

University Administrators Part 3

ARAMARK

A Food Service Vendor at USM, Too

As reported by Courtney Spradlin, *Log Cabin Democrat* (September 1, 2011),

“The University of Central Arkansas Board of Trustees emerged from executive session at a called meeting Thursday and recommended that a committee be formed to interview, under oath, those involved in the misrepresentation of a grant designated to renovations at the president’s home.

At the board’s quarterly meeting a week ago, chairman Scott Roussel announced that Aramark, the university’s food service vendor, gifted [an unrestricted grant of] \$700,000 to the school for the purpose of renovating or adding on to the home on Donaghey Avenue [UCA’s mansion assigned to its President].”

<http://thecabin.net/news/local/2011-09-01/uca-trustees-investigate#.TmEAnc1HCaI>

The unrestricted grant was *quid pro quo* from Aramark in return for UCA choosing Aramark to be UCA’s food service vendor.

What is a descriptive term for such an “unrestricted grant” of \$700,000? Bribe? Kickback?

A UCA Trustee claimed, however, that it is a “common business practice.” Sounds like what your kids might argue when caught smoking marijuana. However, if UCA were located outside the United States the Aramark “gift” might very well have violated the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

Regardless of the questionable legal and ethical implications, does this “gift” advance the education mission of UCA? Or does it simply advance the aggrandizement and assets given to university administrators -- university presidents, for example?

And if Aramark does provide “gifts” [unrestricted grants] to administrators as a “common practice,” did University of Southern Mississippi administrators get a similar “gift” for “choosing” Aramark as the food service vendor at USM?