



University of Windsor Student Mental Health Strategy

Implementation Committee Meeting – Winter 2020

Friday, February 28, 2020

Meeting #4 of the IC

Oak Room, Vanier Hall

10:00am – 12:30pm

Agenda

Present: Dr. Kathryn Pfaff, Lynette Kivisto, Ashley Vodarek, Jenessa Shaw, Kerri Zold, Ryan Flannagan, Evan Ripley-Mcneil, Katie Chauvin, Sandra Ondracka, Healey Gardiner, Dr. Mohsan Beg, Phebe Lam, Janice McAdam, Bianca Lenarduzzi

Regrets: Dr. Debra Hernandez-Jozefowicz, Quessia Mugabo, Muhammad Hussain, Victor Sam, Dr. Renu Sharma-Persaud, Arop Plaek Deng, Admira Konjic, Dr. Tina Pugliese, Sameena Sultana, Derrick Biso, Darren Larue

Key Documents for Discussion

- *Student Mental Health Strategy Proposed Recommendations*
- *Recommended Proposals from the Mental Health Initiatives Fund Sub-Committee + Appendix*
- *Membership List for Implementation Committee 2020-2021*

1. Introductions

Lynette welcomed the group.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

Lynette asked if there were any add-ons or edits to the agenda, none were brought forward.

3. Consideration of Recommended Proposals from the Mental Health Initiatives Fund Sub-Committee

Jenessa shared that there were 8 applications received for the Mental Health Initiatives Fund. She continued to share that the fund subcommittee used the Student Mental Health Strategy Fund Evaluation Rubric to evaluate the applications and determine the allocation and approval of funding. The Student Mental Health Strategy Fund Evaluation Rubric is on the fund website and is public information for all those

who are applying. A summary of the various projects, details and requested funding was distributed to all committee members. An appendix accompanied the summary document which included a description of each application. Of the \$14,000 that was available for this round of funding, 5 of the 8 initiatives were suggested by the subcommittee to receive funding. Bianca asked why all applications were not approved for funding. Jenessa explained that there is limited funding and that this discussion would be an opportunity to agree or disagree with the subcommittee's recommendations.

After the description and summary of the safeTALK training for PSC's Peer Counsellors application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa shared that the Wellness Outreach Office is currently providing safeTALK training campus wide and the subcommittee decided that rather than provide the funding, they would direct the PSC to the Wellness Outreach Office to obtain the training. The Wellness Outreach Office has funding to provide safeTalk training through a grant that is anticipated to be renewed. Bianca shared that they had taken the training and found it very useful. Jenessa clarified that this group would still receive the safeTALK training that they are requesting, but that the training could be sourced through the Wellness Outreach Office rather than the Student Mental Health Strategy Fund.

After the description and summary of the Lancer Recover: UW Student Recovery Community Start Up application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa explained that the subcommittee liked that this project fostered collaboration and addresses a need on campus. She continued to share that it is a grass roots effort/movement that is only asking for about half of the funds that will actually be required to sustain the project. As previously agreed upon by the committee, the wages that this applicant is hoping to subsidize will be a one-time funding opportunity from the Student Mental Health Strategy Fund. It was recommended by the subcommittee that this applicant receive the full funding requested. Sandra asked what the sustainability plan was for this project. Jenessa shared that the applicant requested funding to assist with the start-up cost of the project, and then they will lean on other internal funding opportunities and private donations. Ryan asked where the future funding was coming from, and made a comment that this group will not be guaranteed to receive this funding every year. Jenessa explained that funding will be sourced from internal funding opportunities and private donations. Ryan shared with the committee that there is little on campus in regard to drug abuse, and that the grass roots nature of this project is encouraging. Sandra asked who the key leader would be in this project. Ashley shared that Onawa LaBelle would be leading this start-up and that Onawa has a breath of knowledge and experience in this area. Mohsan shared that substance abuse, as it pertains to mental health, is missing within the Mental Health Strategy. Jenessa highlighted that multiple research articles and

existing programs are referenced in the application. Healey asked if the applicant had any community partners and sponsorships. Jenessa shared that the applicant provided a long list of collaborators and partnerships, and noted that this project would also be funded personally by one of the identified applicants. Phebe shared that that applicant has been completing similar work before they were at the University of Windsor. It was noted that the applicant understood this not as a reoccurring funding opportunity, but that this funding would help kick start the project.

