1. (8:30) Call to Order……………………………………………………………….Callinder
2. (8:30) Roll Call………………………………………...…………………………...Hurson
3. (8:32) Passing Last Week’s Minutes………………………………………………..Hurson
	1. Approved unanimously.
4. (8:35) Gallery Response and Discussion…………………………………………Callinder
	1. Abiad: I enjoyed the Vargas lecture.
5. (9:05) Old Business………………………………………………………………Callinder
	1. