STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE
MONDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1993
MINUTES

PRESENT: Roman Hryciw (Chair), Mark DeCamp, George Estabrook, Ted Hopf, Barbara MacAdam, Jane Wilson Coon, Milan Marich, Gerhard Olving, Louise Stein, Maureen Hartford, Royster Harper, David Karow, Erin Klug, Torrey Smith, Craig Greenberg.

ABSENT: Robert Beyer

The meeting was called to order by Chair Roman Hryciw at approximately 4:30 p.m.

I. The minutes from the November 1, 1993 SRC meeting were approved.

II. The Chair distributed a schedule grid sheet for the 1993 winter term and asked all members to complete and return it to 2366 GG Brown (2125) by January 10.

III. The Committee considered Mary Lou Antieau’s request for the SRC to nominate five new faculty members to be trained as Hearing Chairs for cases under the Statement of Student’s Rights and Responsibilities.
   1. There was a motion, and a consensus, not to forward any names at this time due to the number of currently trained faculty who have not yet heard a case.
   2. George Estabrook suggested that those faculty who are currently on the list of potentials be invited to attend the next training session if they wish.

IV. Louise Stein reported to members that SACUA is now constructing the panel of nominees for the committee that will review the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The purposes of this review are to extract information for the faculty and to make suggestions and recommendations.
   1. Maureen Hartford asked that students be considered for the Review Panel.
   2. Ted Hopf suggested that someone outside the University, who conducts reviews professionally, might be better qualified to evaluate the Office.
   3. It was stated that the Chair should be considered for the Panel and that three other SRC members already are.
   4. It was stated that SACUA should consider a person’s area of expertise when determining the Panel’s final composition.
   5. Committee members were asked to please forward the names of anyone who would be willing to work on the Review Panel to Louise Stein as soon as possible.

V. There was a follow-up discussion of the presentation on the Mentorship Program at the November meeting and members were asked for their opinions on the Program.
   1. Comparison of the mentorship and the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Programs (UROP):
      a. Mentorship hasn’t built as many natural connections as UROP has.
      b. There are benefits to doing meticulous work/research (as in UROP) for both the faculty member and the student.
         i. Someone to talk to for advice
         ii. Provides a sort of assistant
4. The two biggest changes are as follows:
   a. Encourage student organizations to develop their own alcohol policies.
   b. Will begin to emphasize Awareness education and Abuse prevention
      i. Food availability as a means of alcohol consumption
      ii. Perceptions of how much they consume
      iii. Perceptions of how much others consume

5. Members were asked to read and carefully review this draft of the policy. Any comments or recommendations should be forwarded to either Maureen Hartford or Royster Harper.

VIII. New Business:
1. Should the SRC make a recommendation(s) or statement on any aspect of the Mentorship Program?
2. The final results of the First Year Experience Task Force

IX. Members were reminded to complete their schedule grid sheets and return them to the Chair prior to January 10.