Minutes of October 27, 2000

Members in Attendance:


Meeting opened by R. Simpson.

Presentation and dialogue with representatives of Commission on Undergraduate Experience.

Presentation by Commission looking at UG Experience Forums are being held in interest of future of undergraduate experience at U of M.

Deboroah (guest): Michigan is a large school with diverse opportunities Can UG students take advantage of that? What doesn't materialize about student experience at the University.

Taryn O'Leary and Richard Mayk: explanation of reasons for choosing U of M.

R. Mayk: Many opportunities seem to be too similar. College of William and Mary offers a Model UN, Miami of Ohio offers a leadership dorm.

M. Gold: What is the role of the advisory committee in relation to the commission?

R. Harper: Commission is divided into 3 subgroups. These groups are functional groups in the division of student affairs, provide thoughts to the Committee on UG experience.

Commission guest: Plans on making several proposals and submitting them to the President by December. Searching for better ways to recruit students. Commission tries to find out how students connect. One subcommittee is International and Global Communities. It seems some students feel Michigan is constructed like a corporate environment. Another subcommittee is the Connecting Campus Committee. What are relationships between undergraduates and faculty? What barriers are felt by students?

M. Gold: Suggests the formation of focus groups for the commission. Focus groups should include both student and faculty involvement.
R. Simpson: The commission is undertaking an enormous scope of interest. Michigan turns out an excellent product.

R. Mayk: Agrees with R. Simpson on the broad scope of interest, and believes commission should look into why students do not come to Michigan.

Commission poses the question to students: What would you envision for the Michigan UG experience in the future.

M. Gold: Poses question as a faculty member: What kind of faculty aspirations are held for the UG experience?

Student Representative from the Commission: Michigan lacks the passionate flow of ideas. The most serious problem is the perception of the students vs the perception of the faculty. Expresses the belief that there is a general sense of complacency among faculty.

R. Simpson: The importance of faculty and student interactions can be seen in the UROP programs.

D. Heller: It is important to bridge the large university setting and intimate faculty/student relations. Likewise, it is important to allow students faculty attention inside and outside the classroom. How do we create a community outside of athletics or Greek life? Is the style of the university functional?

R. Mayk: Suggests the requirement of students meeting with Faculty Advisors or the creation of a social or community advisor.

R. Simpson: The professional aspirations of students drive their academic interests. It is important not to turn the university into a job training program.

D. Heller: The academic structure should be that students do not have to take all lectures their freshman year. Faculty contact is important and there must be a balance of student choice and administrative decision.

Commission suggests a Sophomore Gateway Experience similar to the one that exists at Stanford University.

R. Mayk: Although it is valuable to have a small setting, it is almost unreasonable to get every student involved in a close knit experience.

D. Heller: Asks if there will be focus groups when concrete proposals are made.

Commissions says that there will be. Commission visitors leave meeting and SRAC members remain to continue agenda.
R. Harper: What role will this committee have when the commission submits its proposals to the President? Reports on new developments:

Preliminary discussion about a new residence hall. Where is the committee with respect to living/learning?

Binge drinking task force development

Focus on deaf and hard of hearing students

The Commission wishes to show SRAC where it stands at a later date.

M. Gold: Does not feel that SRAC should serve as a focus group for the Commission.

R. Simpson: Would like to know how UG Commission has progressed since last March?

M. Gold: Feels the committee should return when they have concrete proposals for further dialogue with SRAC.

At the suggestion of Royster, SRAC agrees the reports from the subgroups of the UG Commission would be helpful. SRAC also decides it would not like the minutes from the UG Commission meetings.

M. Gold: Feels another function the Commission can serve as part of their research agenda is the gathering of literature (ie. On alcohol programs).

Relays that he does not feel that MSA is in very good repair.

R. Mayk: What value does MSA have?

R. Harper: States that the current leadership in MSA is inexperienced.

F. Cianciola: Attempts to stay away from controlling MSA functions. The representative body must be respected as just that.

R. Simpson: Suggests having the members of the executive MSA body come to the SRAC meetings.

R. Harper: Notes that the MSA executives should come to meeting not in addition to and not in replacement of current MSA representatives to SRAC. Asks that F. Cianciola extends an invitation to these individuals.

Agreement reached that MSA executives should be invited to next SRAC meeting

Meeting called to closure by R. Simpson.