

Senate Committee on Student Affairs (SCSA)
April 20, 2016
Minutes of the Meeting

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.

[**In these minutes:** IT Governance Input; Student Conduct Code Policy; Campus Climate Discussion]

PRESENT: Peter Haeg (chair), Jethro Land, Kari Volkmann-Carlsen, Megan Sweet, Kendre Turonie, Thomas Bilder, David Blank, Patricia Jones-Whyte, Michael Stebleton, Nicholas Goldsmith, Kyle Kroll, Kat Yushchenko, Lisa Erwin, Nitish Mittal, Kendre Turonie, Susan Mantell

ABSENT: Amy Thie, Ellii Bipes, Rebecca Houske, Lin Liu, Cecelia Stevens

REGRETS: Matthew Loomis

GUESTS: Laura Knudson, assistant vice provost, Office for Student Affairs (OSA); Denny Olsen, senior associate director, OSA; Jason Langworthy, board associate, Board of Regents (BOR); Trent Raygor, information technology liaison, Office for Information Technology (OIT); Tom Auld, associate chief information officer, OIT

OTHERS: Brianne Keeney, Joelle Stengler

1. IT Governance Input: Trent Raygor information technology liaison, Office for Information Technology (OIT), and Tom Auld, associate chief information officer, OIT, asked the committee for input on where OIT's efforts should be focused in the upcoming year.

The following suggestions were voiced:

- Availability of video conferencing in general is important.
- The Academic Health Center has more restrictive use of Google. Exemption forms must be submitted for many of the Google features. The reason is related to security of patient health information data, but it would be nice if anything could be done to make access easier.
- Student email list formation is inaccurate. It affects elections and student body emails.
- The "Find it" tool in the library system sometimes works and sometimes does not work. Also, interface with databases is challenging, particularly off campus.
- Wi-Fi on the mall is very spotty.
- Listserv emails through MailChimp go to Spam or Promotions folders.
- The new MyU portal does not allow an individual to set their homepage to MyU upon opening; it goes to Google.
- There is frustration when IT help desk individuals will not help with something because it is not on the list of services they are supposed to provide. Their response has been, go to a 3rd party to get that done.

- Wi-Fi reliability has been difficult in the pharmacy classrooms. Class response systems cannot make the transition to being web-based. There are other systems as well that cannot be used until Wi-Fi is more reliable.
- Many graduate students work on their theses on their own computers. Some of these individuals are being funded by grants. Is there some mechanism for students to have access to secure places to keep their data, and still work on their own computer? If so, that information should be disseminated. (Ault replied that there is a new secure system coming out in June for sensitive data. It is being piloted by the AHC.)
- Better training for employees: there is training for new employees but when changes happen, information and training is not required of current employees.
- Each University account has personal web space. If an individual knows how to use html, it is easy to create an online résumé. For many of the professional programs, more and more students are doing this, and paying for it. But since the personal webspace is there and available, it would be great to have that resource, especially if templates were included.

2. Student Conduct Code Policy: Megan Sweet, chief of staff, OSA, said that the Provost's Office was asked by the Board of Regents to review the conduct code. The Board, she said, had specific areas of interest including medical amnesty, new definitions for sexual misconduct, and new processes for students engaged in due process. Sweet and her colleagues took the opportunity to review the entire code, and have previously met with system campuses, the Council of Graduate Students, the Professional Student Group, the Minnesota Student Association, various senate committees, and the Greek committees for feedback. She said this is the final draft before it goes to the academic student affairs committee in May and to the Board in June. The committee provided the following feedback to guests Laura Knudson, assistant vice provost, OSA; Denny Olsen, senior associate director, OSA; and Jason Langworthy, board associate, Board of Regents (BOR):

- Under the list of five items in the process part of changes, it says, "if it is a charge of sexual assault and a student is found not responsible," that the victim can appeal that finding. Why is this appeal provision being added without applying it to every type of charge that is brought forward? *Response:* It is a federal law that we do so. It is not in the Board policy but it has been part of the process since Title IX. This is not standard practice in student conduct circles.
- The "disorderly conduct" definition is ambiguous in areas. Why is there not any clarity to this term? *Response:* This is the first time anyone has voiced concern on this term. We did receive related feedback on disruptive behavior.
- Might the conduct code be interpreted in a way that one might think it is more lenient in some way; for instance, language around the right to assemble? *Response:* The code says students may peaceably assemble. The code is saying dissent is supported but there are boundaries.
- In regard to due process, are there specific grounds for appeals? *Response:* Yes. Subd. 2 calls attention to the administrative policy that lays out the grounds for appeal.
- In regard to the section on hazing, there was an addition of "or University athletic team." Was that deemed necessary when the term "organization" was changed to "group?" *Response:* Athletic teams are not recognized student groups, so they needed to be referred to specifically.

- There should be some clarification of what level of disruption would enact the conduct code.
- Bullying is qualified as being in person or through electronic means. What about, for example, paper and pen? *Response:* Good point. It should probably state bullying by any means.
- The definition of affirmative consent states that it does not vary based on a person's sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. Why do you include the qualifier? *Response:* That is not our document, but the Department of Education has gone to some lengths to make it really clear that sexual orientation and identity need to be addressed. This may be the reason.
- A student can request a formal hearing if they do not accept an informal resolution. Could a standard of review be included? *Response:* Title IX cases need to be set aside for this answer because they have their own guidelines, but for most hearings, the panel shows up with no knowledge of a case before that day. If a faculty member is involved, they will talk about the sanction they assigned. In practice little deference is given to the informal resolution, and many times the informal resolution is over-turned.
- Perhaps you could let students know that little deference is given to the original informal resolution.
- What about adding a part to this code that deals with evidence, a guiding principle about what evidence can be used. *Response:* We really put education first and foremost. If we seek evidence, we use the "reasonable" standard. In a formal hearing the chair is responsible for determining what that is. Some of the procedures talk about the investigative process and the procedures vary from campus to campus, so it really does not belong in the Board policy.

3. Campus Climate Discussion: Haeg asked the committee's thoughts on the previous meeting's campus climate discussion. He stated that in reviewing the various programs the University administers, climate did not appear to be a top University priority. He wondered how the administration knows where it wants to go or what it wants to be in this area, and how that is being measured. He thought it would be useful for the committee to recommend an institutional goal at some point in the upcoming year and pass a resolution to that effect. Committee members made the following comments on the topic:

- A big problem seems to be communication. The University works hard on these issues but the information about their efforts does not get disseminated.
- A big win would be if everyone thought of themselves as part of a diverse community. It seems focused mostly on race and it is much larger than that.
- The School of Dentistry requires a supplemental essay outlining how applicants bring diversity to the University. It is a good reflective piece.
- Perhaps the climate conversation should revolve around being a safe, comfortable, encouraging environment rather than around diversity. The term has been used so much it has lost its significance.
- We need to get specific about what we really want to do about systemic oppression and violence.
- Specific identities just do not feel welcome here. That really strikes me.
- Each of the five campuses is very different. That needs to be considered.

- The University needs to think about establishing a way of evaluating whether a goal has been reached and how to assess success.

Hearing now further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Patricia Straub
University Senate Office