



November 15, 2023

Office of Equity & Inclusion

---

# 1B.1 Investigator Training

Desiree' Clark, M.S. (She/Her)  
Civil Rights Compliance Officer

Ashley Atteberry, Ph.D (She/Her)  
Associate Compliance Officer

Minnesota State

# OUTLINE OF TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- Review Board Policy 1B.1 and System Procedure 1B.1.1
- Investigative Techniques
- Data Privacy





---

# **Overview of 1B.1 Policy and Procedure**

# MINNESOTA STATE BOARD POLICY 1B.1

## EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND NONDISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION

The 1B.1 Policy addresses:

- Equal opportunity for students and staff
- Nondiscrimination
- Harassment
- Discrimination
- Protected Class
- Sexual harassment
- Retaliation



# PROTECTED CLASSES

## HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION ARE PROHIBITED BASED ON:

- Race
- Creed
- Age
- Disability
- Sexual Orientation
- Gender Expression
- Familial Status
- Sex (including pregnancy, child birth, and related medical conditions)
- Status with regard to Public Assistance
- Membership or activity in a local human rights commission
- Color
- Religion
- National Origin
- Marital Status
- Gender Identity
- Veteran Status
- Genetic Information (employees)

# 1B.1 POLICY IMPLEMENTED THROUGH 1B.1.1 PROCEDURE

- This policy applies to all individuals affiliated with Minnesota State, including but not limited to, its students, employees, applicants, volunteers, agents, the Board of Trustees, and others as appropriate and protects the rights and privacy of all involved individuals, as well as prevents retaliation.

# 1B.1 PROHIBITS RETALIATION

Retaliation is prohibited at Minnesota State.

Retaliations includes, but is not limited to, engaging in any form of intimidation, reprisal or harassment against an individual because the person:

- Made a complaint or other communication under 1B.1 or 1B.3;
- Assisted or participated in an investigation or process under these policies, regardless of whether a claim of discrimination or harassment was substantiated (or other applicable laws and policies); or
- Associated with a person or group of persons who are members of a protected class; or
- Made a complaint or assisted or participated in any manner in an investigation or process with the EEOC, the U.S. Department of Education (OCR), the MN Dept of Human Rights or other enforcement agencies, under any federal or state nondiscrimination law.

# CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS

- An employee of Minnesota State **shall not** enter into a consensual relationship with a student or an employee over whom the person exercises direct or otherwise significant academic, administrative, supervisory, evaluative, counseling, or extracurricular authority or influence.



# DISCRIMINATION

The elements of discrimination include:

- Someone was treated **differently**;
- The different treatment was **based on** the individual's protected status or perceived protected class status; **and**
  - **Interfered** with or limited the ability of that person to participate in, or benefit from, the services, activities or privileges provided by Minnesota State **or**
  - Otherwise **adversely affected** that person's employment or educational experience of the college/university

# DISCRIMINATORY HARASSMENT

- Unwelcome conduct or communication;
- Based on actual or perceived membership in a protected class;
- That has a negative effect or is likely to have a negative effect on the complainant or the workplace or educational environment.

# DISCRIMINATORY HARASSMENT

## continued

The examples of discriminatory harassment include:

- Oral or written conduct such as jokes, innuendo, slurs, name calling, negative comments about cultural norms, circulating rumors;
- Physical conduct, battery, blocking movement;
- Non-verbal derogatory gestures, stalking, interference with work performance;
- Visual displays.

# SEXUAL HARASSMENT

- Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, sexually motivated physical conduct, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature **and;**
- The conduct has a **negative** or **is likely to have a negative effect** on the complainant or the workplace or the educational environment.

# SEXUAL HARASSMENT

## continued

The examples of sexual harassment include:

- Unwelcome conduct;
- Preferential treatment;
- Negative treatment or threats;
- Sexual exploitation.

# SEXUAL VIOLENCE

The **1B.3 Sexual Violence Policy** addresses:

- Affirmative Consent
- Sexual Violence
- Dating, intimate partner, and relationship violence
- Non-forcible sex acts
- Sexual Assault
- Stalking

# PER 1B.3 POLICY

- Definition of Title IX sexual harassment  
(conduct on the basis of sex)
  - Employee conditioning the provision of an aid, benefit, or service of the institution on an individual's participation in unwelcome sexual conduct [*Quid pro quo*]
  - Unwelcome conduct determined by a reasonable person to be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively denies a person equal access to the institution's education program or activity [Hostile environment]
  - Sexual assault; dating, intimate partner, and relationship violence; and stalking [Clery crimes]

# SYSTEM 1.B.1.1 PROCEDURE

## INVESTIGATION AND RESOLUTION


- Reporting Discrimination/Harassment
  - Encourage report as soon as possible
  - Administrators and supervisors must report incidents of discrimination/harassment
  - Students, faculty and employees are strongly encouraged to report incidents of discrimination/harassment



# SPECIAL CASES

- Complaints against a president
  - Complaints should be filed with the system office's designated officer. The case will be investigated by an investigator appointed by the Chancellor.
  - Campus investigation - If president's role in the incident was limited to a decision on a recommendation made by another administrator, such as tenure, promotion or non-renewal and the president had no other involvement in the matter
- Complaints against system office employees or the Board of Trustees.
  - Complaints that involve allegations against the chancellor or a member of the Board of Trustees must be referred to the board chair or vice chair for processing. Such complaints may be assigned to a Minnesota State investigator or outside investigatory assistance may be designated
- Complaints against college or university vice presidents, deans or provosts are filed at the campus level with the president as decisionmaker

# ADJACENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES



# SYSTEM 1.B.1.2 PROCEDURE

## PREFERRED NAME

- Chosen name that is different, in whole or in part, from legal name
- Each college, university shall have a procedure
  - Registrar: responsible for students and alumni
  - Human resources: responsible for employees
- Used when and where technically and legally possible

# BOARD 1.B.4 POLICY

## ACCESS & ACCOMMODATIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

- Programs, services, and activities shall be accessible to individuals with disabilities, in compliance with state and federal laws
- Individuals with disabilities may need accommodations to have equally effective opportunities
- Reasonable accommodations will be made to ensure access (with some noted limitations), including modifications to rules, policies, and practices
- Provide qualified student with a disability access to services and activities
- College, University must have process to request an accommodation

# SYSTEM 1.C.0.2 PROCEDURE

## RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE

- Objectively respectful and professional workplace
- **Professionalism:** Displaying the good judgment and proper behavior that is reasonably expected in the workplace
- **Respect:** Behavior or communication that demonstrates positive consideration and treats individuals in a manner that a reasonable person would find appropriate
- **Prohibitions:** aggressive behaviors; deliberately destroying, damaging, or obstructing work performance; knowingly making a false complaint; retaliation

# RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGING/ ADMINISTERING PROCESS

**Designated  
Officer**

**Investigator**

**President**

**Decision-making  
Authority**

# DESIGNATED OFFICER

- Completes system office training every three years,
- Designated by the president or chancellor to be primarily responsible for conducting an initial inquiry,
- Determines whether to offer informal resolution,
- Determines whether to proceed with an investigation under 1B.1.1 procedure, and
- Investigates or coordinates the investigation of reports/complaints of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation as defined by Board Policy 1B.1

# DESIGNATED OFFICER, CONTINUED

- Jurisdiction and scope
- Conflicts of interest
- Interim actions re: health, safety concerns
- Primary person to ensure process moves forward through each relevant step of the procedure
- Release of information requests



# INVESTIGATOR

- Completes system office training every three years,
- May be designated to conduct an inquiry, to investigate or coordinate the investigation of reports/complaints of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation as defined by Board Policy 1B.1 in accordance with the procedure,
- Determines or recommends whether to proceed with an investigation under the procedure,
- Prepares investigation reports, and
- May be the Designated Officer.

# INVESTIGATOR, CONTINUED

- Conducts a fact-finding inquiry or investigation of the complaint, including scheduling and holding interviews and requesting record information; may delegate this to another trained investigator
- Informs involved parties of right a union representative or support person to accompany them during investigative interviews, as appropriate
- Informs involved parties of the protection and prohibition of retaliation per policy
- Creates, gathers, and maintains investigative documents as appropriate

# INVESTIGATOR

- Writes investigation report with organized attachments
- Outlines facts in the investigative report based on information collected through the interview process and review of gathered documents
- Primary person to ensure process moves forward through the investigative steps
- Handles all data in accordance with applicable federal and state privacy laws, consulting with the campus Data Practices Officer when necessary
- Provides all investigative materials to the Designated Officer for recordkeeping

# THE INVESTIGATION

- Provides enough information for the decisionmaker to make a reasoned decision about whether policy has been violated
- Provides findings of facts, **not** findings of policies
- Maintains integrity of process
  - Timely
  - Fair to both parties
  - Provide confidentiality as required by law
  - Thorough
  - Tailored to individual circumstances

# DECISION-MAKER

- Completes Decisionmaker system office training every three years,
- Designated by president or chancellor to review investigation reports,
- Determines whether identified policy/policies have been violated based upon the investigation, and
- Determines or recommends the appropriate action for the college, university, or system office to take based upon the findings.

# DECISION-MAKER, CONTINUED

- Determines whether there is any real or perceived conflict of interest
- Receives and reviews the investigation report
- Provides notice to the Complainant and Respondent regarding receipt of report, their role as Decisionmaker, and anticipated timeline for decision
- Makes sure the investigator has complied with Minnesota State procedures
- May meet with parties or request additional information from the investigator

# DECISION-MAKER, CONCLUDES PROCESS

- Decides whether policy has been violated based on information provided in report
- Writes reasoned decision based on facts, available information, and policies
- Provides decision letters to complainant and respondent of their findings regarding a policy violation; copy to the Designated Officer
- Provides all related report materials to the Designated Officer for recordkeeping

# DECIDING IF MISCONDUCT OCCURRED

- Standard of proof in determining a 1B.1 violation
  - Preponderance of evidence; i.e. more likely than not to have occurred
  - Secondary information has value
  - Reasonable inferences also are used

*The scales of justice:*

*Preponderance = > than 50%*

*Clear and convincing = 75% vs. 25%*

*Beyond a reasonable doubt = 99.9% vs. .1%*



# DECISION FACTORS

- Weigh nature and context of behaviors, the relationship(s) between the parties, the context in which the alleged incident(s) occurred, and other relevant factors
- Consider the totality of circumstances
  - History of complaints/grievances
  - Treatment of others (those who are different and those who are similarly situated)
  - Skills/competencies of supervisors demonstrated by past actions
- What is more convincing and has greater probability

# APPEAL PROCESS

- Complainant and Respondent have right to appeal decision
- Appeal timeframe: 10 business days
- Grounds for appeal
  - Procedural irregularity, affected decision
  - New evidence, not reasonably available before
  - Conflict of interest or bias
  - Insufficient evidence for decision
- Filing an appeal concerning a report against a college/university president

# APPEAL PROCESS, CONTINUED

- Additional information
- Appeal decision timeframe
- Decision notification
- The decision on appeal is **final** under 1.B.1.1 Procedure

# APPEAL PROCESS, POINTS OF INFORMATION

- Disciplinary action imposed on a member of a collective bargaining unit is processed in accordance with that agreement
- Disciplinary or corrective action taken as a result of the decision may be enforced pending the outcome of the appeal.
- Students must be informed of their right to a contested case hearing (Chapter 14) if an outcome of suspension of 10+ days.

# PRESIDENT


- **Removed** from initial investigation and decision-making
- Serves as the final decisionmaker (appeal) for the Minnesota State



# ROLE OF PRESIDENT ON APPEAL

- Review of investigation report
- Review of any new evidence
- Quality review - consults with:
  - Minnesota State General Counsel and/or AGO
  - Minnesota State Human Resources/Labor Relations
- Notify complainant, respondent, and Designated Officer of decision (within a reasonable time)

# Minnesota State 1B.1.1 Investigation and Resolution Process









---

# INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES

**Andrea Rooney**

Investigation Specialist & Lead Deputy Title IX Coordinator  
St. Cloud State University

**Maegen Sinclair Usher**

Investigation Specialist & Deputy Title IX Coordinator  
Metro State University

# INVESTIGATION PLAN

- Scope of Investigation
  - What are the allegations?
    - 1B.1, 1B.3, RWP, Code of conduct, etc.
    - What are sub-elements
  - Who are the involved parties?
    - Multiple respondents; multiple complainants – may consider splitting
    - Large witness pool
  - Do the allegations arise out of same set of facts
    - If not, consider splitting or referring non 1B.1/1B.3 matters
  - Why is scope important?
    - Prevents Scope creep i.e., getting lost/sidetracked
    - Can help structure interviews

# WHO TO INTERVIEW

- Complainant & Respondent
- Witnesses
  - Those present in incident(s)
  - Outcry witnesses – administrators, friends, family complainant/respondent shared with about incident(s)
  - Those involved in documenting incident or process/response - security, other administrators, etc.
  - Focus on witnesses that have knowledge of the incident rather than the character of the individual
- Document interview decisions

# OUTLINE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- Interview structure consistent for all parties
  - "speeches" - overview of meeting, about role/office, policy, procedure, flowchart; advisory notice, waiver of union, privacy of interview' recording/note taking timing of interview
  - Background – name, title/year, start date, major, involvement in extracurriculars/committees, explanation of role, where they live on campus
  - Resources
  - Next steps
  - Reminder about retaliation

# DETERMINE GOALS OF QUESTIONS

- Who, what, where, when, why, how
- Intake meeting vs. Investigatory interview
- Determine scope
- What information are you missing or have questions
  - Read through reports/complaints and note any questions
- Policy elements

# POLICY ELEMENT EXERCISE

# HYPOTHETICAL # 1

A student comes to you and tells you that during a class break last evening, the student was talking to their professor about their recent divorce and then the professor gave them a hug and kissed them on the cheek. The student thought the professor meant to kiss them on the lips, but the student turned away and they missed.

## HYPOTHETICAL # 2

You observed a coworker (C1), who has a reputation for being somewhat flirtatious, trip near the copy machine. Another coworker (C2), who is generally “pretty strait-laced,” was also standing nearby and caught C1. C2 caught C1’s arm with their right hand and their left hand went around C1’s waist but C2’s hand slipped and touched C1’s buttocks. C2 apologized profusely. C1 responded, “I haven’t danced like that in ages.”



# HOW TO STRUCTURE QUESTIONS

- Start with broad/open ended questions
- Allow to tell their story/experience however they choose
  - Where they start/end their story and what they emphasize can be very telling and important for you to have.
- Clarifying questions
  - Funnel approach
- Additional questions/things left unanswered
- Closing questions
  - Is there anything else you think I should know?
  - Anything I didn't ask that you thought I would ask about?
  - Is there anyone that you think I should talk to? Why?

# INTERVIEW QUESTIONS for all

- Interview questions for all parties
  - Allow them chance to share their story/experience
    - "Tell me about your experience" - "this is your opportunity to respond to allegations" - "do you know why I asked to meet with you"
    - Prepare what information willing/able to share
  - Ask the who/what/where/when/how questions
  - Policy elements
  - Effect/impact

# INTERVIEW QUESTIONS CONTINUED...

- Interviewee specific questions
  - Respondent – make sure to review allegations before questions
  - Complainant – clarify protected class and identity
  - What they observed/their perspective of incident(s)
  - Inconsistencies with other parties/witnesses
  - Evidence specific questions – what they have, might have seen/been part of, etc.

# SCHEDULING INTERVIEWS

- Order of interviews
  - Strategy – different order for different situations
- Timing
  - Set aside enough time: prep, interview, notes/reflection time
  - Consider past interactions with party
  - Consult interview outline
- Flexibility – timing and location
  - Provide location options but be sensitive to different needs.
  - i.e., - Zoom requires technology, internet, etc.
- Accommodations
  - Know who/what departments to partner

# CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS

# EACH INTERVIEW MIGHT LOOK DIFFERENT

- Emotion – crying, anger, indifference, being conflicted, trauma, etc.
- Timing – short answers, decisions to make, communication styles, etc.
- How you ask questions
- Credibility concerns
- Effort needed to structure interview – redirect, diffuse conversation, etc.

# MAINTAINING CONTROL OF INTERVIEW

- Safety – Think about how you have arranged the room, security, etc.
- Union reps/ support persons/parents/lawyers
  - Be clear about what their role is [ I.e., don't ask interview questions and don't answer questions) from the very beginning (include in letters; share in speech)
    - Communicate to party and support person (if appropriate)
  - Allow for time and space for them to meet away from investigator (separate room; breakout room, etc.)
  - Give reminders/warnings if necessary
- Don't be afraid to end a meeting
- Difference between control and parties not cooperating

# TRAUMA INFORMED TECHNIQUES

- Forming questions in a way that does not assign responsibility, blame, or guilt
- Creating safe and comfortable interview environment/setting
- Understand the effects trauma can have
- Check your bias especially when assessing credibility
- Ask questions that speak to the senses



# PROVIDING EMPATHY AND VALIDATION

- Focus on treating the individual as a whole person.
- As an investigator, remain neutral
- Practice using sample language that validates a person's experience but remains impartial
- Remember allow space for decisions

# NOTE TAKING

- Handwritten, typed, Zoom transcript
- Some of this is a personal preference – be consistent
- Have outline of meeting/interview
- Consider a notetaker for support
- Model notes after investigation report
- Make notations where you still have questions for follow up or for other parties

# COMMON CHALLENGES & TIPS

- Common challenges
  - parties talk fast or talk in circles/share repetitive information
  - interviews are long
  - prioritizing typing notes after interview
  - Self-care
- Tips
  - type notes/update as soon as possible after interview
  - document thoughts for follow up
  - have a notetaker
  - encourage all to submit a written statement

# RECORDING INTERVIEWS

- Allows the investigator to focus on content/information and being present during the interview
- Recordings can ensure that all data and information is accurate.
  - Provides for use of direct quotes
  - Allows for investigator to review/reflect to determine what gaps still exist
  - Provides investigator an opportunity to refine investigation skills
- Recordings can be taken in multiple ways
  - Zoom, teams, handheld, etc.
- Record ALL the interview - including opening information, data privacy review (ask for verbal acceptance), all "housekeeping" information

# RECORDING INTERVIEW CONTINUED...

- There are additional nuances of recording that are different from standard interviewing.
  - Open recording stating date, time, and introduction of parties (including spelling of names). End recording with time.
  - Audio recordings do not pick up on non-verbal (head nods, etc.)
    - prepare parties at beginning of interview and clarify during interview if needed.
- Develop a plan for your recording - send for transcription, etc.
  - This provides a typed/hard copy of the interview.
- Transcription review
  - Determine if you want to add this as a part of your process
  - Who can attend to complete the review

# RECORDING CONSIDERATIONS

- Contracts for transcription
  - REV.com, other transcription services.
- Access to transcripts
  - Who, when, why
- Storage of recordings and transcripts
- Data retention policies





Office of General Counsel

# Overview of Data Practices

For Minnesota State Investigators System Procedures 1.B.1.1

Daniel McCabe  
Assistant General Counsel

MINNESOTA STATE



# PLANNING THE INVESTIGATION

Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13

Minnesota Rules Chapter 1205

- MGDPA: primary state law on privacy and handling of all government data.
- Government data is defined as: all data created, collected, received or disseminated by government in any physical form.
- Includes investigation data!

# 1B.1.1 Investigation Records are *Government Data*

- Records that you collect, create and maintain for an investigation – in any tangible form – are *government data* under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (MGDPA).
- Records on individual students are also subject to the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), including as part of employee investigation.

# Data About Individuals

- Data about individual students and employees are presumed *private*.
  - Personally identifiable data collected from employee/student witnesses can be “about” the speaker, others or both.

# Private Data Access

- Private data are available to:
  - Subject (if more than one may withhold);
  - C/U officials, others working on behalf of C/U if “need-to-know”;
  - Others authorized in writing by subject;
  - Others as permitted by law.

# Treat Active Investigational Data as *Confidential*

- May share with other school officials who have legitimate business “need-to-know” about specific information;
- **Not available to subject employee** (may be available to student subject);
- May NOT share with third parties (including union reps) unless
  - Specifically legally authorized.

Always seek assistance before disclosing!

## Caveat: Due Process

- Respondent must be informed about charges in order to defend BUT
  - Not the same as access to active investigation data
- Complainants/respondents must receive sufficient information to be able to appeal initial 1B.1.1 decision.

# Employee Issues Under MGDPA

- ID of harassment complainant or other witnesses NOT available to employee respondent if
  - Access would threaten their safety or subject them to further harassment
- Existence and status of a complaint are always PUBLIC, i.e., “there is a complaint and it is under investigation”
  - NOT the nature of the complaint!
  - *The context of a question matters . . .*

# Discipline

- **Default rule:** treat decision as “private” unless/until applicable law permits disclosure.
- Disclosure rules for employee and student discipline are different.
- Notice of a no-contact order must be provided to affected individuals for enforcement.



# Discipline: Employees

(see chart in materials)

- FINAL discipline (action taken and basis) is PUBLIC
  - After all CBA process exhausted; or
  - Employee with no CBA rights has been notified.
- If no discipline: all remains private.
  - But sex harassment victims entitled to certain remedial action information.
- Investigation of *public official* (president and other high level administrators) is public regardless of disciplinary decision.

# Student *Crimes of Violence*

- Discipline and investigation data about students almost always remains private. Exceptions for *crimes of violence*:
  - If 1B.1.1 investigation includes a charge of **assault, intimidation or forcible sex offense\*** certain information becomes available to:
    - The victim regardless of the result,
    - The public upon request if the charge is sustained.

Consultation is required before releasing student discipline information.

\* Not a complete list of *crimes of violence*.

# Avoid Inadvertent Mistakes

- Don't disclose private data to others during investigation interviews or correspondence;
- Employee administrative leave during investigation is not “suspension”
  - Implies discipline
- Refer media requests to campus communications or public affairs.

# Use Good Privacy and Security Practices, e.g.:

- Get consent for others to be present during interview.
- Don't permit unauthorized viewing of paper or electronic records;
- Label report as "Private;"
- Store investigation records securely;
- Follow IT procedures about maintaining electronic security when storing or transmitting data; watch that laptop! (device/phone/etc.)
- Dispose of not public data securely;
- Use email carefully.

# Provide Data Privacy Notice\*

- When interviewing individuals that includes private data “about” themselves, must inform:
  - How information will be used; who will have access; whether individual may legally refuse; consequences of providing or refusing to provide requested information.

(\*This is sometimes referred to as the “Tennessee Warning.”)

Tip: If Notice is given orally, retain a copy for records. Use template notices. Don’t promise “confidentiality” or access; just reinforce we follow the law.

# Know Your Resources

- Campus Data Practices Compliance Official (first responder for questions or receipt of any legal process request);
- Campus policies on referring requests
  - Public
  - Subjects
    - Employees
    - Students
  - Copy costs
- <http://www.minnstate.edu/system/ogc/index.html>
- System Office personnel

# Education Data

- Also subject to federal law: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- Many FERPA provisions incorporated into Minn. Stat. 13.32, but state law provides broader rights in some cases, e.g. applicants.
- Private unless specifically public, i.e.:
  - **Directory information** (unless student objects). Institution defines.
- Private educational data accessible to “school officials” with “legitimate educational interest,” as those terms defined by each school’s policy.

# What is Status of Investigative Data on Students?

- Unlike employee discipline, student disciplinary actions generally remain private, along with all investigative materials.
- Exception: Under very limited circumstances, the victim of a “crime of violence”\* may obtain data about the discipline of a perpetrator who is a student.
- \* “Crime of violence” is defined in privacy laws. Seek legal assistance in determining application of this exception.



# Data Collection Notice (“Tennessen Warning”)

<b>When?</b>	<b>Individual asked for private or confidential data about self</b>
What?	Why collected; how used; legally required to provide; consequences of not providing; ID of others authorized to access.
How?	Oral or written Department of Administration position: Data may only be used in accordance with notice, or subsequent consent.



# MINNESOTA STATE CONTACT INFORMATION

**Desiree' Clark, M.S.**  
**Civil Rights, Title IX, Affirmative Action &  
Compliance Officer**  
[desiree.clark@minnstate.edu](mailto:desiree.clark@minnstate.edu)

**Ashley Atteberry**  
**Associate Compliance Officer**  
[ashley.atteberry@minnstate.edu](mailto:ashley.atteberry@minnstate.edu)

Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI)  
<http://www.minnstate.edu/system/equity/>