

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
October 22, 2014

[In these minutes: Underrepresented student retention data discussion; SSF Resolutions]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the view of, nor are they binding on the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

**PRESENT:** Patricia Jones-Whyte (chair), Thomas Bilder, Peter Haeg, BreAnn Graber, Kyle Kroll, Nitish Mittal, Michael Stebleton, Jillian Ryks, Cecelia Stevens, Amy Thie, Carlos Torelli, Amelious Whyte

**GUESTS:** Sara Carvell, associate director, OSA

**OTHERS:** Corbin Smyth

**REGRETS:** Lisa Erwin, Shivani Kushwaha, Kyungbin Lee, Kendre Turonie, Lanqiu Wu

**ABSENT:** Kristen Lewis, Liza Meredith, Brandt Tharp

**1. WELCOME**

Dr. Jones Whyte called the meeting to order and asked for introductions.

**2. UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENT RETENTION DATA DISCUSSION**

Professor Wassenberg, co-chair, EAD Committee, attended the meeting to discuss a possible partnership between the committees. She is currently analyzing data to determine retention rates of underrepresented student groups. Members discussed the following:

- How does each independent ethnic group experience college and how does this affect their retention?
- As a University, graduation rates do not reflect the population of the state of Minnesota.
- As a starting place, the colleges that are successfully retaining students should be consulted.
- We recruit internationally and nationally. What does recruitment within Minnesota look like? Is this regional or systemic?

Professor Wassenberg will contact the committee when the data has been analyzed.

### **3. SSF CHANGES AND RESOLUTIONS**

Ms. Carvell, associate director, OSA, gave members shared her previous experiences in student affairs and presented proposed changes for the auditing of funds that are given to Student Organizations. She distributed a handout titled "Proposed Changes to Student Services Fees Guidelines - Fall 2014 - For implementation for 2015-2016 Requests." She then read the resolutions and highlighted the following points:

#### ***Section 1: Applications Materials***

##### **Resolution 1: Groups must submit their own content in SSF applications.**

All SSF applicants must submit original application documents unique to the organization presenting them. All documents must be composed of work original to the organization presenting them, and must not be plagiarized, copied or duplicated from the application of another fee-receiving group or any other entity without proper citation or permission.

- This is proposed because two groups submitted identical applications. This resolution will help to provide the Student Services Fees Committee (SSFC) with accurate information.

##### **Resolution 2: Transparency in requests for pass-through and grant funding systems**

Fee-requesting student groups requesting funds for pass-through or grant funding systems must exhibit transparency in such requests.

Pass-through funds:

Student groups that wish to receive pass-through funds from a fee-receiving student group must provide a detailed budget that shall be included as a supplementary document in the funding request of the student group Student Services Fee application.

Grant funding:

Student groups requesting SSF funds for grant programs must provide a detailed description of their grant application and approval process, to include eligibility standards, grant criteria and specific award process(es), in their SSF applications. This will include a copy of the grant application, which must be attached to the SSF application.

- Ms. Carvell explained that, for example, if GAPSA receives a grant program request and the SSFC denies the funding for the grant, the entire budget is not rejected, only the grant. Members suggested:
  - Add language such as “line item” or “particular” budget request.
  - Add clarification as to what a detailed budget is
  - Dr. Jones Whyte said that it is concerning that GAPSA distributes funding as pass through funding instead of grant funding and that this process illuminates larger issues of the structures in place.
  - Mr. Smyth explained the UMD SSF process.
  - Ms. Carvell said that the timeliness of the requests is not optimal, and she feels strongly that instituting a grant process would allow groups to request funding closer to time for the activity. The current budget process requires budgets to be submitted 18 months in advance.
  - A member expressed the importance of the stability that is afforded by the 18-month request schedule.

## ***Section 2: Committee Member Removal***

### **Resolution 3:**

While MSA and GAPSA are each allowed to remove up to two (2) members of the SSF slate when candidates are presented for appointment, the following process must occur in order for removal to take place during the SSF cycle:

1. The group proposing removal of the committee member must provide a specific, non-arbitrary, unbiased reason for removal. The removal must be approved by majority vote.
  2. The Vice Provost and Dean of Students (or designee) will review the proposal and determine if the grounds for removal are sufficient. If so, the committee member will be dismissed.
  3. If the Vice Provost and Dean of Students does not feel the grounds for removal are sufficient, the SSFC advisor will deliver the information to an independent arbiter, such as the Senate Committee on Student Affairs (SCSA), for review. If the SCSA finds that the removal was not warranted, the removal will be overturned.
- A member commented that the process for requesting removal of a member of the fees committee could be provided for all groups receiving fees if they feel they have been discriminated against in the process.
  - MSA and GAPSA should not be the only groups with this power and that they should be treated like any other student group in their opportunities to challenge membership.

### **Section 3: Committee Member Expectations**

#### **Resolution 4:**

SSFC members are required to attend all committee activities, including training sessions, meetings, presentations, deliberations, and hearings. Members will only be excused from committee activities due to legitimate absences as defined by University policy - Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences, Section 1. The Student Services Fee Committee advisor may request documentation of illness or other conflicts. Repeated absences will not be tolerated and may result in an adjustment in stipend and/or removal from the SSFC.

- This change is to ensure that SSFC members, as paid committee members, realize that there are penalties for not attending meetings.

Dr. Jones Whyte asked that language be amended per the recommendations and members voted on the individual resolutions. The resolutions were voted on and the outcomes were as follows:

- Resolution 1: Unanimously passed as presented
- Resolution 2: Unanimously passed with the suggestions that OSA take into account SCSA recommendations
- Resolution 3: A vote was not taken for this resolution
  - It will potentially be voted on via email
  - Members discussed the following change to the language: “in order to remove a candidate *at any time* during the SSF cycle...”
- Resolution 4: Unanimously passed

Hearing no further business, Dr. Jones Whyte adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich  
University Senate Office