

2013-14 Final Report of the Student Life Committee

Committee Members

Students: Ryan Del Rosario, Jenica Holt (Fall), Max Estêvão (Spring)

Faculty: Brad Reich, Lisa Fortlouis Wood (Committee Chair), Mike Benveniste, Ben Lewin, David Latimer, and Poppy Fry

Library Liaison: Eli Gandour-Rood (Recording Secretary)

Senate Liaison: Amanda Mifflin

Ex Officio: Lisa Ferrari (Associate Academic Dean), Mike Segawa (Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students)

Committee Meeting Dates

Fall: 9/26, 10/10, 10/31, 11/14, 11/21, and 12/5

Spring: 1/24, 2/14, 2/21, 3/14, 3/28, 4/11, 4/25, and 5/9

Senate Charges

The Dean of Students, Mike Segawa, brought the following Faculty Senate charges to the committee at our first meeting.

1. Review the Sexual Assault Work Group report and provide feedback to the Dean of Students on its recommendations.
2. Monitor the work of the First Year Experience Task Force and provide feedback to the Dean of Students and the to the Faculty Senate on its work.
3. Review the programmatic initiatives of Commencement Hall, including the potential role of the IEC in the Rocchi International District program.
4. Evaluate the efficacy of Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services, including ways by which the university promotes good health practices. Issues to consider are a) the impact on access due to the co-pay fee, b) the provision of university sponsored health insurance, and c) the adequacy of staffing for mental health services.
5. Serve, on a rotating basis, on Integrity Board, Honor Court, and Sexual Misconduct Board hearings and review the efficacy of this process.
6. Evaluate and provide recommendations to the Dean of Students and the Faculty Senate regarding the Residential Seminar program.

Committee Initiated Charges

See below: **Spring Semester Actions and Process of Committee**

Fall Semester Actions and Process of Committee

The committee formed three working groups at the outset of the semester, and assigned each to work on one charge. Through discussion, the committee selected charges 1, 3, & 4 as foci for the semester. What follows are summaries of the work of each group.

Recommendations of SLC SAWG Working group (Senate Charge 1)

Charge: Review the Sexual Assault Work Group report and provide feedback to the Dean of Students on its recommendations.

1. We recommend that the new sexual assault policy not be implemented at this time for two primary reasons. First, it is unclear what the policy's specific objectives are and, because of this, prioritization of actions to support the policy is difficult, if not impossible. We suggest a succinct statement: "The purpose of this policy is _____" and that everything then following this statement carries out that specific purpose. Second, we are unclear what the role of this policy is relative to the current University of Puget Sound Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct. There is duplication and overlap between the two and we do not know if this is intentional or not. If it is, we need more information as to how the two will work together.
2. Reconvene SAWG and provide ongoing institutional support to ensure permanence.
3. Identify (through "Permanent SAWG") the specific purpose of the proposed Sexual Assault Policy (including whether the policy is sexual assault specific).
4. The University must think about and address SAWG composition (including standing members and/or staggered membership).
5. The University must think about the time commitment of SAWG members (probable full year commitment, including summer).
6. Once Permanent SAWG has been created and the Sexual Assault Policy has been revised to carry out a specified purpose, immediate attention should be given to develop access to the policy/system, publicizing the policy and how to use it, and training for various groups.
7. Develop assessment criteria for SAWG (data collection, specifically looking at reporting and effectiveness of resources for reporting). This should run commensurate with the establishment of access. In other words, it should run from day one.
8. Establish a pattern for regular assessment and review of standing SAWG policy, possibly by a group separate from SAWG standing membership.

SAWG training recommendations:

- Identify who are mandatory reporters and how they report.
- Determine training program with specific focus and goals (who trains, with what objectives, and under what order/time frame).
- There are several groups for whom training appears to be recommended. We list them not to provide an “order”, but to draw attention to the possibility that some groups may be combined, others may be sequential, and others may follow a different schedule.

1. Staff and faculty
2. Residence life student staff
3. Athletic trainers and coaches
4. Greek life
5. Orientation leaders
6. Campus security
7. Overall student body
8. Potentially partner with Sexual Assault Center of Pierce County

*We suggest that if there is training or information for all students that it should be done early in the year, and not during orientation week, due to the mass amounts of information given during this week.

**The current and future role of the green dot program needs to be considered. It is possible it may be supplementary or redundant.

***The current and future role of BHERT needs to be considered because it goes beyond sexual assault, if it in fact encompasses sexual assault.

NOTE: This report was discussed in full committee on 11/14/13. Please see minutes for details.

