council had not been adequately notified.

The Chair thanked President Sanchez for his input and that of Staff Council, and asked for further feedback, as needed, during the committee’s meeting. Vice President Rael suggested the committee enter a brief period of recess to give attendees time to read the language of the revised Regents’ Policy 1.5. President Sanchez thanked the Chair and indicated that a formal recess would not be necessary, as he was comfortable signing off on the language before the committee. The committee paused momentarily, without recess, to review the language.

**V. Discussion and Possible Recommendation—Revisions to Regents’ Policy 1.5, “Appeals to the Board of Regents” (1:16 p.m.)**

The Chair reviewed the language as modified (See **Tab B**) and asked for any further public comments. He noted that the policy had changed substantively over the years and seemed closer to the language as originally enacted.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

Counsel clarified that the revised language had been published in advance, in compliance with the Open Meetings Act. The Chair thanked counsel and reiterated that the current draft did reflect language and concerns brought to the committee's attention by Staff Council and that he did not anticipate either formal or informal objections from Staff Council—but stated that if serious concerns were raised later, the committee was prepared to amend the policy before its consideration by the full Board of Regents.

**Motion to Approve Revisions to Regents' Policy 1.5:** Vice Chair Rael

**Second:** Regent Brown

**Vote:** Voice vote, unanimous in the affirmative

**Motion:** Approved

**VI. Discussion of Board Retreat (1:21 p.m.)**

The Chair began by suggesting to the committee that it begin with a brainstorming session to determine the most appropriate topics of discussion for a Regents retreat. Regent Brown and Vice Chair Rael agreed with this suggestion, and the Vice Chair remarked that it would also be vital to ensure that new regents also have an opportunity to be involved in shaping the agenda and structure of the retreat.

Regent Brown remarked that he was pleased the meeting was in Los Alamos, as he thought it was an appropriate opportunity to discuss the best way to tap into and utilize UNM's branch campuses. He was especially concerned about diminishing revenues and populations in the branch campus communities, especially in Gallup and Valencia, where even mill levy revenues may not be adequate. Regent Brown suggested the retreat include a discussion of the branches, including questions of sustainability—a stated priority under UNM 2040.

Vice Chair Rael added that UNM needed to examine at all its physical space, looking for underutilized physical capacity in the system, as well as where the physical plant is most productive. Regent Brown mused that it seemed odd to construct new campus facilities when there was still space available in current buildings and enrollment is declining. The Chairman responded that many of those new facilities met specific needs—“we can't just take a freshman English classroom and turn it into a nursing facility.” Regent Brown continued to stress that it was vital to continue to look for efficiencies, as legislators and the public were looking to UNM to think more creatively about its use of its existing spaces. The Chair agreed but noted again that there are often limitations on the functionality of some spaces, depending on their proposed use – but added that issues surrounding physical plant should most definitely go on the agenda for the retreat.

Vice Chair Rael lauded the work that has been done in this regard by Teresa Costantinidis, UNM's Senior Vice President for Finance & Administration, who has been acknowledged both by HERC and the New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee for her careful work on a UNM facility planning document to help focus thinking on the long- and short-term use of space. Regent Brown noted that the Regent's own Finance and Facilities Committee was also inclined to take up this issue.

Moving on, the Chair suggested the retreat should also consider an in-depth discussion of the role of the regents in the budget process, as well as how the regents could work with Government Relations to better inform legislators on the role of regents in education.

Vice Chair Rael remarked that this would also be a good opportunity to have a conversation about the larger role of regents statewide, and how the regents can work with HERC and other institutions to advance higher education across New Mexico.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
April 27, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

Regent Brown suggested that it might be useful to look to institutions outside of New Mexico for as models, pointing specifically to Purdue and its efforts to address COVID by appealing directly to student involvement, and how it worked with Kaplan on its online instruction—and as a result, its own enrollment is now up. Both the Chair and Vice Chair Rael agreed that this was a good example of bold and unconventional action, and that perhaps UNM can look to Purdue and other institutions on ways to expand UNM’s virtual presence and online each.

The Chair recognized Regent Ko, who suggested the regents take a “flipped classroom” approach and send each regent materials to read well in advance of the retreat so that the body might move immediately into meaningful conversation, rather than first sitting through lectures or presentations. Regent Ko noted that it was “special” when all the regents could be together in person, in the same place, and that they should take full advantage of that. The committee enthusiastically agreed.

