SLAAC Meeting Minutes
9/26/2012
4:10 PM

Dining Services:
19 volunteers so far for dining services positions, 6 wish to serve on CSC. The Chair will continue to compile the list of nominations for these positions and will forward list to the full SLAAC committee for consideration.

FERPA document final editing:
General discussion about faculty and parents interaction and what the rationale was for distinctions that were made between general inquiries and specific inquiries. The intent is to clarify for faculty what they are permitted to say to parents because they were allowed to say more than they thought they were.

Committee followed up on google docs edits and edited the FERPA document as a group (student instead of child, "academic" relationship or not, other minor edits). Discussion of edits that were made.

The edited FERPA document will go in the faculty handbook and we will have to talk to the VPAA about where exactly it should go in the handbook or look back at previous SLAAC meeting minutes to find that information.

Academic Integrity Survey:
The committee examined Carol Steele's PowerPoint presentation on academic integrity and data. Questions were raised about the intent of the survey, how it will be used, and what expectations will be made of the person who collects the data. Identifying students by athletic or Greek organization might be unnecesary. Discussion of whether there is any value to identifying students by race as well. What about race also as a question, what's the value? Pedar Foss collects data every year on this.

Intent of survey:

Is there a problem with students' perception of the policy versus the actual policy? (Do they have a clear sense of the policy and its specific criteria?)

What is the actual extent of academic integrity violations?
(The survey might indicate that students think there is a low percentage of violations, but it might turn out that there are more than they think because of a possible gap between their perceptions and the reality of the academic integrity policy.)

To identify students by academic year or class to better target efforts to reduce academic integrity violations.

(Are most students who commit violations freshmen? Or are they upper class students? Answers may indicate that they don't have adequate awareness of the policy or that there is lax enforcement of the policy.)

One goal might be to collect demographic data to inform faculty about groups or types of students that are more likely to violate policy in order to correct faculty stereotypes and profiles.

Continued discussion on survey intent:
From the available information, the initial concern was that older students were committing repeated infractions, but the huge jump the committee was looking at was really only three students. Is that statistically significant?

Demographic information could be problematic. Extended discussion of the possibility of profiling students and concerns raised about it. How will the university use these results? The point was made that the real issue might be the need to offer comprehensive reform, instead of the ad hoc policy that currently exists. Some members of the committee noted that the information we had from other colleges was useful and didn't contain demographic information.

The Center for academic integrity has a survey on their website, can we use that? High cost to use and it wouldn't be tailored specifically to our institution, so it is not really an option.

Last year SLAAC had unanimous agreement that information about plagiarism needed to be reiterated all over campus life. The survey came about because of the seeming disconnect between perception and reality.

Discussion of the survey itself and what to strike. Decision to eliminate identifying information (race, gender, country of origin, Greek or athletic affiliations). Continue to identify students by academic year or class.

Committee will continue to edit the survey on GoogleDocs

Other business:
Brad Kelsheimer will come to the next meeting with Audra Blasdel to discuss Dining Services contract. Tim Good from the Athletic Board couldn't come today but will come to next meeting as well.

Issue from last meeting about the IM field being used by athletic department, but it is funded by student activity funds. Pressed for space and IM teams don't often get to use the field as Athletic department uses it much more. Cindy Babington volunteered to follow up with Stevie Baker-Watson on this issue.

Students concerned about wifi access and that the university hasn't located dead spots on campus. Carol Smith could come and update the committee but the basic

problem is that the wiring and equipment is out of date and between 10pm and 1am there is simply not enough bandwidth to meet current demand. Could talk to other student reps and see if they want more information on this.

Concern raised by students that there appears to be less outdoor seating and rocking chairs than before on campus.

Members Present: Caroline Smith, Smita Rahman, Kathryn Millis, Maryclare Flores, Walker Chance, Sara Scully, Lucy Gough, Dorian Shager, Carol Steele, Marie Pickerill , Cindy Babington (Secretary), David Alvarez (Chair)

1. Minutes from September 26, 2012 will be approved at October 24 meeting.

2. Tim Good, Chair of the Faculty Athletic Board, attended as a guest to discuss the reporting structure of the Athletic Board to SLAAC. Good reported that the Athletic Board has not been active until recently and are focusing their mission on articulating the student-athlete experience and creating a more effective communication network between Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR) and the faculty. The Board is currently engaged in re-writing its charge. The Chair of the Board will attend SLAAC once per semester to report in person about the activities of the Board.

