

**Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC)
February 16, 2018
Minutes of the Meeting**

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: Discussion About Laboratory Spaces Being Used as Offices or Meeting Spaces and the Potential Health Risks Posed to Students; Discussion of the Possible Revisions to the Board of Regents Student Code of Conduct; Approval of the Docket for March 1, 2018 Student Senate Meeting; Updates from SSCC Members]

PRESENT: Shantal Pai (chair), Aleksander Holleran (vice chair), Adi Penugonda (ranking student representative), Nick Ames, Matthew Berg, Ruby Debellis, Austin Evenson, Ethan Johnson, Sydney Elliott, Taylor Cronen, Brianna Hanson

REGRETS: None

ABSENT: Allie Ulland

GUESTS: Julie Christensen, deputy chief of staff, Office of the President; Vickie Courtney, director, University Senate Office

OTHERS: None

Chair Shantal Pai welcomed the committee, and members introduced themselves.

1. Discussion about laboratory spaces being used as offices or meeting spaces and the potential health risks posed to students - Pai introduced the topic of potentially unsafe meeting spaces by describing an incident where a fellow senator developed allergies due to being around biologicals, especially animals. She said that senator Christina Larson, a veterinary medicine major, wants to bring a letter to the committee that outlines her concerns that staff are using laboratory spaces as offices or meeting spaces, especially on the St. Paul campus. Pai wanted to put a draft of the letter in front of committee members at the meeting so they could provide comments or critiques by the next meeting in March.

Nick Ames thought that these were valid concerns. A lot of these issues come down to density of office space and the ability to make sure more appropriate options are available. This has been a problem on the St. Paul campus for a while, he said. Brianna Hanson suggested that the committee create a resolution rather than a letter.

Aleksander Holleran said that these situations could have been an oversight and the committee ought to provide tangible solutions for this problem. Pai asked if these concerns were different

between the Twin Cities and system campuses. Holleran said that as a teaching assistant at UMD, he sees a lot of students doing their grading in the labs.

Pai asked if the committee could provide more anecdotes for Larson since the current letter is very focused on the St. Paul campus only. The desired plan would be to bring the letter back for the March SSCC meeting and go before the full Student Senate in April. Ethan Johnson mentioned that the University's current capital investment request at the Legislature would include funding for restoration and renovation of labs in Crookston. Holleran said that Duluth would also be updating its labs soon.

2. Discussion of the possible revisions to the Board of Regents Student Code of Conduct -

Pai introduced the following letter regarding proposed changes to the Board of Regents Student Conduct Code:

To: Eric Kaler, President, University of Minnesota

*CC: University of Minnesota Board of Regents
Douglas Peterson, General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel*

From: Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC)

Re: Proposed Changes to the Student Conduct Code

On February 9, 2018, the Board of Regents will consider adopting the following proposed modifications to Section VIII Subd 4 of the Student Conduct Code:

Current Language:

The Student Conduct Code, Section VIII, Jurisdiction, provides as follows with respect to student groups:

Subd. 4. Conduct of a student who is a member of a student group will not be considered to be conduct of the student group unless the facts and circumstances surrounding the conduct suggest that the student group sponsored, organized, or otherwise endorsed the conduct.

Proposed Language:

The proposed standard replaces the current language with the following:

Subd. 4. Subject also to the other subdivisions of this Section, a student group may be held responsible for violation of any of the Disciplinary Offenses listed in Section IV of the Student Conduct Code based on the conduct of its individual members if:

- (a) the student group directed, sponsored, or endorsed the conduct that violated the Student Conduct Code; or*
- (b) any officer or officers of the student group knew or reasonably should have known the conduct that violated the Student Conduct Code was likely to occur during or directly related to an activity or event conducted by the student group and the officer or officers failed to take appropriate steps to prevent the conduct.*

We are writing to express concerns regarding the effects of these proposed changes. Similar concerns have been expressed through resolutions brought forth by the Council of Graduate Students (COGS) and the University of Minnesota Duluth Student Association (UMDSA).

