

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MAY 3, 2006

[In these minutes: Services Task Force Update; Reporting Bias, Discrimination and Harassment Behaviors; Science Teaching and Student Services Center Building; Campus Committee on Student Behavior Hearing Procedures]

[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 represent the view of, nor are they binding on the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Matt Painschab, chair, Kendre Turonie, Amelious Whyte, Iraj Bashiri, Jennifer Engler, Carolyn Nayematsu, Jon Ruzek, Maria McRae, Nathan Pelzer, Caroline Younts

REGRETS: Jean-Marie Del-Santo, Kim Roufs, Janet Schottel

ABSENT: Jesse Berglund, Jenn Funke, Samantha Peloquin, Hilary Ploeckelmann, Jeffrey Wencil

OTHERS: Gabriele Schmiegel, Tina Falkner

GUESTS: Linc Kallsen and Gerald Rinehart

D). Matt Painschab called the meeting to order.

II). Vice Provost for Student Affairs Jerry Rinehart provided members with an update on the work of one of the seven Administrative Task Forces, *Services*, which he chairs. He noted that the goal of this task force is to focus administrative support on serving faculty, students, and academic units in order to advance the University's teaching, research and public engagement missions.

Task Force members focused their attention on two key service issues:

1. Sufficiency of the hours of operation of business and support services important to students, faculty and staff.
2. Effectiveness of email communication with students.

Final recommendations on these issues are due today from the task force.

A member asked once a decision is made about what constitutes effective email communication with students, how will this information be rolled out to departments. Vice Provost Rinehart stated that once guidelines are established and templates created it is likely this information will be shared with departments via a short tutorial, maybe something along the lines of HIPAA training.

III). Vice Provost Rinehart reported attending a conference last year where he learned about Cornell University's anti-bias efforts. Cornell University's bias response program was created to signal to students, faculty and staff that the institution had standards for acceptable interaction. In addition, it was a tool the administration could use to ensure that anti-hate incidents were followed up on. (<http://www.news.cornell.edu/Chronicle/02/4.18.02/bias.html> for additional information about Cornell University's anti-bias program).

Vice Provost Rinehart brought this information back, and collaboratively representatives from the Coalition for a Respectful U, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and the Office for Multicultural and Academic Affairs worked to flesh out a program to respond to, and help prevent bias crimes at the University of Minnesota. As of January 2006, the University's program was up and running and can be accessed off the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action's webpage at <http://www.eoaffact.umn.edu/Reporting.html>. A response team has also been identified to follow-up on the reports received on this site.

The purpose for developing this protocol, stated Vice Provost Rinehart, was to send the message to faculty, students and staff that the University does not tolerate intolerance. A next important step will be to make sure that the University community is aware of this tool, which has been created.

It was suggested that more time be devoted at freshman seminars to providing information on adjusting to freshman life, particularly as it relates to diversity, tolerance, etc. Vice Provost Rinehart agreed that this would be a good idea.

IV). Matt Painschab introduced Linc Kallsen, director of financial research, who was invited to provide the committee with information on the proposed Science Teaching and Student Services Center building. Mr. Kallsen distributed handouts and gave a brief overview of the project highlighting the following:

- The Science Teaching and Student Services Center building would replace the Science Classroom Building (SciCB).
- Work on the SciCB concluded in 1962 despite the fact that the building was technically not finished. The legislature planned to fund the SciCB in two phases, but never funded phase two.
- SciCB currently houses four 238-seat science demonstration classrooms, a handful of offices and a vending area.
- SciCB has been on the University's six-year capital plan for quite some time. The SciCB key location played a significant role in the University's decision to propose that it be the new One Stop site.
- The proposed Science Teaching and Student Services Center is expected to house general-purpose science demonstration classrooms; integrated One Stop student service transaction space and offices; life counseling offices, workshop spaces and resource center; and a district cooling plant.

- In terms of general-purpose classroom space, the project calls for six 250-seat classrooms; one 400-seat classroom; one 165-seat classroom and two 75-seat classrooms.
- Three major components are being planned for the student services portion of the building:
  1. A new, improved One Stop, which would transform the University's current office-centric student service model to a student-centric model.
  2. Career services and leadership programs.
  3. Advising space for undecided and transfer students.
- The new building is budgeted at \$62 million, and is currently in the state capital request, which means the state would pay 2/3 of the cost of the building and the University would pay the remaining 1/3. To date, the House of Representatives has funded the request and the Senate has given the University planning money. This item will be worked out in conference committee over the next few weeks.