The Chair opened the floor for other suggested topics and input.

Terry Babbitt suggested that the regents might consider adding athletics, master planning, and physical assets to the agenda, as well as a discussion of the university’s policies regarding climate action and carbon footprint. VP Costantinidis suggested that there be a conversation about maximizing federal aid and federal dollars, as well as a dialogue on foundational fundraising and how the regents might appropriately engage in that activity.

The Chair added that the UNM Foundation is also working on climate change, as well as issues related to corporations in the UNM portfolio, and agreed that the regents should have input into both of these conversations. Regent Brown mentioned how shaky oil and gas investments are at the present time, and VP Costantinidis pointed out that the regents will be required to approve any changes in UNM’s investments and overall portfolio. Terry Babbitt also noted there was a Regent committee that was looking closely at these issues and would shortly be bringing its recommendation to the full board.

*Regent Brown, apologizing for a prior commitment involving intergenerational engagement and consulting, took his leave at 1:40 p.m. and was excused by the Chair.*

The Chair then opened the floor to student leaders and asked for their suggestions on topics for a regent retreat.

Greg Romero, President of ASUNM, agreed that the use of space was an important topic and encouraged the regents to continue to look at creative uses of existing spaces. He also urged the regents to look at improved student experiences as a mechanism for increasing enrollment, suggesting that college is more than academics; it’s also about a quality student experience and great programming for all students. He suggested the regents think about UNM’s campus life, and what, apart from education, makes UNM an attractive place for students. Experiences outside the classroom matter.

The Chair thanked President Romero and asked for specific examples of what UNM, and the regents, do well in this regard. President Romero said he would be delighted to send the committee more information, and noted that, generally, the onus for student programming falls on ASUNM and not on many other campus organizations, and that the regents might consider examining how to encourage student engagement and programming campuswide, across organizations. Vice Chair Rael said it would also be very helpful if there were data, not just anecdotal evidence, that could inform the regents about the student experience.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
April 27, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

President Romero thanked the Chair and reiterated that students stand ready to help the university and want to work closely with the regents and the president on programming that is meant to benefit them. The Chair noted that the regents would enthusiastically look to ASUNM for guidance.

The Chair recognized David Saavedra, President of the UNM Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA), who urged the regents to continue to consider how to graduate students involved and how to tap into professional students as a resource on campus. He also noted that GPSA had a large contingent of students and professional on the north campus, which could be valuable in realizing the institution's "One University" value in UNM 2040. The Chair asked for more information, and President Saavedra informed the committee that GPSA was producing a report with a five-year plan for the organization and would deliver a copy to the Board when it was completed.

Regent Ko was recognized and posited that it might be useful for the regents to engage directly with students, to lay out expectations students have of the regents—and vice versa. This would also permit the regents to identify issues of note and perhaps create a task force to take on the most pressing issue identified in its meetings with students. Regent Ko suggested it might also be helpful for the regents to meet regularly to discuss strategic planning, and not just meet on actionable items.

The Chair agreed that meeting with students was an idea worth considering, and that it might even provide an opportunity to discuss the use of space. Perhaps, mused the Chair, student organizations might be provided with designated spaces in some buildings.

Counsel advised the Chair that she had no topics to suggest, as there were already plenty of topics on the table and the regents would likely only have the time to consider between four and six of them during the retreat. She agreed with Regent Ko that it was likely better to have more discussion, less presentation, and that the Board might want to consider having "champions" for each of the six topics to lead the discussion and suggest and provide pre-retreat reading on their subject of expertise. Counsel also advised that the Board might consider coordinating regular meetings with the Foundation, to take up matters of mutual concern and interest. She also agreed that a "summit" with the administration and students would be useful.

The Chair enthusiastically endorsed the idea of champions idea for the retreat. He also asked if there was a draft list of attendees, noting that if there were too many people in attendance, it was difficult for the regents to do meaningful work.

Vice Chair Rael asked if the definition of "reading" could be expanded to include video presentations, as it was often more informative, and useful, to listen rather than read. The Chair agreed that whatever format was the most useful and effective for conveying information, he was on board. He also noted that VP Costantinidis was particularly adept at explaining wonky and weedy topics like budgeting in a compelling and easy-to-understand manner, and he would be delighted to watch any video presentation she might put together on pretty much any topic.

