1. Welcome and introductions

2. Review committee standing rules and responsibilities

The SRAC Standing Rules were reviewed, and an overview of the committee responsibilities were summarized. We discussed the awards given (Drucilla Shepard-Smith and Waldo-Cummings) along with the committee participation required for each. Emphasized the majority of work for committee members will be the review and selection of Waldo-Cummings recipients. Discussed the general criteria for Waldo-Cummings, as well as number of awards received and addition of monetary award beginning last year. A copy of the invitation to apply for Waldo-Cummings was provided to members so all could have a thorough overview of the information students receive. A question was posed about the need to provide a reference. No veteran members recall reaching out to references as part of the review/selection process. We will revisit this at the next meeting and discuss whether the committee feels this should still be a requirement.

3. Reviewed process for student members joining the SRAC.

We had two student members in attendance who served last year and have agreed to participate again this year. We had one additional student who was not in attendance today, who has also agreed to participate. Amy will follow up with the faculty senate contact to ensure student members are provided the appropriate ASOSU forms. With the three current members, we need to try and recruit an additional 5 student members. Ideally we would have a full group of 8 active student members. A call was put out to all in attendance to talk with other students and try to solicit interest in participating. It was asked that any students showing interest be directed to contact Amy Riley, who can assist with facilitating between faculty senate and ASOSU to get the proper paperwork submitted. The committee also discussed the need to review FERPA training status for all committee members, and to ensure all members are current in FERPA training prior to reviewing student application materials.

4. Timeline for events

The committee discussed a general timeline of events. We will plan to reconvene in late January or early February to determine subcommittees, review applicant scoring rubrics and essay questions, and finalize plans for inviting/reviewing/awarding students. We discussed that applicant review work in the subcommittees will likely take place in late April and early May, with students notified in early May and the university awards celebration taking place a few weeks later in late May. Amy will connect with University Events to determine date for the awards ceremony, and will create a more detailed timeline for committee tasks and deadlines. This will be shared no later than the next meeting during Winter Quarter.

5. SRAC Handbook

The group discussed the need for a SRAC handbook that can be used by future members. The goal would be to have a document that outlines the standing rules, goals, activities, etc. It was listed as a task for the group with a goal to have a working draft prepared prior to the winter term meeting,
so that committee members may review and make suggestions or edits. Ideally we would like to have a final document that has committee consensus by the end of the school year.

6. Co-chair

Discussed the need for a co-chair. Ideally the co-chair could assist with the development of a handbook, and could assist with the procedural steps required for the Waldo-Cummings selection process. The goal would be to partner with a co-chair who is slated to serve on the committee through at least the 2017-2018 school year. If anyone is interested, they are asked to connect with Amy.

7. Discussion of class standing

A discussion was had about class standing for student applicants being considered for the Waldo-Cummings award. Currently the students are assigned a class standing based on a credit breakdown used by the registrar’s office. What this has produced over time are students who are new to the university and have an extensive amount of AP or other early college program credits in their first year. Depending on the amount of earned credits, a student may be grouped in with Sophomore or potentially Junior students during the applicant review phase. This has led to students not being as competitive due to the lack of time they’ve had to participate in campus or community events, earn university honors and awards, etc. An idea to add a question to the Qualtrics survey was discussed, so students could self-identify their class standing with the preface that the group they select is the pool they would be evaluated with. If someone selected something egregious, (no credits, but chose junior) the committee or subcommittee chair could follow up for more information. This idea will be revisited during the next meeting so a decision can be made prior to sending invitations for students to apply.