The current language in the Student Conduct Code protects student groups from being unfairly penalized as a whole due to the actions of individual, rogue students. It first assumes that a student group is not accountable for the actions of individuals. Then, if facts about the conduct have been brought forward that significantly suggest otherwise, the conduct is considered that of the group. We do recognize there are situations where it is appropriate to hold entire groups accountable for their actions. It is an important and laudable goal in situations like hazing and sexual misconduct which are often a consequences systemic, cultural problems. As students we feel these problems personally and support any effort to hold perpetrators and those who enable them responsible. Nevertheless, there are potentially unforeseen consequences of this change in language.

This change is dangerous It is a consolidation of power and a shift in the burden of proof required to enact sanctions on a group. The ambiguous nature of the language proposed allows for subjective judgment to be made by members of the administration about what is considered “reasonable” and “likely.” This judgement will depend on time, place, and situational context and will certainly reflect the personal beliefs of those deciding. We believe this is too much power to give to a small group of people when the consequences are so high. Furthermore, these changes could allow individual bad actors to target student groups by simply planning disruptive actions to take place during otherwise innocuous activities.

We have serious concerns that the reasons above will create an environment on our campuses that is in no way conducive to student free speech and protest. Student groups regularly serve as vehicles for social movements and forums wherein students can organize public actions. We recognize that the University has an obligation to enforce the Student Conduct Code and dispense sanctions. However, penalizing the student group instead of individual students who may choose to participate would expose student groups to liability that they are ill equipped to handle, resulting in a chilling effect that impedes students’ rights to peaceful assembly and free

expression. For these reasons, we strongly object to the amendments and ask that you reject this proposal.

Sincerely,

The Student Senate Consultative Committee

Holleran made a motion for the committee to consider approval of the letter. The motion was seconded by Ames.

Adi Penugonda clarified that the letter, as it currently stands, doesn't make sense as the Board of Regents decided to delay the vote on this issue. Penugonda made a motion to postpone action on this issue and table the letter until the topic is discussed more thoroughly before governance. The motion was seconded by Ames. **A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Pai asked Vickie Courtney, director, University Senate Office, to describe the new process recently proposed by the administration for dealing with this topic. Courtney stated that the proposed amendment to the Board of Regents Student Conduct Code was not routed through governance in the usual manner. As a result, a number of groups expressed disapproval over the process and the language itself. Joe Konstan, chair, Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), and others took notice of the lack of process and asked the Board of Regents to defer motion on the issue until further consultation could take place. Courtney, Konstan, and other members of the administration later met to clarify what the best steps are to move forward. Courtney proposed, and Konstan approved, a plan to the group that would be as follows:

- Make sure that the Board of Regents, especially the board's chair, is on board with the plan in order to proceed.
- Create a working committee comprised of faculty and students. The working committee will include the following representations:
 - One member from the SSCC
 - One member from the Student Senate
 - One member from the Senate Committee on Student Affairs (SCSA)
 - One member from the Student Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC)
 - One faculty member from the Law School
 - One member from the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T)
 - Two members of the FCC, one from the Twin Cities campus and one from a system campus
 - One student member from a system campus
 - One ex officio representative from the Office of the General Counsel and one from the Office for Student Affairs
- After the working committee provides a recommendation on the amendment, the Senate committees responsible for consulting on the Student Conduct Code will be afforded an opportunity to review the proposed draft; finally, the Student Senate would then vote on

it. If the aforementioned committees desire to have members of the administration at a meeting for further discussion, it will be accommodated. However, the hope is that the working group puts together an agreeable proposal and members can present the language to their respective committees.

Penugonda asked about the lack of context around the proposed change and wondered what was the original goal of the change. Holleran added why did the Regents go about it the way they did? Courtney said that the intent of the policy change will be spelled out explicitly by the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) for the working committee. Julie Christensen, deputy chief of staff, Office of the President, added that the OGC had indicated the intent of the policy change was in backdrop of the sexual misconduct prevention discussion. The intent was to better define what it means to endorse or sponsor these types of practices and put limits on what University can do to penalize, or not, so there is more clarity on the issue.

Ames noted the language doesn't really change the clause and it should have been applied to sexual assault violations. People have been upset because it was applied to the entire code for any crime or violation. The change should have been more narrow in scope.

Pai asked Holleran and Evenson to think of a UMD student to recommend for the working committee. Matthew Berg mentioned he knew of people within the Professional Student Government association (PSG) who would be interested in serving as well.

Courtney continued by saying the process will not be rushed. The next step is a letter to go out outlining what the goals of the working committee will be. The letter will come from Konstan and could be co-sponsored by a senior administrator as well. She relayed a message from Konstan that the process will move slowly but with intent and will not move forward without support from the Board of Regents. Berg had concerns that this process might take too long and PSG might not be able to weigh in appropriately if the process goes beyond this academic year. Courtney clarified the intent is to have this process completed by the end of this spring.

Pai thanked Courtney and Christensen for their work on this issue and representing the students' interests so well.

3. Approval of docket for March 1, 2018 Student Senate meeting - Pai introduced a draft docket for the March 1, 2018 meeting of the Student Senate. The items were as follows:

1. Administrative Response to Senate Actions (Information)

Resolution on revisions to the parental leave policy for graduate students

Approved by the Student Senate: November 3, 2016

Administrative Response: PENDING

Resolution on expanding on-campus childcare

Approved by the Student Senate: November 9, 2017

Administrative Response: PENDING

2. Student Senate Nominating Subcommittee - Approval of Appointed Senators (Action) (11:30-11:32 a.m.)

Shantal Pai, chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee and Student Senate

Motion: *That the Student Senate approves the appointment of the following Twin Cities student senators, as selected by the Student Senate Nominating Subcommittee:
Sarabeth Moore, CEHD*

3. Minutes for November 9, 2017 (Action) (11:32 a.m. - 11:34 p.m.)

Shantal Pai, chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee and Student Senate

Motion: *To approve the Student Senate [minutes from November 9, 2017](#). Please send any suggested edits to kwap0003@umn.edu no later than noon on February 26, 2018.*

4. Assembly Assembly/Association Updates (11:34-11:47 a.m.)

Pai noted that if members need assistance with their updates to please let her know. Her desire is to make sure that these updates are engaging.

5. Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee Chair Report (11:47 - noon)

Shantal Pai, chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee and Student Senate

6. SYSTEM-WIDE STRATEGIC PLANNING (Discussion) (12:00 - 12:45 p.m.)

Karen Hanson, executive vice president and provost, University of Minnesota

7. RESOLUTION: MEASURING AND MAINTAINING ADEQUATE CAMPUS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (Action) (12:45 - 1:15 p.m.)

Lauren Mitchell, senator, College of Liberal Arts, and president, COGS

Pai asked the committee if they had any concerns about the resolution. Her intent is to make sure that it is applied system wide and avoid any last minute edits at the meeting. Ruby Debellis had concerns from the Morris campus since Morris doesn't have the ability to report on a number of the measures outlined in the progress report and that some responses might have to be reported as inconclusive. She said the intent is to not make it seem like the Morris campus is being non-compliant with the reporting. Ames asked is there a need for these services in Morris. Having zero information about these services should be a good indicator that there is a need for it on campus he said. Debellis noted that they are trying to find a balance of reporting so other system campuses can't find a loophole in under reporting or not reporting at all.

Pai noted a suggestion from Joe Konstan in a previous meeting that a good change would be in the first paragraph of the appendix to change from the word "recommend," to the word "suggest." Adding this into the sentence would help to make it a conversation starter. The committee agreed that the suggestion is a good compromise.

Penugonda asked about the background of the resolution and wondered if COGS spoke with the Office of Institutional Research and asked what they suggested for these measures. Ames said that when COGS first addressed this issue about 2-3 years ago, a number of conversations were had with these offices about what other institutions do including what some of the best practices are. These measurements are based off that research and those conversations.

The committee amended the resolution as follows:

Topic: Measuring and Maintaining Adequate Campus Mental Health Services

Date: March 1, 2018

For consideration by the Student Senate, University of Minnesota

BACKGROUND:

In 2015-2016, waitlists for mental health counseling services on campus were out of control. Twin Cities students routinely waited over a month to receive care after requesting an appointment¹, and waitlists at Boynton Mental Health Clinic peaked at 50-60 students². The Duluth campus had only half of the number of counselors recommended by the International Association of Counseling Services³. Students united around this problem in an unprecedented way. Several student organizations including the Student Senate⁴ advocated for the hire of new counseling staff to address the waitlist crisis, and also a more intentional approach to planning services, so that a crisis of that magnitude would never happen again⁵.

Waitlists have been mostly under control in recent semesters, but demand for mental health services has continued to increase substantially. For example, this semester, Boynton Mental Health Clinic estimates an 18% increase in demand over last year⁶. If the University does not proactively address these increases in demand, then we will quickly find ourselves back where we started two years ago. We must continue to make incremental progress, so that we do not slip back into crisis.

Toward that goal, students have advocated for the University to collect and publicly report data on mental health services to the Board of Regents⁷. The Board is charged with monitoring and evaluating the University's performance, and is the chief mechanism for ensuring accountability among University administration. The information that the University is required to report to the Board shapes how staff allocate their time and attention, and the situation that arose in 2015-2016 could only have come about by inattention. Preparing and delivering this report to the Board will ensure that University administration is actively attending to and monitoring mental health needs.

Here, we request that the Board receive an annual report on the status of student mental health systemwide, consisting of the measures identified in the Appendix of this resolution.

Furthermore, we request that a subset of these measures be reported annually on the University

Progress Card. These measures would provide enough information, to the Board and to the public, to be able to identify potential problems in the University mental health system before they reach a crisis level.

Resources to support student mental health should not only be obtained through a destructive cycle of crisis and agitation followed by reluctant investments. Routine assessment and evaluation of mental health services will allow us to break this destructive cycle.

RESOLUTION:

Resolved, the Student Senate Consultative Committee requests that the Office of the President and the Office of the Provost commit to providing an annual report of measures of mental health to the Mission Fulfillment committee of the Board of Regents. Our recommendations for these measures are indicated in the Appendix of this Resolution;

and be it further

Resolved, the Student Senate Consultative Committee requests that the first three measures indicated in the Appendix of this Resolution be published annually on the University Progress Card.

¹ 2015-2016 Report of the Student Representatives to the Board of Regents

² Boynton Health Service Student Services Fee Request, 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 Academic Years

³ Vice Chancellor Erwin, January 26 2017, SSCC Meeting.

⁴ Student Senate Resolution Concerning Student Mental Health Planning, May 5, 2016

⁵ COGS Resolution, Commitment to Campus Mental Health Services, December 2016

⁶ <http://www.mndaily.com/article/2017/10/n-traffic-increases-18-percent-at-boynton-mental-health-clinic>

⁷ 2016-2017 Report of the Student Representatives to the Board of Regents

Appendix: Proposed Mental Health Measures

First, we recommend that three measures of student mental health outcomes be added to the University Progress Card. These three measures, outlined below, would provide the most basic and important information about student mental health, without needlessly lengthening the Progress Card.

Proposed Progress Card Measures

Prevalence of specified mental illnesses as diagnosable, diagnosed, and treated, as measured by screening questions in student mental health surveys such as Healthy Minds

Ratios of counseling staff to student number, by campus

Wait times for beginning multi-session individual counseling, as measured by days till third available appointment; peak and average over academic year

Second, we suggest that, in addition to the Progress Card measures, the University collect and report more detailed data on student mental health to the Board of Regents on an annual basis. This report could take place in an appropriate committee of the Board, such as Mission Fulfillment. Here, we suggest several measures that should be included in such a report, in order to provide the Board with an appropriate amount of information to be able to hold administrators accountable for their commitment to meeting students' mental health needs. We suggest that these measures be reported for each campus in the University System.

