



April 12, 2026

Dear members of the Undergraduate Student Government,

Thank you for sharing the One Too Many letter and for the concern and commitment that clearly went into its development. Student voices are essential to conversations about mental health, and we value student advocacy and efforts to articulate the lived experiences of peers. I share your goal of strengthening student well-being at Princeton, and I see this work as most effective when approached collaboratively. The comments below are respectfully offered in that same spirit of partnership and shared purpose. I had planned to send these comments to you prior to the USG voting on the One Too Many resolution, as it was my understanding that the resolution was going to be heard at the April 19<sup>th</sup> USG meeting. However, I still believe it is important to share my concerns below, which align with views expressed by administrators in meetings with USG leaders last week.

Many of the letter's central claims rely on findings from a student survey, yet key information needed to evaluate those findings, such as survey construction, sampling approach, and analytic methods—is not made available. The letter repeatedly cites a separate “Data Report,” but in the version of the letter I have, citations do not link to accessible documentation. Without this information, it is difficult to assess the validity of the conclusions or to understand why the findings differ from existing university survey data. For these reasons, I believe it would strengthen both the letter and its impact to defer moving forward until the underlying data and methods are available for review. Doing so would help to ensure that the USG's advocacy rests on a foundation that is both compelling and defensible. As Princeton students, you also have access to faculty with expertise in social science methods, public health, psychology, and academic pedagogy. I encourage you to take advantage of faculty expertise in these areas—not as a corrective, but as a resource that can refine the letter's analysis and support its conclusions.

More broadly, greater engagement with established research, expert guidance, and best practices in college student mental health would support the letter overall. While student narratives and campus journalism are essential for illuminating lived experiences and identifying areas of concern, the letter relies heavily on opinion pieces and reporting without consistently distinguishing between them, and it includes relatively limited reference to peer-reviewed research or expert guidance. In addition, it gives little attention to broader social and technological contexts that affect the mental well-being of college-age populations. Grounding the recommendations in a broader body of evidence—on academic stress, learning environments, suicide prevention, and help-seeking behavior, including work by Princeton faculty or national experts—would strengthen the letter and bolster its credibility, helping to ensure its proposals achieve meaningful change.

I am also concerned that some language and characterizations in the letter may unintentionally discourage students from seeking care. I understand that the sense of urgency reflected in the

letter's crisis framing comes from genuine concern. At the same time, from a suicide prevention and public health perspective, repeated crisis framing, particularly when paired with misleading prevalence statistics or narratives of institutional failure, can unintentionally heighten distress among vulnerable students and discourage help-seeking. Princeton's internal data show high levels of student satisfaction with Counseling and Psychological Services, timely access to initial consultations, and active care coordination for students referred off campus for ongoing psychological care. These findings do not negate the experiences of students who struggle with access to care or feel underserved, but they do suggest a more complex picture than the letter currently conveys.

Finally, important additional information will soon be available. The forthcoming report of the University's Task Force on Mental Health, which reflects work with the Jed Foundation (<https://jedfoundation.org>), including strong student involvement, covers many of the themes raised in the letter. I recognize that USG members had no way of knowing the timing of this report's release and that earlier communication would have better supported work on the letter. I regret that missed opportunity; responsibility rests with me. Yet given the report's relevance, I still encourage reviewing and integrating any pertinent findings before moving forward.

I share your commitment to improving student well-being and want this work to succeed. I welcome continued dialogue and collaboration to advance student well-being in ways that are evidence-informed, accurate, and protective of students. Thank you for considering what I have written and for all the fine work you do for the students you represent.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Kolligian". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a small flourish at the end.

John Kolligian  
Executive Director  
University Health Services