VP Costantinidis thanked the Chair for his compliments and courtesy and reiterated that a comprehensive report on the management of UNM's assets was presently in the works—and that perhaps a video companion to this report might be useful so that regents could actually see the spaces that were under discussion.

## **VII. Other Discussion**

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
April 27, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

The Chair noted there were no further items to discuss and reiterated that he was intrigued by the idea of exploring, in some creative new ways, how the regents serve the university, and appreciated the input the committee had received this afternoon.

**VIII. Adjournment (1:58 p.m.)**

Vice Chair Rael motioned to adjourn. As the only remaining member of the committee, the Chair naturally seconded.

**Move to Adjourn:** Vice Chair Rael

**Second:** Chairman Schwartz

**Vote:** Voice vote, unanimous in the affirmative

**Motion:** Approved.

*The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.*



# **TAB A**

**Minutes of Special Meeting  
of February 28, 2022**

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
February 28, 2022 – 3:00 p.m.



**The University of New Mexico  
Board of Regents**

**Governance Committee**

**Special Meeting Minutes**

February 28, 2022

3:00 p.m.

\* \* \* Virtual Meeting \* \* \*

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
February 28, 2022 – 3:00 p.m.

**SUMMARY & MINUTES**

**Committee Members Present:**

Regent Rob Schwartz, Chair  
Regent Kim Sanchez Rael, Vice Chair  
Regent Doug Brown

**Members from Administration**

Terry Babbitt, Chief of Staff, Office of the President  
Loretta Martinez, University Counsel

**Advisors in Attendance**

Nathan Bush, Chief Government Relations Officer  
Teresa Costantinidis, Senior Vice President for Finance & Administration  
Randy Ko, Regent  
Sidney Mason-Coon, Policy Officer  
David Saavedra, GPSA President  
Scott Sanchez, President, Staff Council  
Ariadna Vazquez, Deputy University Counsel

**Support Staff**

Mallory Reviere  
Brian Jones

**IX. Call to Order (3:04 p.m.)**

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:04 p.m. After a roll call, the presence of a quorum was noted.

The Chair suggested revising the proposed order of the draft agenda to consider Regents' Policy 1.6 first, followed by Regents' Policy 1.5, and to permit public comment during the consideration of each specific Agenda item.

**Motion to Approve Revised Agenda:** Chairman Schwartz  
**Second:** Vice Chair Rael  
**Vote:** Voice vote, unanimous in the affirmative  
**Motion:** Approved

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
February 28, 2022 – 3:00 p.m.

**X. Comments from Regents**

Committee members had no additional comments and proceeded directly to consideration of the first agenda item.

**XI. Public Comments**

*Please see Agenda Item V, below, where the Chair yielded to Mr. Scott Sanchez during the discussion of Regents' Policy 1.5.*

**XII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation—Revisions to Regents' Policy TAB A  
1.6, "Special Recognition and Awards" (3:09 p.m.)**

The Chair noted that there are many awards presented by the University of New Mexico, but that this particular Regents' Policy deals *only* with the way the Regents select awards. Regent Brown suggested that a process needs to be articulated for nominations, and that a committee should be created to approve winners and to determine the appropriate venue for presenting any Regents' awards. There was general agreement that the process for soliciting and selecting honorary degrees was perhaps not as robust as it should be.

The Chair referred to Terry Babbitt's clarifying memo creating a *Regents Special Recognition and Awards Committee* (SRAC), tasked with overseeing these awards (*see TAB A*). The Chair queried the committee on exactly how much direction the Governance Committee should give to the SRAC in creating the formal process, or whether to have the SRAC create a process, which would then be submitted to the Governance Committee for formal approval. The consensus was that the SRAC should be given the flexibility to create the process for submission and approval.

The Chair suggested that the language be modified to add a "special commendation" for nominees who might miss the final cut for any award, but still deserve some kind of recognition. The Chair also suggested it be made clear that the formal process is organized by the President and the Chair of the Board of Regents.

Regent Brown suggested that the SRAC should include members from outside of the immediate UNM community. The Chair noted that the current language was flexible enough to permit a wide swath of members to be appointed, so no changes should be needed in the language suggested in the Babbitt memo.

