

**Minutes of the Student Life Committee
November 21, 2013**

Present: Faculty Members Brad Reich, Lisa Fortlouis Wood, Mike Benveniste, Ben Lewin, David Latimer, Poppy Fry; Student Representative Ryan Del Rosario, Library Liaison Eli Gandour-Rood; Dean Mike Segawa

Meeting was **called to order** at 8:17 a.m.

Wood called for discussion of the 10/31 Minutes, and two corrections were offered: to correct a typo referring to CHWS as 'Campus Health & Wellness Services' rather than the correct 'Counseling, Health & Wellness Services" and to clarify that the proposed helpline was not necessarily a student-run or student-organized helpline, though that was mentioned, but rather a broader idea of a University-supported helpline. Gandour-Rood will correct the minutes.

Lewin moved to approve the minutes, David Latimer seconded, **unanimously approved**.

Wood called for discussion of the 11/14 minute:

Fry took the minutes at 11/14 meeting, and had already received via email a correction to the discussion about the SAWG working group report, clarifying that the working group's main question concerned the lack of specific purpose of the University's sexual assault and harassment policy.

There was brief discussion about the contents of the minutes, including discussion about whether it would be possible for the University to collect demographic information about frequent attendees at Honor Court, to see if there are ways to provide interventions to offenders earlier. Segawa noted that it would be difficult, as there is a very small numbers of folks that we're aware of who are repeat perpetrators, so it would be a very small sample size

It was also suggested that the SLC talk to the faculty ambassadors to the athletic departments, to see if deeper connections could be made.

The committee unanimously **approved the Nov 14th minutes**.

Business

Wood called for announcements, and Segawa noted that they are working on getting another faculty college to join the SLC.

The commencement hall working group announced that they would be meeting with students later in the day. At least 8 students have signed up to participate, perhaps more. There are more who are willing to send written feedback. Latimer explained that it's to bring students together and ask them about their feeling about the building and how it's been going. Wood noted that one idea originally brainstormed by the commencement hall working group has already been implemented (a photo contest for the traveling students).

The Commencement hall working group solicited suggestions from the rest of the committee about discussion topics or questions to ask at the focus group. Suggestions include asking about whether their expectations for living in the dorm are being met, and also to ask if they have a sense of how the rest of the student body views THEM (the residents)...as being luck or not, etc.? Another suggestion was to ask whether they feel integrated as a building, or whether the different 'special' groups feel isolated. Also, to ask what they would want to see improved in the house (do they have a wishlist?), and how their experience in Commencement Hall compares to past experiences living on campus.

Wood then recognized the Counseling, Health & Wellness Services working group, which is not yet ready to bring forward a list of recommendations to the larger group.

Members of the CHWS group raised additional concerns about what the endpoint is for this working group. It was noted that there's a tendency for the faculty senate to come up with charges that they haven't necessarily thought all the way through, along the lines of "we want to hear more about X, and X is a student life thing, so let's send it to SLC."

Segawa noted that one perception of the CHWS charge is that it's a leftover from last year's SLC that didn't get 'gotten to' so it carried forward. So in a sense this is almost a 2 year old charge. Further, he noted he feels the University always has a need to get a perspective regarding CHWS with how well they are meeting the needs of students. or instance, there is a waitlist of a couple weeks for non-essential services...longer than we would want, but is that wait so long that the University needs to prioritize more resources to CHWS to eliminate the wait? Feedback on perception to help make those decisions would be helpful.

Lewin noted that the CHWS working group has a draft of a report that addresses the charge and whether the working group feels it can or cannot address each part of the charge. One suggestion at present is to refocus from Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and move back to more health-focused outcomes.

It was also noted that as the charge is written, the SLC (via its working group) is supposed to analyze CHWS from a student-centered perspective, but all of our information is from CHWS itself (i.e. institution-centered). That's not to say that it is bad information or necessarily unreliable, but, in a sense, it's the opposite of what we are trying to do. Anecdotally, it seems that student perception of access and actual infrastructure of access is not similar.

Further discussion of healthcare accessibility on campus covered the fact that about 90% of the student body is covered by health insurance, though it's unknown if that's from their parents or elsewhere. Most data that we have related to health and wellness and out students is generated through CHWS, and the role of the SLC could be to determine what other externally generated information is needed?

It was noted by faculty that, anecdotally, it appears many students have no idea what to do if they have a health issue, and will just return home if they need help. So perhaps the faculty senate charge regarding CHWS should be two parts. First, how can the University best utilize the health and wellness infrastructure that's in place now and make students informed of it, and second, what information

would we need to make meaningful structural reform. There was agreement that there could be two goals, one related to messaging and outreach, and one related to assessment and evaluation.

Reich noted that the questions from the CHWS working group about the charge was similar to one faced by the SAWG working group. He noted that there is a difference between strategizing and formulating solutions, and it looks like the CHWS charge is solidly in the strategy or “statement of the problem” phase.

Wood noted that there used to be a standing committee of the faculty senate dedicated to health and wellness, but it disappeared quite some time ago, and raised the question of whether it should come back.

Lewin noted that the working group is currently completing a draft of a detailed piece-by-piece response to the formal charge and what would be needed to address it as it stands.

Further discussion of how the charge could evolve included: coming up with ideas about positive steps CHWS could take to improve campus awareness; ways for the University to highlight use of off-campus wellness resources for students; a helpline for health and wellness information; Q&A sessions hosted by CHWS; online tutorials through the CHWS website offering health & wellness information; a newsletter or other regular communication from CHWS to the student body.

Wood noted that there is one more SLC meeting scheduled for the 5th of Dec, and asked the working groups write up a summary of their work to be included in a midyear . She also noted that it seems that the working groups are operating differently and better than previous SLC groups, and asked for thoughts on this year’s working group structure.

General agreement from faculty and student representatives were that this year’s meetings have felt more efficient than last year’s.

Wood thanks the committee for its work, and commended everyone on doing a good job. She noted that when we meet for the last time on December 5th, the committee will try to set goals for next semester, including looking perhaps at the first year residential seminar, and what to be done with the remaining charges from the Faculty Senate.

Segawa note that his office will look at committee members’ schedules for Spring semester to try to find a meeting time for next semester, which he will try to bring by the 5th so that the committee can discuss the options.

Also, there will be food and beverages available at the final meeting.

The meeting **adjourned at 9:01am.**