3. Brad Kelsheimer, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Audra Blasdel, Director of Community Relations and Auxiliary Services, attended as guests to discuss the request for proposal (RFP) and decision process for contracting with a new dining services firm. DePauw has employed Sodexo for over ten years. It is not unusual to have long-term contracts with dining services firms, but it makes sense with the building of a new dining hall to examine our current dining services contract. Kelsheimer and Blasdel wanted to consult with SLAAC about the process and how to engage the entire campus community. Blasdel shared a chart (see attached) that compared us to the top 25 liberal arts colleges. We are an anomaly in the type of meal plan (declining balance) we have. Several of the top 25 institutions have self-operated dining services; Kelsheimer does not believe we should pursue this option as running a dining service is not central to our mission. RFP will ask for two things – a transitional solution until the new dining hall is built (the Hub will be closed for a period of time) and what a firm will offer financially towards a new dining hall.

   Kelsheimer and Blasdel provided a document that outlined the RFP process and timeline. The overview highlighted when SLAAC input would be needed (see attached).

   In committee discussion, SLAAC questioned whether they have the authority to participate in this process in lieu of the Dining Services Oversight Committee (DSOC). It was pointed out that the DSOC is actually not a faculty committee and deals primarily with the day-to-day issues of dining services. Nevertheless SLAAC felt it is important to involve the DSOC. Carol Steele suggested beginning with the DSOC's end of the year report. The report will be distributed to SLAAC members. We then considered that a special committee be created that would involve six students (Greek/independent, all four class years) and six other faculty/staff members Membership on the committee would primarily be drawn from those faculty, staff and students currently serving on SLAAC and DSOC. Kathryn Millis, Carol Steele, Dorian Shager and Smita Rahman volunteered to participate.

4. A professor had e-mailed David Alvarez a question regarding the University Policy with regard to conflicts between Greek Life and Academics. Participating in Greek life activities is not a sanctioned excuse for missing class. There is not an "official" policy stating this, but there is no policy allowing it as an excuse for missing class.

5. New business
    a. We may need to update our charge in the handbook to reflect which committees report to SLAAC. Chair will contact Chair of the Faculty to obtain information about which committees currently report to SLAAC.
    b. Chair will update the names on the SLAAC web page to reflect 2012-13 membership on URC, dining services committee and community standards.

Top 25 Liberal Arts Colleges

Rank	University/College	Enrollment	Location	Rural/Urban	Tuition & Fees	Room & Board	% R&B of Total Cost	Food Service Provider	Meal Plan Type	Meal Plan Count	Comments
1	Williams College	2,053	Williamstown, MA	Rural	$ 44,920	$ 11,850	20.9%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	5	
2	Amherst College	1,791	Amherst, PA	Rural	$ 44,610	$ 11,650	20.7%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	2	
3	Swarthmore College	1,545	Swarthmore, PA	Suburban	$ 43,080	$ 12,670	22.7%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	5	
4	Middlebury College	2,507	Middlebury, VT	Rural	$ 44,111	$ 11,839	21.2%	Self-Operated	Included	1	3 meals a day, part of tuition
5	Pomona College	1,586	Claremont, CA	Suburban	$ 41,438	$ 13,526	24.6%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	6 student, 4 F/S	
6	Bowdoin College	1,778	Brunswick, ME	Suburban	$ 44,118	$ 12,010	21.4%	Self-Operated	Hybrid	5 meal, 1 DB	
7	Wellesley College	2,502	Wellesley, MA	Suburban	$ 42,082	$ 13,032	23.6%	AVI	Meal Count	1	
8	Carleton College	2,018	Northfield, MN	Rural	$ 44,445	$ 11,553	20.6%	Bon Appetit	Meal Count	4	
9	Haverford College	1,198	Haverford, PA	Suburban	$ 43,702	$ 13,290	23.3%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	1	20 meals a week - preset (2 on Sunday)
10	Claremont McKenna College	1,301	Claremont, CA	Suburban	$ 44,085	$ 13,980	24.1%	Bon Appetit	Meal Count	4	
10	Vassar College	2,386	Poughkeepsie, NY	Suburban	$ 46,270	$ 10,800	18.9%	Aramark	Meal Count	5	
12	Davidson College	1,756	Davidson, NC	Suburban	$ 40,809	$ 11,346	21.8%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	8	
12	Harvey Mudd College	777	Claremont, CA	Suburban	$ 44,442	$ 14,471	24.6%	Sodexo	Meal Count	3	
14	United States Naval Academy	4,576	Annapolis, MD	Urban	$ -				N/A		
14	Washington and Lee University	1,790	Lexington, VA	Rural	$ 43,362	$ 11,006	20.2%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	6	
16	Hamilton College	1,864	Clinton, NY	Rural	$ 44,350	$ 11,270	20.3%	Bon Appetit	Meal Count	3	
17	Wesleyan University	2,882	Middletown, CT	Urban	$ 45,328	$ 13,434	22.9%	Bon Appetit	Hybrid	5 meal, 1 DB	
18	Colby College	1,815	Waterville, ME	Rural	$ 55,700	$ -	0.0%	Sodexo	Meal Count	2 student, 1 F/S	
18	Colgate University	2,947	Hamilton, NY	Rural	$ 44,640	$ 11,075	19.9%	Sodexo	Meal Count	5	
18	Smith College	2,627	Northampton, MA	Urban	$ 41,460	$ 13,860	25.1%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	1	Full board - 3 meals a day
18	United States Military Academy	4,624	West Point, NY	Suburban	$ -				N/A		
22	Bates College	1,769	Lewiston, ME	Urban	$ 44,300	$ 12,935	22.6%	Self-Operated	Included	1	Included in tuition (single fee philosophy)
22	Grinnell College	1,693	Grinnell, IA	Rural	$ 41,004	$ 9,614	19.0%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	7	
24	Macalester College	2,005	St. Paul, MN	Urban	$ 43,693	$ 9,726	18.2%	Bon Appetit	Hybrid	4 meal, 1 DB	
24	Scripps College	966	Claremont, CA	Suburban	$ 43,620	$ 13,468	23.6%	Self-Operated	Meal Count	2	
54	DePauw University	2,352	Greencastle, IN	Rural	$ 38,750	$ 10,200	20.8%	Sodexo	Declining Balance	3	

DePauw University
Dining Services RFP Process Overview & Timeline
October 2012

Goals:

- Create an environment conducive to an exceptional and continuously improving student dining experience, operational innovation and food service creativity.
- Ensure that DePauw has the best possible partner to assist in design, operational planning and capital investment in implementation of the new dining facility on campus and has the ability to effectively manage through a transitional period in campus dining services.
- Engage a long-term partner that respects and balances the targeted exceptional experience with the reality of both the students' and university's economic constraints.

Timeline:

Distribution of RFP	October 22, 2012
Question period	October 25 – November 12, midnight
Site visits	October 29 – November 9, 2012
Proposal due	Postmarked November 15, 5pm EST
Initial review of proposals	November 19 – 23, 2012
Invitation for presentation to top two/three proposers:	November 26, 2012
Presentations	December 6, 2012
Final Recommendation	December 7, 2012
Compilation of notes and analysis	December 2012
Executive Approval	January 2013
Board of Trustees Endorsement	February 2013

DePauw University Dining Services RFP Development and Input Process	
Finance & Administration Responsibilities	**SLAAC Participation**
RFP & Scoring Research - Companies - Schools - Rankings - Other RFPs - Campus Input	Research/Input for RFP & Scoring - Currently good - Current areas for improvement - Important values of provider - Important services of provider - Least important values and services
Writing & Distribution of RFP	
Reference Checks – 10 per proposal: 5 from active locations, 5 from lost accounts	Input on development of standard reference check questions
Monitor and address questions by respondents	
Site visits - Schedule and conduct site visits at the request of respondents	Site visits - Locations of importance - Standardized agenda & route
Proposal receipt, review, analysis and scoring	Proposal Review - Scoring by those who wish to participate
Presentation scheduling, organization and scoring	Presentation - Observe, comment and score
Consolidation of scoring and comments into recommendations for executive approval and Board of Trustees concurrence	