

Rollins College

## Rollins Scholarship Online

---

Student Life Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

---

11-10-2020

### **Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Student Life Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 10, 2020**

Student Life Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_sl](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_sl)

---

## **SLC Meeting November 10, 2020**

- I. Call to Order
- II. In attendance
  - a. Jana Mathews (Chair, faculty)
  - b. Sarah Parsloe (Secretary, Faculty)
  - c. Raghendra KC (SHIP subcommittee chair, Faculty)
  - d. Nancy Niles
  - e. Jonathan Harwell
  - f. Wisly Zephir (Student Rep)
  - g. Giselle Rios (Crummer Student Rep)
  - h. Danielle Elliott (Guest from SGA)
  - i. Marwa Abdellatif (Guest from SGA)
  - j. Katelynn Mcaraw (Guest from SGA)
- III. Absent
  - a. Karla Knight (staff)
- IV. **Approval of Minutes**
  - a. Nancy moves
  - b. KC Seconds
- V. **Proposing Items of SLC Slate**
  - a. Tuition rate freeze (Daniel Elliott from SGA presents)
    - i. General idea—Student would be charged the average of the tuition rates that they would have been charged each year over the course of 4 years. This way, they are charged the same rate every year
    - ii. Has been presented to Ed Kania; admin will be hiring an outside consultant to assess the proposal and provide a report before the February Board of Trustees meeting
    - iii. Daniel requests help generating conversation around this proposed policy change with faculty (potentially leading faculty forums, talking about in divisional meetings, discussing with EC/at faculty meetings)
    - iv. KC asks about how the student body would respond if this policy put Rollins at a competitive disadvantage in recruiting new students; suggests that this is the likely response from the College. Also suggests that this policy actually puts students at a disadvantage in terms of “time value of money”
      1. Daniel counters by suggesting that the value added is framing Rollins as more “honest,” giving students the ability to predict and plan for their budgeting
        - a. KC: Transparency and Consistency are the core values that you should emphasize in your argument
        - b. Jana asks about peer and aspirant institutions—we are not the first, there are 17 states that have/are proposing freezing tuition from when you enter. However, these are public institutions.

- c. There are fewer examples of private schools—Daniel will find list and email this to Jana
  - b. International Student Spaces on Campus (presentation by Katelynn Mcaraw, SGA)
    - i. She is currently conducting a survey to gauge interest. Early interest suggests a desire for a lounge space
  - c. Recycling on Campus
    - i. Decision was made unilaterally by Facilities to halt the recycling program at Rollins
    - ii. Reasons recycling was discontinued
      - 1. Students were not using the bins correctly—contamination
      - 2. Rate hike by service provider
    - iii. Support involves sending a rep to serve on a committee with ENV, SGA, Ecology Club to put muscle behind the effort to reinstate a recycling program
  - d. Dean and Alford Scholars
    - i. Proposal: expand the definition of who would be considered to promote diversity and inclusion
  - e. Forging links between Holt and Crummer (presentation by Giselle)
    - i. Articulates gap between CLA and Holt
  - f. Social Isolation
    - i. Student Affairs has formed a Fun Committee to brainstorm ways to get individuals together
    - ii. Students are often feeling isolated and “in prison” (according to Wisly); experiencing screen burnout
- VI. Deciding on a Slate
  - a. Tuition Freeze
    - i. KC is willing to help Daniel craft a statement; wait for the results of the study to come out in February
  - b. Recycling
    - i. Nancy will serve as an SLC rep
  - c. International student lounge
    - i. Jana will serve to support this
  - d. Fun Committee and thinking about connections between CLA and Holt
    - i. Jana suggests that Giselle serve on this committee; she will also serve
  - e. Revising the membership of the SLC
- VII. Things we will **not** take on
  - a. Romantic Relationships Policy—not a high priority
  - b. Dean and Alford Scholarships
    - i. KC suggests that this will be a difficult subject to tackle because of the way that this scholarship is currently being used to “attract talent”
- VIII. SHIP Grant Assessments
  - a. Both projects were research projects linked to a graduate program, fall into the category of additional HIP
  - b. Challenges:
    - i. We don’t want to set a precedent of funding individual research projects

- ii. What happens to the equipment? Students have suggested that they would keep the equipment
      - iii. Is there a “give back” to the Rollins community?
      - iv. KC describes alternative, much cheaper options that could meet the same needs
    - c. Question: Is there already a precedent?
      - i. No—we have historically funded experiences, not equipment requests
      - ii. Jana notes that historically the SLC has pushed back on funding a set of students experiencing similar things in one department
    - d. DECISION: Not Funded
  - IX. Ideas to Revise SHIP
    - a. Adjust criteria to be more specific—what won’t we fund (like individual research projects)
    - b. Jana suggests that we could adjust criteria to focus more on the “give-back”
  - X. Action Items
    - a. KC will revise to add language to the SHIP criteria to emphasize “give back,” will review this at next meeting on November 24<sup>th</sup> at 4:30pm