I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by B. Hoffman to approve the agenda, seconded by B. Coller. Motion passed by acclamation.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Approval of minutes from October 10, 2016 meeting.

A motion was made by E. Fredericks to approve the minutes from the October 10, 2016 meeting, seconded by D. Dugas. Minutes approved by acclamation.

III. OLD BUSINESS

a. Discussion of Working Rules

There was discussion of the working rules that McGowan had drafted. There were positive comments of the draft. A consensus that the duties of the committee are broad. Some members found it difficult to ascertain how to move forward. Monitoring and evaluating the campus environment encompasses so many things. What means will be used to narrow the focus?

McGowan's original thought in putting duties B and D together stemmed from the presentation by Kelly Smith, Director of First- and Second-Year Experience, who also initiated a compilation of information pertaining to mentoring programs offered throughout campus. Freedman suggested that D as well as B might be a sub-set of A.

Discussion about how the committee would decide which campus environment issues to pursue continued. Should the committee invite in various groups across the university, i.e.,
student services, etc. to meet with the committee to determine what should be pursued? Klonoski suggested contacting the Student Senate to ask the students what they feel are the issues, perhaps limiting it to their top three issues. Another suggestion he made was to ask the Presidential Commissions if they needed assistance with issues. Barrett asked about the student members that should be serving on the committee; wouldn’t they be able to provide input? Klonoski said how difficult it is to get students to serve on the various committees.

This led to Freedman suggesting that each college have a student advisory committee. The discussion turned to how the committee could “require” that. Fredericks suggested a letter be sent to the deans saying that the committee recommends establishing such a committee and giving the benefits – using the existing colleges as an example. It was brought up by Hoffman that these student advisory committees are responsible for the Excellence in Undergraduate Instruction and Teaching Awards. Colleges that don’t have them should be encouraged to form them.

Dugas mentioned there were approximately 120 student groups with an academic focus. He suggested some type of survey to gather information for the committee. This would be an initial information gathering process instead of the part of the standardized process that had been discussed. The committee wants to collect information from a number of groups; the student Senate, the College groups, the interest group types of organizations. Klonoski suggested contacting the cultural centers, only one of which has a direct academic component but he thought that would allow the committee to reach populations that might not be readily available through the college advisory committees.

McGowan recapped the tasks:

a. Look for models on how to monitor student concerns from different universities as well as potential websites (Beth McGowan)
b. Contact Student Involvement for simple way to contact student organizations (Daryl Dugas)
c. Request college deans establish student advisory committees (Each rep to do this)
d. Ask Student Senate reps to attend meeting and bring their three biggest issues/concerns (Beth McGowan)
e. Draft a letter (survey) to the academic student organizations asking about their concerns (Daryl Dugas)

VI. NEW BUSINESS

N/A
V. ADJOURNMENT

M. Konen made a motion to adjourn at 2:20 p.m., seconded by E. Fredericks. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeanne Ratfield
Administrative Assistant, Provost’s Office