Recommendations of the Commencement Hall Working Group (Senate Charge 3)

Charge: Review the programmatic initiatives of Commencement Hall, including the potential role of the IEC in the Rocchi International District program.

The Student Life Committee 2013 Commencement Hall working group held a focus group with students on November 21, 2013 to solicit feedback about their experience in the new dormitory. What follows is a summary of the focus group meeting and suggested actions that grew out of that discussion.

Present:

Residents {Elena Beck, Kathryn Stutz, Kieran O'Neil, Michael Denman, Laura Andersen, Hannah Butensky, Kathryn Ginsberg; SLC Faculty members Lisa Wood, and David Latimer.

Meeting notes:

Our meeting with students was really important for showing support and interest about their experience.

Most students found CH to be a beautiful building and liked the idea of the "house" concept. The residents expressed a range of experiences in regards to the social aspect of their respective houses. The Humanities and Honors houses seemed to function as tight-knit communities. On the other hand, residents of the International house reported little to no social interaction with their floor mates. After some discussion, it seems that the success of the Humanities and Honors floors can partially be attributed to shared classes or orientation activities (for the first year students). Despite shared interest in international travel, this commonality did not seem to result in any cohesion amongst the residents in the International house.

In terms of interaction among the various houses, the response from the residents was uniform; there is little interaction at all. Since students only have access to their own floors, casual interactions between different floors are nearly impossible. Planned events by Resident Community Coordinators (RCCs) would be a formal way of promoting a dorm-wide community. It was reported that there are three Resident Community Coordinators (RCCs) in the dorm. Some students felt that adding more RCCs could improve the community aspect both within a house and among the houses.

Most students were of the opinion that something should be done to improve coordination with the physical plant. Students are responsible for cleaning the common areas (kitchens and bathrooms), so without the regular attention of janitorial staff, soap dispensers often ran empty, and toilet paper could take days to be replaced.

Residents were also interested in making the common areas more inviting and amenable to social interaction. There were requests to better equip the common areas with chairs, sofas, etc. to promote the use of this space. Also, to make the space feel more like home, residents suggested that rugs be provided, and a few students lamented the fact that they could not hang pictures on the walls.

Ideas for action:

1. End of semester cookie fest with tea and coffee for Commencement students. This would involve cookies and beverages the first night of finals week, perhaps in the lounge. Maybe for that one night the couches and soft chairs could all be put in that room with music on etc.
2. Kitchen drive: Staff/Faculty/Offices will adopt houses in Commencement and donate pots and pans (sturdy and/or lightly used). We will gather over the next few weeks and distribute in January the few days before classes start.
3. Set up an email listserv for CH residents. Through the listserv, residents can be more readily aware of dorm-wide activities planned by the RCCs, and activities

might develop organically from the residents themselves.

4. Equip RCCs with the ability to plan two or three dorm-wide events each semester. The Tahoma room could be a great gathering place for coffee or a midnight movie.

Follow-up:

1. Mike Segawa organized a gingerbread house contest and cookie study break that was held on December 16. It was attended by a small group of students who nonetheless enjoyed the festivities.
2. Mike Segawa is in the process of outfitting the kitchens in the building with new equipment. These should be installed during spring semester.
3. We are investigating the possibility of creating a listserv.
4. There will be an additional focus-group session late in Spring Semester to assess the experience of students returning from abroad.

NOTE: This report was discussed in full committee on 12/5/13. Please see minutes for details.

Recommendations of CHWS Working Group (Senate Charge 4)

Charge: Evaluate the efficacy of Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services, including ways by which the university promotes good health practices. Issues to consider are a) the impact on access due to the co-pay fee, b) the provision of university sponsored health insurance, and c) the adequacy of staffing for mental health services.

The working group that was assigned to evaluate the efficacy of CHWS believes that we do not have enough data to properly complete this charge. After consultation with the full Student Life Committee, it was decided that instead of collecting and analyzing new data, the working group would instead make recommendations as to how this charge may be effectively completed in the future.

- 1) We recommend that the faculty senate create an ad hoc committee that is responsible for an external, independent review of the efficacy of CHWS. A proper evaluation of the utilization of services and outcomes will require significant time and resources. The creation of an ad hoc committee would allow for suitable execution of this charge.
- 2) In order to properly evaluate the efficacy of CHWS data should be collected from a number of sources. Triangulation is highly recommended; both qualitative and quantitative data will help evaluators to understand student experiences during CHWS encounters and the outcomes of these encounters. We recommend survey data and focus group interviews with students.
- 3) While the CHWS annual report does contain some useful information, we believe that there are a number of variables that need to be considered when evaluating CHWS efficacy that are currently missing. For example, the 2011-2012 annual report discusses student satisfaction, but does so using questions designed to

measure student learning outcomes. While this may be valuable in some other context, it is not a valid measure of patient satisfaction. The importance of patient satisfaction is well documented in healthcare literature. Patient satisfaction correlates with improved physician-patient communication, continuity of care, and compliance with treatment directives. Although anecdotal, informal conversations with students reveal that satisfaction with CHWS may be subpar. We suggest that a more valid measurement be used for assessing satisfaction. We also believe that it is important to analyze return rates. It is important to understand whether students who return to CHWS are visiting for new problems or if they are returning because their original problem was not resolved after the first visit. It is also important to know what happened to students who did not return after their initial visit. Did the visit successfully resolve the problem, or did the student go see an off-campus provider to continue treatment? These are just a few examples of questions that may be addressed with a thorough assessment carried out by ad hoc committee.

4) Regarding the specific sub points in this charge:

a) *Consider the impact on access due to the co-pay fee*

There was a 23% decline in mental health utilization and a 17% decline in medical utilization during the 2012-2013 academic year. However, it is impossible to tease apart the possible causes of the decline in CHWS utilization. The CHWS report states that, "lower service numbers though the fall were attributed to those new fees." However, we are unclear as to how that attribution was made. The report goes on to say that "... requests for medical services were down in the fall, but seem to have recovered by the spring semester." This is ambiguous. Overall, we believe that there is no way to determine if the changes in utilization are due to staffing, the co-pay, subpar reputation among students, a healthier population, normal variation in larger trend, etc. More detailed data is required to properly understand the effect of copay on access to CHWS services.

b) *Consider the provision of university-sponsored health insurance*

This is a massive undertaking. A proper consideration of university sponsored health insurance would require different data than what would be required to evaluate the efficacy of CHWS. On top of current access, utilization, and outcome data, the committee working on this part of the charge would need a significant amount of information on financing, insurance options, etc. While we certainly agree that this worth exploring, it is beyond the scope of this working group.

c) *Consider the adequacy of staffing for mental health services.*

Given that, as of now, the only data we have to work with is the CHWS annual report, we can only echo the claims made in that document: CHWS is performing well with the limited resources that it has, but it is severely understaffed and needs more resources.

5) As noted above, a proper evaluation of CHWS will take a significant amount of time and resources. While the evaluation is underway, there are some positive steps that CHWS could take to maintain a healthy relationship with students and continue to deliver effective care to the campus community. Some recommendations include:

- a) Highlighting the use of off-campus resources
- b) Creating a “help line” that can be used for either basic health questions or to obtain information about off-campus health services
- c) Finding ways to more effectively utilize the CHWS webpage
- d) Q&A sessions with students about CHWS services or general health issues
- e) A monthly CHWS email bulletin sent to all students
- f) Finding ways to integrate suggestions from the SLC report on sexual assault into communications between CHWS and students

NOTE: This report was discussed in full committee on 10/31/13 and 12/5/13. Please see minutes for details.

Spring Semester Actions and Process of Committee

A. Senate Charges

Charge 2 *“Monitor the work of the First Year Experience Task Force and provide feedback to the Dean of Students and the to the Faculty Senate on its work”*

Through discussion, the committee determined that one member (Prof. Poppy Fry) would focus on charges 2 from the faculty senate. Professor Fry graciously volunteered to attend meetings of the First Year Experience Task Force in order to provide a basis for shared information, and to provide feedback to the SLC regarding the progress and planning of the FYETF. Spring committee minutes include brief reports by Professor Fry regarding progress and impressions of work undertaken by the FYETF.

Charge 6 *“Evaluate and provide recommendations to the Dean of Students and the Faculty Senate regarding the Residential Seminar program.”*

The committee opted to defer charge 6 until next year, when more data on the residential seminars will be available.

B. Self-Initiated Charges

During spring semester, the committee addressed the following self-initiated charges.

SI Charge a: *Develop a clearer understanding of the roles, functions, and scope of action, for the Student Life Committee.*

The committee had several discussions about the explicit and implicit mandates stated in the Faculty Bylaws, as well as committee history and practices. We then discussed the varied possibilities for committee action, as well as the deliverables that would serve in multiple stages of the committee process including: planning, implementation, communication, and evaluation.

SI Charge b: Clarify processes in the following areas of committee work: charge development, prioritization of work, role as liaison and consultant, and deliverables.

The committee created a document for developing, processing, and prioritizing charges from external and internal sources. This document is currently under-revision (attached is a sample of this document, filled out with the major elements of a sample charge). The committee plans to continue piloting this document during the coming week as it develops its final list of suggested charges for next year. These will be sent as an addendum after the SLC meeting on 5/9/14.

SI Charge c: Develop clearer guidelines and processes for involving students in the work of the committee. This includes those serving formally as representatives, student groups, as well as students at large.

The committee began its work on student involvement in committee activities this past week (4/25/14) with a brief discussion about ways to increase the participation of student representatives, student groups, and students at large. The committee also met with a student group during that meeting (Peer Allies) to hear more of their work in providing informal, yet visible, support to students who have been victims of sexual assault on campus. The committee plans to modify the existing documents on charge development to include specific language regarding the inclusion of students in our work. We also plan to follow up on this charge next year.

Summary and Conclusion

During fall, the committee working groups identified a number of key issues in the charges put forward by the Faculty Senate last September. As a result of the working group analyses (documented above), the committee saw a need to clarify its role, and particularly to specify appropriate targets for its work in relation to broader initiatives. Through a process of open discussion, the committee articulated its role with greater specificity, and then began to outline its scope of action and range of potential deliverables. Throughout these discussions, we noted the importance of liaison with faculty, students, staff, and administration. Following exploratory discussions, we focused on key processes in charge development, particularly prioritization, implementation, and assessment. These discussions coalesced into a working document (Charge Development Worksheet).

The committee will have its final meeting next week (5/9/14), at which time we will submit a list of recommended charges and a refined version of the Charge Development Worksheet. We anticipate using this document to shape our work on some of the charges undertaken earlier in the year when we resume in the fall.

Final Report for Student Life Committee 2013-14

In closing, I would like to express my gratitude to the committee members for their thoughtful contributions to our discussions this year. In addition, I am grateful to our student representatives, with a special note of appreciation to Ryan del Rosario for sharing his candid observations and recommendations about student participation on this committee. On behalf of the committee, I thank Eli Gandour-Rood for his willingness to take notes each meeting; everyone appreciated his exceptional skill in creating detailed accounts of our discussions. Appreciation also goes to Dean Segawa and Associate Dean Ferrara for their support and helpful input.

Lisa Fortlouis Wood, Ph.D.
Student Life Committee Chair 2013-2014

Student Life Committee

Process Worksheet for Developing Committee Charges 2014

A. Working Title and Rationale for Charge

[Click here to enter text.](#)

B. Connections to SLC Ongoing Interest Areas and Current Foci

- Health/Mental Health [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Safety/Security on Campus (including Univ. Housing) [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Belonging & Social Support [Click here to enter text.](#)
- 1st-Year Experience [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Harm Reduction re: Substances [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Employment/Internship Opportunities [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Student Retention [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Diversity/Inclusion [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Experiential Learning [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Academic Development [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Other(s) [Click here to enter text.](#)

C. Assessment/Analysis

1. Previous/Current Work on This Topic:
[Click here to enter text.](#)
2. Existing Groups, Staffing, Stakeholders
[Click here to enter text.](#)
3. Existing Structures/Programs/Resources
[Click here to enter text.](#)
4. Known Issues, Obstacles, Problems
[Click here to enter text.](#)
5. Definable Goals, Outcomes, Solutions
[Click here to enter text.](#)

D. Specific Targets & Goals

Based on Assessment/Analysis of Working Charge, what are the goals for completion this charge? [Click here to enter text.](#)

E. Implementation

What specific goals can the committee undertake this semester/year given its role (scope of practice)? [Click here to enter text.](#)

Who should be involved during implementation (within & outside committee)?
[Click here to enter text.](#)

Concrete Actions and Who Does What: Individual/Working Group/Whole
[Click here to enter text.](#)

Sequencing and Prioritization [Click here to enter text.](#)

F. Deliverables,

What deliverable outcomes should the SLC consider (within its scope of practice)
[Click here to enter text.](#)

- Report and Document Findings of Assessment/Analysis [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Recommendations/Referral to [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Funding request(s) or Resource Development [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Development of New Charge/Modification of Current Charge/Postpone Existing Charge
[Click here to enter text.](#)
- Consult on Development/Implementation of a program/intervention [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Liaison w/ Programs/ Committees/Depts. [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Other [Click here to enter text.](#)

G. Ongoing Evaluation

The committee should evaluate the progress and effectiveness of work on each charge in order to determine whether the charge is completed satisfactorily. As part of this process, the SLC may choose to seek feedback from: Faculty Senate, Dean of Students, Student Groups, or Other Committees and Individuals. Findings should be discussed in committee and reported in minutes as well as end of year report to the Faculty Senate.

