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1. Call to Order
   a. In attendance
      i. Nathan Arrowsmith (staff)
      ii. Jen Atwell (staff)
      iii. Gay Biery-Hamilton (faculty)
      iv. Alexa Gordon (staff)
      v. Destinee Lott (staff)
      vi. Ellane Park (faculty)
      vii. Hannah Ewing (faculty), SHIP Co-Chair
      viii. Matt Nichter (faculty)
      ix. Jim Norris (faculty)
      x. Lexi Tomkunas (SGA)
      xi. Theo Schutz (SGA)
   1. Absent:
      a. Mae Fitchett (staff)

2. Approval of Minutes
   a. Approved: Lexi Tomkunas

3. Food Committee Update: Alexa Gordon
   a. Einstein’s Bagels and Rollins Bookstore
      i. Dianne’s is closing after the Fall semester.

4. Winter Park Parade on December 3.
   a. Invitation is open to participate on behalf of Rollins College.

5. Value of Residential Liberal Arts Experience
   a. Timeframe for transition from a 2 year to a 4 year living campus.
   b. Is this a priority? Shouldn’t the need for more classroom space be more important
      than the residential life experience?
   c. What is the comparison between the lifestyle (and amenities) of living on campus
      vs. off campus. Is the value of the two comparable?
   d. This goal (of 80% living capacity) be achievable with financial backing?
      i. This needs to be incentivized to students.
      ii. Increase the amounts of things that you can do within your living facility.
         1. Gym renovation (in fitness equipment) with new machinery and new
            carpeting in space.

6. SHIP Report: Hannah Ewing
   a. We received 10 new applications by the deadline—which brings us up to 14 total so far
      this year. This is exactly the number of applications we had received as of this deadline
      last year. (We are likely about halfway through the total number of applications for the
      year, based on last year’s total numbers and anecdotal evidence I have heard from faculty
      asking about the grant.) Of the new applications 9 were for the same program, and 1 was
      for a traditional conference presentation. Three reviewers reviewed each application.
   b. We have $50,122 in our account (after only awarding $600 in the last round of 4). Even if
      we decide to fully fund all applications this round, we would still have $44,167 in our
account. Therefore we are doing well re: finances; our award considerations should be more about the nature and the health of the SHIP program than finances.

i. Prioritize where the funding goes. It’s up to our discretion in what we can afford to give. Should we give clear categories for students who are presenting at conferences. Or students who are presenting at the summit. We will prioritize for the applications that are associated with our mission statement.

ii. Create another category of funding.
   1. $750 presenting a paper at a conference
   2. $500 if you’re attending a conference
      a. If you’re not presenting at a conference, you must present on-campus.
   
   c. The one traditional conference application (K) was a straightforward consensus: full funding for a conference presentation. The committee decided to award $195 to this student.
   
   d. There was no consensus on the remaining 9 applications (E-J and L-N). Since these are virtually the identical, and struggle with the same eligibility issue, we need to discuss how to treat them as a whole. All were complete; there are no real distinctions between them.
   
   e. Rejected applicants can use SSF as a secondary resource.

7. rFLA Q & A in February with Claire
   a. Then a larger resource event will be put together with Claire for the entire community.

8. Next Meeting: January 2017

9. Adjournment