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Approved Minutes
Student Life Committee Meeting
10/27/09 12:30-1:45 Olin Library Bib Lab

Present: Ashley Kistler, Patricia Tomé, Derek Paladino, Denise Cummings, William Boles, Micki Meyer, Amanda Moreno, Christina Figueroa, Drew Doty, Mahjabeen Raffiudin,

Guests: Diane Willingham, Karen Hater, Brent Turner

I. Boles called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m.

II. The committee approved the minutes.

III. Announcements:
A. SGA update: Helping Hands across America is taking place in November.
B. Swine flu and attendance policy: Students ask for extended deadlines and due dates (Figueroa and Moreno), allowing students time to make up missed work. SGA has drafted a resolution
   1. Faculty respond that they have not developed an across the board policy, but will extend deadlines on a case by case basis.
   2. Boles asks what happened to the SGA resolution, where does it go? When will it get to the faculty? Wallrapp will email it to the Provost, who presents it to faculty. Boles reports that the faculty discussed this at the most recent faculty meeting, but not due dates, just the attendance policy.
   3. Tome brings up the difference between attendance and deadlines and missed work. She feels that students need to keep up with work if out with swine flu, that there is a very clear difference between the attendance policy and work deadlines.
   4. Meyer responds that getting back to the resolutions, something powerful would be having a January meeting with SGA and EC to clarify what student roles are on committees and in SGA. This would help to clarify processes, etc. and governance: SLC should facilitate this. We should train students to have a voice, not just be reporters. This committee could be a good model for other committees if we figure out how to all work together.
C. Boles reports that at Thursday’s faculty meeting, the faculty approved two things: first, they promoted Dean of Student Affairs to permanent status and created a committee to look at structure and reporting system of how the Dean of Student
Affairs office works, i.e. to whom she should report—Dean of Faculty or Provost? Should there be an Academic Vice President that this person should report to…What is the SLC’s feeling on this? Who should be on the committee? What should the committee look at? Any nominations to the committee?

1. Meyer replies that there needs to be more than one Student Affairs person on the committee, since everyone comes from different perspective and needs an opportunity to represent his or her perspectives. Also, it would be good to have different faculty from different ranks and different disciplines, and we need the same thing from Student Affairs division.

2. Figueroa asks if the people on the committee will be picked, not voted on?

3. Boles replies that we don’t know yet, we haven’t addressed this issue yet. How will we define the committee? Probably they will be appointed by EC, but approved by the faculty.

4. Meyer states that there should be a lot of people involved in the process of appointing people.

5. Boles replies that Creston Davis, Scott Hewitt, Jennifer Cavenaugh, and a student were supposed to be on the committee to select the Dean of Student Affairs. He thinks that someone that raised this whole issue of structure should be on the committee…O’Sullivan or someone else. They have institutional memory about this issue.

6. Paladino states that there should be another student affairs person on the committee. It is their field, so they should be represented. Also, the committee should include more faculty that have done stuff in Student Affairs.

7. Cummings asks if the committee has to be 3 faculty and 1 student affairs person? Or could it be 2 or 2?

8. Boles states that members of EC think that this debate is a faculty driven issue, so it should be lead by faculty.

9. Hater agrees with Meyer, at least someone from Student Affairs and someone who knows Student Affairs across the board, not just at Rollins, but in general.

10. Meyer replies that Brent Turner should be on the committee, since he has a lot of experience in Student Affairs and went to aspirant schools. We need someone with history and someone new with a different perspective.

11. Cummings asks how willing people that brought up these issues would be to be on committee.

12. Boles states that this is not an issue, they have an obligation to do so, since they brought it up.

13. Raffiudin states that we need to come up with a vision for moving forwards, not just look back. We used to do this, why is it that we don’t now? There is nothing wrong with looking back, as long as we have a vision to move
forward, and not relive history again. We need to be informed by the current culture of our students.

14. Hater asks if we are planning to restructure the relationship between Student Affairs and Arts and Sciences, or if we are looking at how the structure functions with the whole campus.