Wait times

Average number of days until third available appointment for beginning multi-session individual counseling

Peak number of days until third available appointment for beginning multi-session individual counseling

Average number of days until third available appointment for psychiatry

Average number of days until third available appointment for services with a specific provider

Average number of days until third available appointment for services with the first available provider

Student perception of accessibility of services

Incidence

Prevalence of specified mental illnesses as diagnosable, diagnosed, and treated as measured by screening questions in student mental health surveys such as Healthy Minds.

Suicide and Crisis

Number of completed suicides

Number of attempted suicides, as currently measured by Boynton Health Services

Number of calls and texts to crisis hotlines

Number of crisis appointments made with on-campus providers

Referral

Proportion of students referred to community resources due to a complex diagnosis

Proportion of students referred to community resources due to reaching service limits

Quality of insurance of students referred to community resources

Quality of Services

Overall self-reported client satisfaction

Self-reported client satisfaction by diagnosis

Self-reported client satisfaction by severity of concerns

Self-reported client satisfaction by type of service received

Number of appointments, by appointment length

Number of missed appointments that had been scheduled in advance (“no-shows”)

Credentials of staff members

Number of counseling staff, and ratios of counseling staff to student number

Rate of staff turnover

Provider’s reported satisfaction with quality of care

Provider’s reported satisfaction with work environment

Expenditures

Revenues and Reimbursement

Reimbursements from insurance

Revenues from state funds

8. Old Business

9. New Business

10. Adjournment

Pai made a motion to approve the docket for the March 1, 2018 Student Senate meeting. **A vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously by the committee.**

4. Updates from SSCC members - Pai encouraged members to let their constituents know what is on the docket for the upcoming Student Senate meeting so they can decide if they want to attend the meeting. If people have new ideas for getting more students involved with the senate, said Pai, please let her know. Berg said that PSG is having more issues in getting people to run for the senate. Part of the problem is a lack of infrastructure for connecting to other PSG students. Ames said a good way to get people involved is to touch base with those who may only have slight interest or pet issue. It gets them personally invested and they might stick around longer. Hanson mentioned that the Twin Cities is having trouble with filling seats for the College of Design and the School of Nursing. Senators look for a proxy but often can't find anyone to fill in for them, she said. Holleran asked if UMD Medical and Pharmacy schools count towards PSG. Berg replied that they do. Holleran said he would be willing to put Berg in touch with some of these students to try and get them more involved.

Ames said that COGS is busy working on the student mental health and parental leave issues. They are getting finalized after two years of work. There has been a bit of internal turmoil regarding the COGS presidential and vice-presidential elections as well.

Austin Evenson said that Bulldog Day at the Capitol is coming up next week where they will be lobbying for renovations for UMD through HEAPR funding. They have finalized locations for more accessibility of feminine care products, he added.

Debellis said that at the Morris Campus Student Association (MCSA), tech fee allocations are coming up soon. MCSA will allocate \$197,000 for computer, lab, and other technological upgrades. They are also hosting a fundraising gala called the "Prairie Gala." The gala tries to encourage alumni to give back to the campus. Support the U day is also coming up and it is their hope to get more students involved with that legislative initiative.

Johnson said that Crookston is putting together a proposal for a \$1 increase to their student fees to further fund the student association. Crookston Support the U day was a success. Three

legislators came to campus and students were able to visit and tell their stories and perspective about why investment in higher education is important.

Hanson said that MSA recently passed a DACA resolution for students at risk of deportation. It allows them to be able to take an incomplete in a course which is an accommodation similarly afforded to students who serve in the military. They are moving forward with the initiative to rename and reclaim buildings on campus with an emphasis on the Coffman Union. They currently have a petition that has over 1000 signatures. Some other news is that over 60 people applied for Student Senate positions at the Twin Cities campus with heavy competition in CLA.

Berg said that PSG is working on its association's congressional changes including the way they allocate funds. The intent is to build a stable of leaders for the future. The Regents Student Code of Conduct has continued to be a big issue and the Child Development Center closure has had an impact on PSG members and they are working on responses to that issue.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Chris Kwapick
University Senate Office