**Motion to Approve Amendments to Regents' Policy 1.6:** Vice Chair Rael

**Second:** Regent Brown

**Vote:** Voice vote, unanimous in the affirmative

**Motion:** Approved

*Discussion: Hiring of a Student Researcher (3:16 p.m.)*

Following the vote, the Chair suggested that it would perhaps be useful to hire a student to research similar policies at other institutions to better advise the Committee on formal processes and the potential

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
February 28, 2022 – 3:00 p.m.

impact of any amendments. The Chair suggested that he be permitted to hire such a researcher, within the limitations of the budget. The Vice Chair supported this suggestion, and the Committee suggested taking this matter to the full Board for further discussion.

Regent Brown suggested that perhaps every committee could be “put under the glass” to review their activities, and recommended the Regents consider a periodic review of all standing committees. No formal action was taken.

*Discussion: Committee Meeting Schedule (3:18 p.m.)*

Counsel asked about setting a standing schedule for the Committee, suggesting that a quarterly meeting would be the most appropriate, pending any necessary business. The Chair suggested the Committee meet “as needed,” as there may be structural issues that take multiple meetings to resolve. Counsel advised the Committee set a few meeting dates in advance, to ensure adequate planning and coordination of calendars.

The Chair further suggested that the Committee consult with the Board to determine the most appropriate course of action for the Committee. Vice Chair Rael supported examining the defined scope of the Committee, and consulting with the Board to perhaps re-order the Committee’s priorities.

Counsel said she would examine the initial charge to the Committee and review prior minutes to advise the Committee on the most appropriate course of action, and potential schedule, moving forward.

**XIII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation—Revisions to Regents’ Policy TAB B  
1.5, “Appeals to the Board of Regents” (3:23 p.m.)**

The Chair began the discussion by yielding to Scott Sanchez, President, UNM Staff Council, for comments. Mr. Sanchez noted that as the revised policy was in response to a lengthy appeals process, it was vital for stakeholders to continue to be a part of the conversation—and staff council had not yet had the opportunity to check in on the issue, and that a more formal proposal was needed for comment. The Chair reclaimed the floor and agreed that this was a reasonable suggestion.

Regent Brown expressed his concern that some appeals were being presented to the Regents without having been through the Office of the President first, as required by current policy, and that this was not only shortcutting the process, but was also unfair.

Counsel provided the Committee with the number of appeals that have gone before the President and then the Board:

- **2017 – 2021, Office of the President:** processed 69 appeals, the majority of which were appeals from students related to OEO or PEO complaints.
- **2014 – 2021, Board of Regents:** processed approximately 30 appeals, the majority of which were from students, largely related to OEO or PEO complaints. **It was noted by the Chair that none of these appeals had come before the Regents any time in the last three years.**

The Vice Chair asked how many cases appealed to the Regents had been remanded back to the President. Ms. Reviere responded there were only four cases acted upon.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
February 28, 2022 – 3:00 p.m.

The Chair posited a number of questions he thought would need to be further clarified in any revised policy, including:

- What cases can be appealed?
- What kinds of cases are mandatory for the Regents hear?
- What is the process? Specifically—
  - When does the appeal have to be noted?
  - Is there a certain required waiting period or deadline?
  - What documents have to be filed?
  - Do the Regents sit as a seven-member court, or can they appoint a fact-finding committee to take care of this? If so, how big is the committee? Can the regents refer to a hearing officer who takes evidence and then makes a recommendation to the Regents?
- What is the role of the President/Regents in the appeals process under the new collective bargaining process?

General discussion ensued about what kinds of cases trigger a “mandatory review” by the Regents, including removal of tenure or imposition of long-term penalties through an administrative process. Regent Brown pointed out the process for those cases was already specific and arduous; the Chair reiterated that it was important to give employees a non-university-affiliated structure where they can plead their case.

The Vice Chair articulated that the current appeals process may not actually be broken, as the cases that have been presented to the Regents haven’t been overly burdensome, and have been given a thoughtful, thorough review by the Board.

The Chair was concerned that the Regents had not been as diligent in their role in the appeals process as he might have hoped. “I don’t think over the last three years we’ve taken our role as seriously as we should have,” he noted, as “it was seen as too complicated.”

Regent Brown pointed out that it was *not* the responsibility of the Regents to check every fact in any appeal, but rather do a thorough review of the process to ensure the required roadmap has been followed. There was consensus that the role of the Regents should be clarified to specify the Regents’ role in any appeal was to ensure a ‘procedurally-proper decision.’

