

Student Life Committee Minutes October 21, 2009

Attending: Bruce Mann, Aislinn Melchior, Mike Segawa, Lisa Ferrari, Geoff Proehl, Jan Leuchtenberger

The Committee was convened at 2 pm

- I. The Committee approved the minutes of the last meeting, and decided that in the future the secretary should send a draft of the minutes for approval by email before sending them to be posted on Facultycoms.
- II. The Committee heard from Mike Segawa that at the moment there were 10 students suspected of having H1N1, but that 500 shots were received the previous Friday and were being made available to students by appointment. Members were also reminded of the Health Fair scheduled for November 13, at which seasonal flu shots (but not H1N1) would be available.
- III. Mike Segawa reported that he had no new issues to bring to the Committee.
- IV. The Committee then returned to its discussion of International Education:
 - a. On the question of who should take over running the survey of returning students and other issues originally worked on in earlier SLC:
 - i. The Chair spoke with the former chair, Nick Kontogeorgopolous, and he was not sure who should take over. It was his understanding that the SLC was finished with the issue when his term was over and that the International Education Committee would take over the project. The SLC could get involved only if a student life issue arose.
 - ii. Mike Segawa also reminded the Committee that the Faculty Senate was still undecided about where to send the charges on the issue.
 - iii. Perhaps the Senate, IEC and SLC chairs should meet with Nick to discuss it.
 - iv. Lisa Ferrari noted that the topic had come up in the previous meeting of the IEC but that committee also was unsure about whose issue it was. She said she would put the chairs of IEC in contact with Bruce.
 - b. The Committee agreed that the surveys should probably be run by the IEC but that the SLC might deal with how to integrate the experience of returning students into the classroom. Aislinn said she had already mentioned the topic to the Wednesday at Four group.
- V. Mike Segawa also announced that he had asked ASUPS to assign a member of the Student Concerns Committee to this Committee, but had not heard back from them yet.

- VI. The Committee then returned to discussion of Residential Seminars.
- a. The Chair asked Mike Segawa if there were anything else he needed from the Committee on this topic.
 - i. Earlier, Mike sought our feedback for a possible request for funding to the Budget Task Force, but that request was not made and instead funds were re-allocated from another part of Student Affairs.
 - ii. Re-allocated money, combined with commitment from administration to support writing advisors, will cover 10-12 residential seminars for Fall 2010
 - iii. Costs involved in residential seminars include:
 1. 3-4 writing advisors
 2. \$1000 for each seminar (total \$10,000-12,000)
 3. Assessment activities
 - iv. So, comments have been helpful, but no more feedback needed from Committee
 - b. A member asked how faculty for residential seminars were chosen
 - i. Lisa Ferrari explained that once the schedule of first-year seminars is set, she and Debbie Chee go through the list and choose those they believe are best suited to the residential format and those that represent a good mix for the incoming class. Then faculty members are asked if they would like their seminar to be residential. This ensures that seminars cross disciplines and aren't all in the Humanities.
 - ii. A member observed that in department discussions of course offerings the option of a residential seminar is seldom discussed.
 - iii. This may be because during the pilot program, the residential seminars were not widely publicized.
 - iv. Information about them may be added to Admissions info. in the future and might help students make the choice more knowledgeably.
 - c. The Chair asked Mike if there were anything in the assessment of the residential seminars that the SLC should address. Mike explained that:
 - i. Assessment results that Debbie and Mike have show:
 1. Students report little effect on classroom performance.
 2. In residential component, however, they report doing more academic work with people on their floor and having more academic conversations.
 3. Students and faculty say that classroom interaction gets off to a faster start – seen by both groups as a positive.
 4. Documents pertaining to this assessment are available.
 - ii. The library also assessed information literacy in the residential and regular seminars to learn how to teach academic integrity.

1. A tutorial on academic integrity is now being tested in the library.
 2. The concern is that the information doesn't stick unless it is embedded in an assignment.
 3. But there is some indication that the issue stops being a problem once students declare a major.
- iii. A member suggested adding resources so that information literacy training could be embedded in the residential seminars.
 - iv. Res. Seminars could become test sites for other pedagogical initiatives.
- d. Mike Segawa thanked the Committee for all of its input on the Residential Seminars.
- VII. The Chair proposed that the Committee move on to work on the Retention Task Force at the next and subsequent meetings, and asked if someone could report to the Committee on the findings. Mike Segawa offered to repeat the presentation he gave to the Board. Because he would not be available for the next scheduled meeting of the SLC on Nov. 4, the Chair suggested the Committee cancel that date and next meet on Nov. 18.

The meeting was adjourned at 3 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jan Leuchtenberger