15. Boles replies that we are examining the relationship of DOSA to campus, rather than to A and S specifically.

16. Hater states that it seems that we should really look at how all the schools are related to office, if we are taking the time to do it. Why are we just focusing on a small piece of the puzzle?

17. Meyer states that the other reason why we need two people is because we don’t have a lot of relationships across boundaries. This is an opportunity for faculty and staff to work collaboratively.

18. Boles asks if we should vote on this? We propose that two student affairs staff serve on the appointed committee.

19. The committee votes unanimously to approve the recommendation.

IV. Old Business

A. Social Honor Code: the subcommittee, which has two faculty, two staff, two students: Allison and Alex, Brent and Diane, Creston and Bill, met four or five times to discuss this topic. They have done research and discussed merits of different verbs.

1. Meyer recommends that we call the code the philosophy of honor, rather than honor system…word sounds dated.

2. Boles replies that these terms are what the faculty approved already, so if we want to change it, then we have to re-present it. The committee met last week with members of the Academic Honor Council, and meeting went well, but members said that whatever was approved by the faculty should not be touched by faculty again…cannot be changed. Language change rather than philosophy change would need to be voted on, don’t want faculty to vote on original issues again…we are not opening doors for change.

3. Several faculty members debated over language of the revised honor code, in particular, the verb “striving” and its implications.

4. Tomé asks how many times students see the pledge…do they see it more than once throughout their careers?

5. Boles asks how many people even read it? Or sign it? Students never see it again after convocation.

6. Hater replies that this is one of the reasons why we put up the Academic Honor Code in every classroom, so that students face it all the time…going to
be an interesting decision about what to do with the social honor code. How are we going to remind students that it is there?

7. Figueroa states that the social honor code is not going to do anything, because there is no punishment if violated.

8. Boles asks what are our values? We are trying to sidestep this in the honor code, since it’s a conversation that the entire community has to discuss. Not our responsibility to define this.

9. A discussion ensures about the use of the word, “fairness”? Boles replies that this term was accepted by the Rollins community, but it is unclear on its exact meaning and the rationale behind it. Rafiuddin replies that it implies equity for all, not for some, used as the value in all movements, very timely for Rollins to use this term, given that we have students that come from very privileged backgrounds, we need to define this term, knowing what is equity…the world is not a level playing field.

10. Meyer asks if there a word that is even stronger than fairness?

11. Majabeen replies that it means equity, justice, equality.

12. Boles asks committee members to play around with language, think about it, work on it and send it back, the language in honor code. Any thing missing from pledge that they should add?

13. Rafiuddin asks if there a way to talk about voice? Voices are not amplified? Students don’t feel that their voices are heard?

V. New Business

A. Boles asks would SLC would like to make a holiday for High (Jewish) Holy Days, using the days we get off for Fall Break…would we like to pursue this as a committee, or is it a non-issue….?

1. Figueroa thinks it’s a good idea, but maybe SGA should propose it.

2. Boles: this body could craft it and then be presented to SGA and to faculty.

3. Cummings: Why are the two issues being talked about together--recognizing Jewish holidays and taking away Fall Break?

4. Boles replies that it has to do with necessary calendar days…we could do it without messing up the calendar in December. We would need to take those days to make up for it.

5. Drew asks if it would it be completely out of the question just to work with faculty so that students who are Jewish are excused from class? Rather than eliminating Fall Break?

6. Meyer and Cummings show that there is a psychological reason behind Fall Break, students need it.

7. Drew states that he can see how it would be easier to just change fall break, but it would be better to work with students to excuse students for those days,
without counting against allotted days. They recognize the day, it would
cover everyone.

8. Rafiuddin states that when OMA drafted a calendar of all religious holidays.
   It was sent out college wide to faculty and staff, stating when it is ok to miss a
class or not, spiritual education, all religious holidays would have to be
acknowledged.

9. Figueroa states that this would hold faculty accountable too. We would like to
   push more for faculty recognizing more, than messing with the calendar.

B. Boles: announces that the meeting with Eisenbarth and Bitakofer to talk about the
   outdoor classroom has been moved to Dec. 1.

VI. Meeting was adjourned 1:50 p.m.