After the description and summary of the Girl Talk application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa shared that the subcommittee appreciated the fact it was a collaborative and grass roots initiative. The program was justified with immediate and long-term benefits. The subcommittee believed that the requested funding was reasonable, and suggested providing the applicant with their minimum request of \$1,500.

After the description and summary of the Muslim Chaplaincy's Educational Programs application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa shared that the committee felt this program would have high impact and reach, meeting the need for a specific type of counselling on campus. She noted that the program will occur whether or not they receive the funding from the Student Mental Health Initiatives Fund, since they have additional support and funding. Jenessa continued to share that the committee had concerns with some of the requested funding not being directly related to mental health, and that if funding is approved that the applicant will need to know the items the funding is to be allocated towards. Healey asked if the technology requested played a factor in deciding to only provide the Muslim Chaplaincy's Educational Programs with the minimum requested funding. Jenessa explained that the committee's goal was to disburse the funding as much as possible, that is why the subcommittee proposed approving the minimum funding requested for this application. Sandra asked where other funding is coming from for this project. Jenessa explained that other funding is coming from the community, in-kind contributions, and donations. She continued to explain the different items outlined in the application to justify the requested amount. Ryan shared that the community provides a lot of resources and support for the Muslim Chaplaincy's programming. He explained that the Muslim Chaplaincy will be sustainable and that they will not need this amount of money every year to support its programs, only to help with the initial start-up. Bianca shared that they felt a video campaign that is outlined in the application would be a great way to reach the student population, breaking down barriers for students and reducing stigma. Ashley shared that the streaming video camera was not chosen to be funded due to the cost of the technology, not because of the service it would provide to the Chaplaincy. Ashley further explained that to support this need, the Muslim Chaplaincy would be able to collaborate with other

services on campus to help offset costs and share resources, for example video recording and other technology.

After the description and summary of the Wellness Wednesday application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa explained that Wellness Wednesday is an ongoing initiative, and the application is looking to offset some larger costs for their April events around exams. Jenessa shared that the subcommittee liked that this applicant collaborates with other student mental health groups, and it was felt that the amount requested was a small ask that could have big impact. It was suggested that the full amount requested be awarded to the Science Society for the Wellness Wednesday program.

After the description and summary of the Therapy Dogs to Support Students in the Faculty of Engineering application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa explained that Giselle is an embedded counsellor in the faculty of Engineering. On her own initiative, she has found a therapy dog and offered to handle all responsibilities for the dog. She is only asking for a reimbursement for half of the training costs that were incurred to have the dog trained. The committee felt that this was justified and generous of her to cover as much of the cost as she has. The subcommittee acknowledged the concern that it might set a precedent approving this application for others who are looking for a therapy dog. Jenessa explained that Giselle has already incurred all of the cost and is accepting responsibility of the dog, the fund would simply help her off-set part of the already incurred costs. Bianca asked if this was different from paws for stress. Jenessa explained that they are different and that a therapy dog would be able to assist in counselling session and available for the entire faculty. Ashley shared that this has a strong support from the Faculty of Engineering. She continued to explain the benefits of having the dog in therapy session and interacting with students in the building. Bianca asked why this dog would only be for Engineering. Ashley shared that Giselle worked within the Faculty of Engineering and has personally taken the steps to obtain a therapy dog. Ryan added that this is a result of Giselle's own initiative. Sandra asked if this was Giselle's therapy dog or the University's therapy dog, and inquired about who would be responsible. Jenessa shared that one of the items mentioned in the cost breakdown was the insurance, and confirmed that Giselle would be the owner of the dog. Sandra suggested talking with legal and shared that if this applies to other departments how would the committee feel setting a \$5,000 precedent. Ryan noted that someone would follow up with Julie to inquire further about the legal side of things. Ryan continued to share that the precedent is not for any dog, the therapy dog would have to go through formalized training. Giselle has put forward a lot of her own resources to make this happen. It is possible other departments might see this as an opportunity, but it was noted that the chance of another individual putting in the same amount of resources as Giselle would

be unlikely. Mohsan added that not every faculty has an internal therapist. Sandra shared that Human Kinetics has been very animal friendly. She inquired about the fairness of Engineering having a dog, but other faculties not. Mohsan added that having a therapy dog could be a barrier for some students. He noted his concern for those who would not self-identify as uncomfortable towards the dog's presence. Mohsan offered to work with Giselle to create a process for having the dog in the room or present for sessions. Lynette suggest that it could be an opt-in opportunity. Katie suggested putting the therapy dog on the intake forms. Healey shared that therapy dogs can become certified through St. Johns ambulance for little cost. Mohsan shared that it was an extensive training and that there is a big difference between an emotional support dog and a therapy dog. The application described specific uses of the therapy dog, such as being able to recognize different levels or stress and triggers. Healey asked if Giselle would be responsible for shots, lodging, and care. Evan inquired about the layout of the offices within the faculty and where the dog would be housed. Mohsan shared that to his understanding the dog is currently with Giselle unless there is a specific request for the dog not to be present. He agreed with the concerns that students need to be aware of the dog prior to interaction in sessions, and entering the office.

- **Action Item:** Ryan to follow up with Julie to inquire further about the legal side of therapy dog in Engineering.
- **Action Item:** Mohsan to work with Giselle to create a process for having the therapy dog in the room or present for sessions.

Phebe was asked to leave the room since she was listed as a collaborator on the next application. After the description and summary of the Integrating Wellness Resources and Awareness through the FAHSS Student Success Initiatives application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa shared that the committee felt the role itself was important, but that there was weak alignment with the strategy since mental health would only be a small portion of the project. She continued to share that the Wellness Outreach Office is able to provide this group with the requested material needed, and that the recommendation would be to not provide this applicant with the funding requested. Mohsan asked if the applicants would receive an explanation. Lynette inquired about the current and anticipated student positions in FAHSS. She suggested providing feedback to this applicant, emphasizing the need for more mental health related projects versus wages to be covered. Sandra asked if the Wellness Office was already involved. Ashley shared that the Wellness Office is involved and would be happy to continue working with FAHSS.

After the description and summary of the Mental Health Awareness Head Start application was read, the floor was open for discussion. Jenessa shared that the

subcommittee felt the requested funding for swag items was a good idea to get resources into students' hands, but that the subcommittee felt funding could be better allocated to other programs under consideration. Jenessa continued to explain that the Wellness Outreach Office has swag items that can be distributed and MySPP swags items have already be promised to Head Start this year. Based on the recommended funding amounts in the application process so far, Lynette asked if all of the funding would be utilized. She asked if consideration was given to reach in the allocation of funds. Jenessa confirmed. Mohsan asked if the Wellness Outreach Office would be able to follow up with some of the resources we use on campus to see if they would consider funding the branded swag items or provide additional funding for Head Start to promote their products. Bianca asked if mental health awareness was separate from the Head Start program. Ashley explained that it would be incorporated into the program, and that MySPP ambassadors are already scheduled to be at the Head Start sessions. Ryan shared that one of the recommendations in the Student Mental Health Strategy is to target the high school population to help with their transition to post-secondary.

- **Action Item:** Wellness Outreach Office to follow up with current resource providers to inquire about additional funding to further promote mental health and wellness at Head Start to incoming students.

Sandra shared that very few people reach out to Lancer Rec to provide resources and incorporate physical activity into their faculty or programs. She shared that Athletics finds a barrier in getting students physically over to the St. Denis Centre. She continued to say that Athletics' is willing to spend the money if it will entice people to go to the Athletics Centre, and that Lancer Rec is looking and willing to work with more collaborators. Ashley shared that the Wellness Outreach Office will continue to provide Take the Moment on campus and further promote more programming at the St. Denis Centre. Jenessa made a note to follow up with the Wellness Wednesday applicants to connect them with Sandra.

- **Action Item:** Wellness Outreach Office to follow up with the Wellness Wednesday application and connect them with Lancer Rec.

Lynette asked if there were any concerns with any of the recommendations from the subcommittee. Sandra said she approves the therapy dog as long as the risk management side is addressed. Ashley motioned to approve the recommended applications and funding amounts. Evan seconded to the motion. All were in favour – carried.

- **Action Item:** Wellness Outreach Office to contact applicants regarding the status of their application.

4. New Committee Member Selection

Ashley shared that with an overwhelming response to the call for new committee members, understanding new committee members are expected to join the committee in the spring a Qualtrics survey was sent out to those interested in joining the committee to gather more information. New committee members have been suggested by Ryan, Ashley and Sarah based on the number of committee members leaving, the applicants experience, and the applications alignment with the strategy. Ashley shared that there were 10 committee members leaving and based on the applications, 11 were recommended to join the committee in the spring. A document with the membership compositions and applicants was provided to the committee. There were 25 individuals who responded to the call for committee members, 22 responded to the Qualtrics survey of further qualifying questions each with an excellent response. Ashley shared that she had compiled a list of the applicants along with a summary of their applications to present if required. She continued to emphasize that no one has been informed of the preliminary results as of yet. Lynette shared that there should be a balance in diversity versus a background in health, noting that Psychology had a very strong representation. Ashley shared that consideration was given to reach and area, but when determining strong applicants those suggested had the strongest alignment with the strategy. Mohsan agreed with Lynette, noting that this implementation is for all of campus and 40% of the faculty chosen will be from psychology. He continued to share that the committee should be looking for representation not an expert panel. Kathy asked if lived experience was considered in the applications. Ashley shared that a significant portion of answers included lived experience. Applications that lacked response or responded as “not available” in regards to the applicant’s availability criteria were removed from consideration. Discussion continued around diversity of applicants. Bianca asked why UWSA, OPUS and GSS were not included in the proposed new members. Ashley shared that UWSA, OPUS and GSS have one spot reserved for them on the committee for their reps.

Ryan then took to committee through the list of those leaving the committee, staying on the committee, and suggested additions to the committee. He noted that there are 5 permanent staff members dedicated to the committee for operation, reporting, and continuity. Those members are Dr. Mohsan Beg (Student Health, Counselling and Wellness Services), Ashley Vodarek (Wellness Outreach Office), Katie Chauvin (Student Experience), Sarah Racinsky (Student Experience), Ryan Flannagan (Student Experience).

Committee members staying who are staff members include Kerri Zold, (Career Development and Experiential Learning), and Sandra Ondracka (Athletics). Based on the applications received, 2 new members were recommended from Engineering and CELD based on their strong applications. Two applicants were disqualified due to time commitments, and two applicants had experience but other candidate criteria was stronger. Kerri voiced it was important to have staff that are involved in faculties and to have engineering representation. After discussion the committee agreed to accept Anouchka Plumb (CLED) and Amal Jamail (Faculty of Engineering) to the committee for the available staff positions.

Committee members staying who are faculty members include Phebe Lam (FHASS and School of Dramatic Art), and Dr. Renu Sharma-Persaud (Sociology). Phebe shared that she is also a licensed psychologist in Michigan, bringing additional psychologist representation to the committee. Ashley reviewed the faculty members applications. The committee discussed the applicant's applications, emphasizing a need for diversity and highlighting specific skills and research that would bring value to the committee. Concerns about over representation in Psychology were discussed. After discussion the committee agreed to accept Onawa Labelle (Psychology), Alice Grgicak-Mannion (School of the Environment) and Sarah Woodruff (Kinesiology) to the committee for the available faculty positions.

The only student committee member staying is Victor Sam (Economics – undergraduate). Regarding the proposed new student members, Ashley shared that the proposed individuals each had some degree of experience in program implementation and/or strategy work which would be an asset to the strategy implementation committee.

The committee discussed the student applicant's applications, emphasizing a need for diversity and highlighting specific skills and experience that would bring value to the committee. Lynette highlighted the need for both undergraduate and graduate representation on the committee. Kerri noted that one of the applicants listed under the student section was not a student, rather a research assistant at the University. Phebe shared that there was an applicant involved in cultural groups on campus and that some cultural group representation is missing on the committee. Evan wanted to make sure that the student applicants were not graduating and leaving the institution after this year. It was confirmed that all student applicants would be returning to the University in the fall. Based on the originally suggested 6 applicants, Ryan proposed that the committee accept 7 new members due to the large number of qualified applicants. After discussion the committee agreed to accept Alana Sabelli (Psychology – graduate), Aman Ahluwalia Cameron (School of Social Work - graduate), Paige Coyne

(Kinesiology - graduate), Jesse Scott (Psychology - undergraduate), Mikayla Bornais (Faculty of Education - undergraduate), Jermeka Castello (Psychology – undergraduate), and Shelby Lacey (Faculty of Nursing - graduate) to the committee for the available student positions.

Ashley motioned to approve the new committee members as outlined in the discussion above. Kerri seconded the motion. All were in favour. Motion passed.

- **Action Item:** Wellness Outreach Office to contact applicants regarding the new committee selection decision.

5. Ranking of Recommendations to be Pursued

Ashley shared that 10 total responses were collected from the Qualtrics survey distributed to the committee, identifying the top recommendations to focus on. It was noted that progress and proposed additional actions will be brought forward in the spring committee meeting. Ashley took the committee through the top 14 recommendations listed in the Student Mental Health Strategy Proposed Recommendations document, noting the weight of each recommendation based on the Qualtrics survey results.

Ryan shared that Recommendation 27 would be difficult to implement since the position outlined falls into both the UNIFOR and CUPE union positions. He continued to share that there is an individual who will be in charge of triage and in-take coordination starting Monday, March 2nd, 2020, completing a portion of this recommendation.

Ryan commented that the committee should look to prioritize 6-10 recommendations and focus resources to achieving these. He continued to share that a lot of recommendations already have work completed, and that the goal of this agenda item is to review the recommendations and identify next steps.

Kathy suggested adding in a column in the Strategy tracking document for the next meeting to identify what funding has been put in place or secured for each recommendation.

Ryan shared that recommendation 32 (expand counselling resources) involved adding more positions, and at this point the University does not have the resources to do so. However, despite the absence of any assigned funding, if the committee felt that a one or more of the recommendations required new funding, Ryan noted that he would be able to take this information to senior administration to request more

resources. Lynette was hesitant to add a funding column, since it would be hard to identify exact costs and funding. Ashley identified various projects that already have funding and agreed this information could be added to the tracking sheet. She added that this would be helpful to estimate unfunded projects as this would be a helpful indicator of what projects could be implemented and which may not be as possible due to funding and will require further consideration.

Mohsan inquired about the results and shared his concerns about only having 10 people respond to the Qualtrics survey, contributing to the ranking of the recommendations. He asked if the new committee members would be able to re rank the recommendations. Katie suggested adding the new committee member rankings to the current rankings. Jenessa shared that the last Qualtrics survey was anonymous, and that she would not be able to identify who has taken the Qualtrics survey and who has not. The committee discussed the option of new ranking options with the new members, some highlighting that this could be a beneficial exercise for the new members to familiarize themselves with the recommendations. Regardless of the results of the Qualtrics survey or a new survey, Ryan explained the ranked recommendations might still change after discussion. With concerns around the large turnover of committee members, the committee decided to resend the survey when the new committee members join the committee in the spring. The committee discussed the current format of the Qualtrics survey, and decided in the new survey to have each committee member select their top five recommendations to focus on for 2020/2021.

Mohsan motioned to send another Qualtrics survey to help rank the recommendations when the new committee meets in the spring, and for each committee member to identify their top five suggestions. Jenessa seconded the motion. All were in favour, motion passed.

- **Action Item:** Wellness Outreach Office to look into different tools that can be used in the recommendation ranking survey to provide ease of use and most accurate results.

6. Next meeting

Ryan identified that the next meeting would be late May or early June, and that the main point of conversation would be the recommendations to prioritize for 2020-2021. He continued to share that both co-chairs indicated that they cannot stay on and commit for the full 2020-2021 academic year but could chair a May or June

meeting. In advance of the next meeting, Ryan suggested that a call could be put out to the 20-21 members to see who would like to be a new co-chair.

Mohsan motioned to adjourn. All in favour. Meeting closed.