

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
October 13, 2010

[In these minutes: student affairs update, Student Services Fees Review Committee Report, committee business]

[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: Silvia Canelon and Joyce Holl (Co-Chairs), Kendre Turonie, Elizabeth Vose, Amelious Whyte, Thomas Bilder, Adam Arling, Elena Machkasova, Nathan Pelzer, Carlos Torelli, Anthony Albecker

REGRETS: Christine Bartels, Thomas Reynolds,

ABSENT: Thomas Rozeske

GUESTS: Vice Provost Gerald Rinehart, Bree Dalager

OTHERS: Gabriele Schmiegel

Co-chair Joyce Holl, called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. She asked the committee members to introduce themselves. The committee approved the April 7 meeting minutes as corrected. Co-chair reviewed the committee's charge, and highlighted the portion of the charge referring to the Students Services Fee Subcommittee (SSFS).

Ms. Holl informed the committee that the SSFS had been dormant for some time, and last April, the Senate Committee on Student Affairs (SCSA) began considering the role and necessity of this subcommittee. She stated that the SCSA would be taking this issue up again. She hoped the scheduled speakers, Bree Dalager, chair of the Student Services Fees Review Committee, and Amelious Whyte, chief of staff, Office of Student Affairs (OSA) would provide some insight into the history of the subcommittee, its previous role, and whether it remained relevant.

Ms. Holl then asked for input from the committee on agenda items for the upcoming year. Professor Elena Machkasova indicated she would ask the Multiethnic Committee and Assembly if they had any issues to bring forward. Kendre Turonie noted that last year the SCSA expressed a desire to delve deeper into issues and not just be a "listener." The committee then reviewed some of the issues considered last year:

- Whether the committee was carrying out its charge with regard to the subcommittee to oversee the student services fees process,
- The impact of the H1-N1 flu virus on students, and
- The opening of the new stadium and related student behavior

It was noted that the impact of the light rail and road construction on student's ability to get around campus would be an important issue to consider this year.

### **Vice Provost of Student Affairs, Gerald Rinehart**

Ms. Holl and Ms. Canelon welcomed Vice Provost Rinehart. Vice Provost Rinehart began his remarks by discussing the recent incidents of violence in the fraternities. He stated that the situations were not related to one another and that the OSA was working with University Relations, Vice President Kathleen O'Brien's office and the University police to address the situation. He went on to state that alcohol was an underlying factor in all of the situations, and that a new group consisting of college deans, OSA representatives, city council representatives, and bar and property owners had been formed to provide leadership on this issue. Their focus is shifting the culture around alcohol consumption. It is a complex but very important issue requiring education and enforcement. He noted that Mr. Whyte and Chad Ellsworth are meeting with the inter-fraternity council, and that the council is being encouraged to "step up" around alcohol policy issues. The goal is to encourage safer environments and reduce the gap between what fraternities say they are doing and what is actually occurring.

Next, Vice Provost Rinehart stated OSA is working with student governance on the issue that there is no formal policy statement about the involvement of students in the university decision-making process. He indicated President Bruininks was unwilling to create such a policy as he is leaving in June. But, there is a draft memorandum of understanding on consultation in the decision making process, and it will be used until a new president is in place. The issue will then be brought forward to the new president. He noted that difficulties with the graduate school restructuring pointed out the need for some formal policy about how decisions are consulted.

Vice Provost Rinehart then discussed a new process for providing emergency contact information and signing up for the text U service. Previously students had to sign up for text U, but now when a student opens a specific application, such as viewing their grades, they get a request to update their contact information. They are also asked if they would like to sign up for text U. The staff portion of this program has not yet been rolled out, but it will also be tied to viewing specific applications. The hope is that this system will increase participation in the service. It is particularly important for the University to have current contact information for handling emergency situations. In response to Ms. Canelon's questions, Amelious Whyte clarified that students will see the request to update their contact information when they view their grades and at the My U site. The information that will be requested is

- Current address,
- Phone number,
- Cell phone number, and
- Emergency contact information
- Whether you want to be in Text U

Mr. Whyte emphasized that University is not asking for new or different information.

Next, Vice Provost Rinehart stated OSA is working with the undergraduate education office to improve the experiences of transfer students. He noted that their experience is less positive than that of students who enter the University as freshman. They do not receive a welcome week,

their orientation is abbreviated, and they do not receive housing. OSA is looking into an extended orientation and determining what services are available when they register. Vice Provost Rinehart noted that an enrollment management policy is needed for transfer students.

Next, Vice Provost Rinehart addressed the student services fee process. He stated that a Student Fees Review Committee (SSFRC) was put together last year and charged to look at four areas of the fees process.