#### Questions/comments from members:

- When would construction start on this building? Mr. Kallsen stated that assuming the state funds this request, demolition of SciCB would begin almost immediately. Currently, the University is in the pre-design phase of this project. If the project is funded this session, it is anticipated that the building would open in the fall of 2009.
- Would the new building be taller than the existing SciCB? Yes, stated Mr. Kallsen. The design parameter, however, is for the new building not to be taller than Appleby Hall.
- How many students use SciCB on any given day? Assuming the classrooms are full, roughly 5,000 students pass through this building daily.
- Will there be parking for the new building? There have been discussions that services that can be accessed nearby will not be replicated. Therefore, plans are to use the East River Road Garage behind Coffman Memorial Union and the Weisman Parking Garage for parking purposes.
- Will the Office of Student Finance be moved into the new building? The current plan is to not move entire offices into the building. Instead, offices are being challenged to look at their front office and back office operations and explore new ways of service delivery. Since the goal is to bring as many services as possible to students under one roof, it would be impossible to move entire offices.
- There needs to be enclosed spaces for privacy reasons versus having the entire space comprised of cubes. Mr. Kallsen agreed that private, enclosed space is necessary to address confidential issues, and some of this type of space will be designed into the project.
- What services will be housed in this space? Mr. Kallsen stated that this has not been finalized but cited examples such as registration, financial aid, bursar, study abroad, etc.
- Will the Office of International Programs be housed in this building? Mr. Kallsen stated that conversations have taken place with the Office of International Programs and the offices that fall under the umbrella of the Office of

Multicultural and Academic Affairs and while both of these groups liked the idea of being close to the building, they did not want to be in it. Because the new building will be very busy, these offices, Mr. Kallsen was told, were looking for space that would be more amenable to building community.

Members of the committee thanked Mr. Kallsen for his presentation.

V). Professor Michael Rodriguez, chair, Campus Committee on Student Behavior and Becky Hippert, Senate staff, reported that the Student Behavior Hearing Procedures had been revised. Copies of the old and newly revised Student Behavior Hearing Procedures had been distributed via email along with the agenda so members could review the documents prior to the meeting. Paper copies were also distributed at the meeting. It was noted that the revised hearing procedures were streamlined, while being mindful of retaining content related to fairness and due process. Old, out-dated information was removed from the procedures as well as redundancies; leaving a concise document that provides all parties with the information they need to know.

Becky Hippert added that a group had been convened earlier in the year to examine the student discipline process. One of the first things this group looked at were the hearing procedures because they were cumbersome and, to a degree, difficult to understand. At the request of the chair, Ms. Hippert highlighted the changes that were made to the document.

Questions/comments from members:

- Do the changes made to the hearing procedures have any implications for the Student Code of Conduct? No, these changes do not affect the Student Code of Conduct.
- In the old document it specified that hearings could be open or closed, but the new document does not specify this, why? Associate General Counsel Tracy Smith recommended that all hearings be closed for confidentiality reasons.
- Is the information about witnesses still shared with the parties since the decision was made to remove it from the document? This information was simply condensed and put under the section pertaining to case presentation.
- Please describe the process once a student is charged with violating the Student Code of Conduct. If a student is charged with violating the code, a report is filed with Student Judicial Affairs. The conduct code coordinator reads the report to make sure there is enough evidence to support the charges. Assuming there is enough evidence, Student Judicial Affairs will send a letter to the student telling him/her that he/she has been charged with a violation of the Student Code of Conduct and request the student contact their office to make an appointment to discuss the matter. A representative from Student Judicial Affairs then interviews the student about the allegations, and collects other information to help determine whether there was a violation of the Student Code of Conduct. If it is decided that the code was violated, the student is offered an informal resolution, which he/she can either accept or reject. If the student rejects the informal resolution, the matter is referred to Campus Committee on Student Behavior.

- Are students required to contact the Student Conflict Resolution Center as part of this process? Students contact the Student Conflict Resolution Center voluntarily if they want an advocate, but they are not required to do so.
- It would be nice if there were a one-page handout to summarizing the judicial process for students. It was noted that the group that revised the hearing procedures is looking into developing such a document.

Hearing no further questions, members unanimously voted to approve the revised hearing procedures. The committee also unanimously voted to recommend that a one-page judicial process summary be created.

VI). Since this was the committee's last meeting of the academic year, Matt Painschab thanked members for their service. Members, in turn, thanked Mr. Painschab for chairing the committee this year. Hearing no further business, Mr. Painschab adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate