

## **Student Life Committee Minutes April 16, 2003**

Members present: K. Bartanen, H. Douglas, K. Ferguson, B. Gast, D. Hulbert, D. Kelley, K. Walls, C. Washburn

The meeting was called to order at 9:07. The minutes of April 2 were discussed, with approval deferred to the next meeting.

Given this was the penultimate meeting for the 2002-2003 academic year, the committee reviewed its charges in order to plan how best to bring closure to old business, prepare for the end-of-year report to the Senate, and forecast charges for 2003-2004.

There was no work forthcoming from ASUPS this year on the Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. The Conspiracy of Hope project proceeded to successful completion without committee involvement. The committee met in the fall with Associate Director for Student Services Monica Nixon to discuss neighbor relations. The process for faculty recommendations for student leadership positions was streamlined along with other campus recommendation processes in the fall term, so the committee did not perceive that action needed to be taken on that charge. The bulk of the committee's effort has been directed toward the topic of students' relationships with Security Services and that work will be summarized at the next meeting, with revised minutes of April 2<sup>nd</sup> serving as a useful summary document.

The committee, thus, turned its attention to its sixth charge: Explore ways of encouraging campus conversations aimed at promoting greater responsibility, accountability, and civility on campus. Douglas noted that the type of community sought makes a difference in expectations of civility one might hold for students. Intellectual communities practice a higher standard of interaction than civic communities. In civic communities, impugning character, *ad hominem* attacks, and other tactics are acceptable, whereas in intellectual communities they are not acceptable (even if they do sometimes occur). Bartanen suggested that in an academic community where one might hold higher standards for intellectual interaction, it might also be reasonable to hold higher standards for behavior and interpersonal interaction among peers, colleagues and neighbors.

Washburn noted that Prelude introduces new students to protocols of academic conversation and that focus groups on educational goals had been held with some senior students. The Prelude Committee discussed specific goals for incoming students and Prelude faculty, discerning that the critical objective is to orient students to the new relationship they have with college faculty and how that relationship differs from relationships they have had with high school teachers. College students need to learn that they have more responsibility for their education and have accountability to peers and faculty.

Committee members wondered whether there are other moments in the undergraduate experience where issues of what it means to live in an academic community might be addressed. Ferguson suggested that, in part, just bringing the rhetoric of "intellectual community" more visibly into campus discourse (a motto, letterhead, etc.) might raise consciousness about expectations. Gast asked how the University mission statement might be a more conscious part of syllabi or course content.

Ferguson suggested that an alumni "hall of fame" might highlight models of intellectual and civic accomplishment for current students, adding that distinguished alumni might be invited back to campus for talks and discussions. Bartanen reminded the committee of the current issue of *Arches* that profiles five alumni who have accomplished significant social change, but wondered if those *Arches* profiles have been read by many students.

Student advisory committees, such as one that might serve to foster better understanding of and relationship with Security Services, were suggested as another possible strategy for fostering conversation about expectations and recommendations. In response to questions about how such groups might be created, Bartanen observed that some might be formed at the request of particular departments or programs (e.g., Counseling, Health and Wellness Services' decision to form an advisory group) and that some could form in response to a particular need (e.g., the Campus Harassment Policy Work Group). Hulbert offered another example of a recent helpful discussion about student stress among colleagues from CHWS and the School of Music.

After some discussion of student stress and questions of balance, the committee adjourned at 9:57.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kris Bartanen