1. The appeals process for late applicants
2. The 10% financial reserve requirement
3. The percentage of an organizations budget that can be used to compensate staff
4. The purposes and status of resolutions from the fees committees

Vice Provost Rinehart complimented the committees response and indicated that individuals at the OSA were crafting a response to the Student Services Fees Committee's final report. This report is now online at <http://www.studentservicesfees.umn.edu//index.html>. He noted that the final recommendations would be incorporated into the instructions for those applying for fees this year.

He next mentioned an issue that has arisen around the allocation of space to a limited number of organizations in Coffman Union. Questions have been raised about why only 29 of the 700 student groups receive space. Vice Provost Rinehart asked the Board of Governors to address two issues: How can the second floor of Coffman be organized to serve more students and organizations? and what is the history of the groups that have space in Coffman? A group of students from the Board of Governors is travelling to the Universities of Michigan and Ohio to see how other universities handle the issue.

Finally, Vice Provost Rinehart stated that a small committee including members from the General Counsels Office, the Student Conduct Office, himself and Mr. Whyte is reviewing the Student Conduct Code. Once the language is drafted it will be brought to the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and others for recommendations. The Student Conduct Code and recommendations will be presented to the Board of Regents in February or March. Some areas that committee is looking at are:

- The codes failure to address violations of city or municipal ordinances
- Whether the conduct code is able to address "cyber issues"
- Whether the code should address situations when individuals cause harm by a failure to act.

Ms. Holl asked when the Student Conduct Code would likely come before SCSA. Vice Provost Rinehart stated, it would likely be in February.

Mr. Whyte addressed the question of why the SCSA has not recently been requested to consider student fees issues, despite the provision for a student services fees subcommittee in its charge. He stated that in practice most of the student service fee issues have been delegated to the senior student affairs officer. Only, substantive changes have been brought to the SCSA for input. Mr. Whyte noted that he sees its role as considering policy issues not administrative issues. He further noted that the SSFRC report states that there might be a role for the SCSA fees subcommittee to review disagreements about Student Services Fess Committee resolutions.

stated that the SCSA is charged to receive and review an annual report from the SSFC, but this has not happened for several years. Mr. Whyte stated an annual report has not been done in several years, and that is why it has not been provided to this committee.

Professor Elena Machkasova asked if it be helpful to have a report from coordinate campuses on the fees process. Mr. Whyte responded that under the charge, there should be a report from each campus, however that has not happened in at least ten years. He indicated this is likely because of mechanisms that have been put in place to improve the fees process. He recognized, however, that reporting outcomes and identifying issues makes sense.

### **Bree Dalager, Chair of the Students Services Fees Review Committee (SSFRC)**

Ms. Dalager noted that the SSFRC's recommendations and report are on the SSFRC's webpage and that this is also accessible via the OSA website. She reviewed the structure of the SSFRC, how it was constituted, and its meeting schedule. She also noted the efforts the committee had made to gather community input by having open meetings, and holding two forums for feedback on the committee's initial report. She stated the feedback the committee received was incorporated into the final report it presented to the OSA in October.

Ms. Dalager indicated the most substantive change between the initial report and the final report was a clarification that the OSA and Vice Provost would retain final review authority over an appeals process. She went on to highlight the need for an appeals process to deal with late applications, incomplete applications, and final recommendations that are lower than the initial recommendations.

She also emphasized the need for a structure to insure that fees committee resolutions become part of the historical documents and are maintained in accessible form. The committee recommended creation of a fully searchable database for all past resolutions. Ms. Dalager next discussed the proposed framework for passing, implementing and including resolutions in the fees handbook. This included a report to the fees advisor containing "material resolutions" and review by the Vice Provost.

Ms. Dalager concluded by noting that during the course of its review process the committee identified several potentially problematic areas of the fees process that were outside the scope of its charge. A list of these issues was compiled and presented to the Vice Provost. Ms. Canelon asked how the committee addressed the concerns of the minority view of the committee that there should be no appeals process for late applicants. Ms. Dalager indicated that there was consensus on most of the issues, but on this issue there was more dissent so the minority view was expressed in its report. She also explained that the minority view was based on implementation of a "checkpoint" system for applying for fees.

Adam Arling asked whether the committee had addressed the potential conflict of interest caused by Graduate and Professional Student Association and Minnesota Student Association selecting members to be on the SSFRC when they are fee-receiving groups. Ms. Dalager stated that the issue came up in a conversation with Vice Provost Rinehart, but it was not specifically addressed.

Hearing no further business, and adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay  
University Senate Office