Counsel reiterated that collective bargaining will lay out a firm process and what is covered under such a process, and that the entire institution, not just the Regents, will have to explore how collective bargaining may affect existing policies and what will need to be modified. Counsel noted that the current Regent policy in 1.5 was very broad, and perhaps the Regents should amend the language to ensure they were only involved in a “final” decision.

Regent Brown restated that it must be made clear that the process requires any appeal to go through the Office of the President before it is presented to the Board. No appeal can circumvent the process.

The Chair wanted to ensure that any policy does not “promise more than we can provide”; that is, it should not promise a substantive review of every issue. As Regent Brown noted, “we are not in the habit of calling witnesses or doing an independent investigation.”

Mr. Babbitt posited that the process was not broken, as appeals were being given a very thorough review, with the Office of the President examining countless of documents and artifacts for each appeal that has

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO BOARD OF REGENTS  
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
February 28, 2022 – 3:00 p.m.

gone through its office. Mr. Babbitt said he would be supportive of the President having the option of delegating to another entity for a thorough documentary review, as the process was very time consuming.

The Chair agreed that the President's review was thorough and that the Regents, too, needed to ensure it approached appeals with this kind of rigor. The Chair asked how it might ensure it could ease the administrative burden on the president, based on the requirement that the Regents do not get involved until the President has heard the appeal? The Chair suggested that language might be added to specify appeals cannot come to the Regents until "final decision of the President or her designee." Mr. Babbitt said he would be supportive of this language, especially as the President currently reviews more than twenty appeals annually.

Counsel stated that she would put together a flow chart of the appeals process, so Regents will have a clear idea of how thorough the review appeals process has been by the time it gets to them.

The Chair recommended the language reflect that the Regents (1) maintain their authority to hear appeals only of "final decisions of the president or her designee"; (2) that all reviews by the Regents will be discretionary; (3) that there are certain cases that shall not be subject to further review. The real question was the process for those appeals that would be permitted.

Counsel encouraged the Committee to compress the time frame for appeals, as well as a solid end-date so appellants would be assured that the process *will* have an end result. The Chair suggested a ten-day window to appeal, with the Regents having 90 days to make their decision. Counsel also suggested language should clarify the standard for the appeal. Is it a violation of the *procedure* (i.e. due process)? Or something substantive that requires fact-finding?

Counsel promised to draft a revised policy for further review, perhaps in time for the March 22 Regents' meeting.

**No action was taken, as no final policy was placed on the table for consideration.**

#### **XIV. Other Discussion**

Committee members had no other items for discussion.

#### **XV. Adjournment (4:19 p.m.)**

**Move to Adjourn:** Vice Chair Rael

**Second:** Regent Brown

**Vote:** Voice vote, unanimous in the affirmative

**Motion:** Approved.

*The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 p.m.*

# **TAB B**

**Regents' Policy Manual – Section 1.5**



# Regents' Policy Manual - Section 1.5: Appeals to the Board of Regents

**Adopted Date: 09-12-1996**

## Applicability

This policy applies to appeals of administration, faculty, student government, or hearing board decisions to the Board of Regents.

## Policy

Faculty, staff, or students affected by a decision of the administration, faculty, student government, or hearing board may appeal the decision to the Board of Regents. The Board has discretion to determine whether the appeal will be considered, except for those appeals from decisions of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee which the Board is required to hear. The Board may refer appeals to a committee of the Board for recommendation as to whether the appeal should be heard.

## Implementation

A person wishing to appeal a decision to the Board must submit a written petition to the Board through the President of the University. The petition must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date the decision being appealed was rendered, unless expressly provided by University policy to the contrary. The petition must describe the decision being appealed and the basis for the appeal.

In considering whether to take a discretionary appeal and in considering the appeal itself, the Board (or a committee if one is appointed to consider whether an appeal should be heard) may request written briefs, oral arguments, or both.

The Board shall render its final decision within 90 days from the date the appeal was filed unless a delay is requested by one of the parties and approved by the President of the Board. If no decision is rendered within the deadline, the appeal shall be deemed denied.

## References

Other documents and policies that specifically mention appeals to the Board of Regents include, but are not necessarily limited to: [\*\*\*Faculty Handbook Section B\*\*\*](#), [\*\*\*UAP 3220 \("Ombuds Services and Dispute Resolution for Staff"\)\*\*\*](#), [\*\*\*Student Grievance Procedure\*\*\*](#).