

10-1-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_sl



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 1, 2013" (2013). *Student Life Committee Minutes*. Paper 4.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_sl/4

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Life Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

SLC Meeting
12:30 p.m., Bib Lab
10/1/2013

Attendees

Members: Yusheng Yao, Brooke Pankau, Alex Grimm, Rachel Newcomb, Adriana Talbot, Alice Davidson, Heidi Limongi, Scott Rubarth, Gabe Anderson, Zeynep Teymurolu

Guests: Raquel Ells, Penelope Strater

I. Minutes from 9.24.13 meeting approved

II. Ship Discussion

- **Who will monitor post-SHIP grant progress/reports?**
 - Should we ask Penelope to do it?
 - What do we want the post-grant monitoring to include?
 - Can retract \$\$ (charge to student account)
 - Can deny funding for future grant
 - Ask supervisor/faculty sponsor to review the post-grant report (Zeynep)
 - Maybe we can have sponsor evaluate it using LEAP learning outcomes (Ed)?
 - Don't think it's going to go anywhere (Rachel), but we need to be accountable for what our students are doing
 - If/when student applies and submits application, we develop a sub-team that confirms w/ faculty that they review it? (Heidi); but faculty have to sign the initial form (Rachel); but there should also be a blurb where faculty says they agree to review post-grant report (Zeynep): "faculty advisors must also sign off on post-grant progress reports"
 - Think sub-committee should approve the applications and also the evaluation of the post-grant progress reports; if we're going to go after funding for this it makes sense to be strategic, so that we have something we can show we've evaluated (Gabe)
 - *Responsibilities of sub-committee:*
 - Members:
 - Make up is 2 faculty, 2 students, and 1 staff member
 - Students will rotate from fall to spring
 - Faculty will probably be the same
 - Subcommittee members: Rachel Newcomb, Alice Davidson, Brooke Pankau, Ed Leffler, Gabe Anderson
 - Revising form (clarifying that "faculty advisors must also sign off on post-grant progress reports"; No more funding of an entire class project – add to revised application)
 - Reviewing applications and approval/denial

- Yusheng will create a Blackboard site and all applications will be posted there for people to review
 - Fall Application due dates Oct. 22 and November 12
 - Spring application due dates Feb. 11 and April 8
 - Reviewing post-grant progress reports
 - Due date of progress report: 2 weeks after event happens
 - Communicating anything that needs to be done with faculty
 - And then make recommendations to larger committee
 - So, if faculty sponsor does not want blog posts made public, the sub-committee will still be able to review it and make sure the work happened. And faculty sponsor will need to give rationale why
- **Additional \$\$ needed**
 - Maybe contact people with Rollins alumni magazine and have them do an article on it, to PR, Institutional Advancement to market it, so people know it exists; sub-committee can help identify exceptional grants that might be spotlighted
 - \$\$ coming from VPSA, Dean of A&S, and International Programs – not from CPS right now; probably not in our purview to deem CPS applicants ineligible for grants
- **We need to address rumors going around last year that the awarding of grants was somehow connected to who people knew on the committee (Yusheng)**
 - Is application process blinded? NO
 - Maybe we could consider possibility of removing names from applications (Ed)
 - We need to try to review grants as objectively as possible
 - Review by R-card #
 - Possibility of bias against/for an applicant
 - People on sub-committee should recuse themselves from reviewing applications if they know the person (Alice)
 - Worry about people disclosing info that's too personal/sensitive (Gabe) – but it is helpful to have context to make decision
 - Have Penelope email applications to everyone – but sub-committee will review and make yay/nay decisions and then bring decisions to whole group
 - No one on sub-committee should be an advocate for an applicant
 - Has to bring recommendations to larger committee for final approval
 - Only controversial cases will be brought to larger committee to discuss
- **Blogs – who is reading them?**
 - Maybe we can have one internal blog site and one that is for more external readers that is part of the monitoring process; does PR want to be involved in this process? (Scott)

- “Get the blogs we like, meet with PR, and make it sexy” (Ed)
- In award approval email, we’ll have a step-by-step process for what will happen
- Put check box on application up front about whether students are ok with their blogs being posted

III. Agenda for the Year

- Scott: Are we going to talk about what our agenda goals are for the year?
Yusheng: yes, next meeting
- Brook is going to make announcement at the beginning of each meeting about what SGA is concerned about/what they’ve been addressing
- Bike rack outside of Bush Science building.
 - Brook – students want it
 - Zeynep – it’s happening

NEW BUSINESS

IV. Non-smoking policy

- Brook: we implemented a policy, but it’s not very effective right now. There’s no consequence for anyone who does smoke in non-smoking areas.
- You should involve Maria Martinez (HR). She can give you some of the rationale behind policy (Heidi)
- Raquel – I spoke with Maria last year who said it’s campus safety’s job and Ken said it’s not their job.
- We get VPSA on this (Ed)
- It’s an everybody on this (Heidi)
- Maybe we should go smoke free (Heidi)
- Pilot program is not really working, so maybe we need to go smoke free (Brooke)
- Should we invite Maria Martinez to come to SLC meeting? (Rachel)
- Useful to have Sandspur article about this? Let people know this is being considered (Scott)
- I think people don’t know about the policy. I see people smoking everywhere. Put up flyers so people know about it (Adriana).
- We will wait on bringing Maria Martinez to SLC
- Admissions should be aware of this also (Ed)
- We will:
 - Encourage a Sandspur article to be written about this
 - Remind Maria Martinez to email everyone reminding them and then re-visit this in 3 months (Rachel)

Meeting adjourned = 1:45 p.m.