January 21, 2000

Attendance

Alphonse Burdi (chair), Frank Cianciola, Dan Green, Donald Heller, Susan Pritzel, Julia Klein, Matt Lafferty, Royster Harper, Nichole Pinkard, Robert Simpson, Simone H. Taylor, Phyllis Valentine, Teshome Wagaw, Grace Wu (staff).

Guests: Gary Krenz, Michael Marletta, Philip Margolis, Pamela Raymond.

I. Opening Remarks

Professor opened the meeting at noon sharp with several welcomes. He welcomed Professor Daniel Green as a new SRAC member and who will be substituting for Professor Gold who is on leave this term. Also welcomed were Pamela Raymond from the Office of the Provost, Gary Krenz from the President’s Office, and Michael Marletta from the Life Sciences Institute.

II. Review and Approval of Minutes

The draft minutes of the November 19, 1999 meeting were distributed for committee review and approval. Given the limited time available, Professor Burdi invited the committee to review the minutes more thoroughly after the meeting, and then contact either him or Grace Wu for will be considered as approved any suggested revisions. Should there be no revisions suggested, the drafted minutes will be accepted as distributed.

III. Updates from Committee Chair

Professor Burdi reported that he plans to meet in the near future with the MSA leadership (including Bram Elias) to broadly discuss SRAC’s responsibility and work on the Code amendment process, including some briefing by MSA on amendment proposal(s) being submitted by that group. Dr. Burdi viewed this meeting as a healthy step in promoting the sense of “community” among all those who might be directly or indirectly influenced by the Code.

Burdi reported that SRAC member Susan Pritzel is actively and productively involved a member of the OSCR search committee.

IV. Updates and Comments—Interim Vice-President Royster Harper
Royster Harper emphasized the importance of SRAC and the broader university community to look at the issues of hazing practices within the campus’ Greek community. The State and University do not have a specific law against hazing practices, so there are no rules restraining students from the traditions and practices of hazing. A number of discussions and suggestions have been made to address this practice, including the setting up of hazing hotlines to help students.

The vice-president next informed SRAC of the need for the university to frame and implement a mental health policy as another step in promoting wellness among our students. The situation of effectively and sensitively assisting students experiencing psychotic break down in a timely manner was given as a prime example for the need of a mental health policy and services for the students.

As a last update item, Royster reported on continuing concerns raised with the Naked Mile, which is a traditional event that happens on or about the last day of classes of the winter semester. While noting that SRAC probably would return to this issue of the Naked Mile, it was noted that students need to be fully educated and aware of the legal implications of being arrested at such events.

V. Focus Discussions/Actions Items

The Life Sciences Initiatives and Institute. The Chair turned the agenda for the meeting over to SRAC member Frank Cianciola to introduce the “Life Sciences Initiative and Life Sciences Institute”. Cianciola invited our guest resource spokespersons (Gary Krenz, Michael Marletta, Pamela Raymond) to introduce themselves and briefly describe their roles in the LSI. Before entering fuller discussions of the LSI, Professor Burdi did indicate that SRAC was supplied with several summaries of the LSI, including the “Institute” executive summary sent to the regents in July, 1999. To assist the guests in their comments, the Chair indicated that, among other things related to the LSI ventures, SRAC is especially interested in what explicit planning is underway to include meaningful involvement of students, especially in the “Life Sciences Institute” since the planning for that institute appears to be relatively well along.

Gary Krenz (from the President’s Office) focused his remarks around the been report and recommendations of the LSI Commission appointed about two years ago by President Bollinger. He encouraged SRAC members to access www.umich/pres/LifeSciencesInitiatives for a fuller description of the report.

He did note that the University of Michigan as a research university takes quite seriously its mission of education and teaching. However, it appears that many students do not take advantage of the research possibilities available at U of M. Perhaps, Krenz continued, the only research opportunity program most notable to students is that offered by the UROP (Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program), and, given the size of our student population, a relatively limited number of students are involved. The goal of the Life Science Program is to make opportunities available and engage students life science research as an integral part of their educational experiences at this university.
Associate Provost Pamela Raymond next addressed the committee. She highlighted the excellent opportunities (made available by the geographic proximity of the college and the professional schools) to bring together educational and scientific programs for to the advantage of our students and our interdisciplinary faculties. While only briefly touching upon the myriad of research and scholarly opportunities for students that currently are or soon will become available to students, Professor Raymond did highlight the exciting field of bio-informatics which is rising to prominence on this campus and throughout the country.

Professor Michael Marletta from the medical school next gave an eloquent summary of the many new and important research directions which the scientific world is addressing, including the efforts to map the human genome. As Marletta briefly reviewed these directions, he showed no question whatsoever for the University of Michigan to take on leadership roles in a number of these ventures seen to be so important to the basic sciences and to the wellness or health care of our citizens. Marletta saw the University as being solidly positioned to do this, especially as the worlds of our many enthusiastic students and mentoring faculties are brought closer together through the Life Science Program, the Life Sciences Initiative, and the Life Science Institute.

After a brief exchange of ideas and questions between our three LSI guests and the committee, the Chair concluded this part of the meeting by thanking our three guests, and encouraging them to participate in future SRAC meetings on this new and exciting LSI blueprint for the future.

SRAC “Code” Amendment Process. Moving to the major agenda item for the day, Professor Burdi distributed a draft document dealing with how SRAC could responsibly and effectively fulfill its role in reviewing amendments to the Code. That draft document essentially was a hybrid of two separate process proposals drafted and suggested to SRAC in November, 1999. That hybrid draft proposal showed a timetable for amendment review/recommendation tasks. Moreover, that latest draft process presented to SRAC at the January, 2000 meeting featured a “batch-process” review for Code amendment proposals.

After some discussion and consensus that the essence and framework of the proposal presented to SRAC (on January 21, 2000) appeared workable. The Chair then suggested that SRAC committee members (a) continue with its critique of the review/recommendation procedural document; and (b) test the workability of that procedural document by reviewing the only proposal currently available to SRAC, i.e. the proposal to amend the current Code as submitted by the Civil Liberties Board in 1999. Professor Burdi asked that SRAC members provide him with responses to each of these two items (a and b) by January 31, 2000. The importance of a defensible process for reviewing proposals was underscored. It was his intent to collate such input and report back to SRAC at its February 18, 2000 meeting, if not before. The suggestion was made to consider amendment proposals through subcommittees of SRAC who would then report back to the entire committee for a fuller discussion and decision based on recommendations of the subcommittee. This suggestion warrants further discussion.
Adjournment

The meeting formally closed at 1:35 PM, with a reminder that the next SRAC meeting will be on Friday February 18, 2000 with the high probability of an extended meeting lasting to 2 pm on that day.

Minutes respectfully drafted and submitted by Grace Wu.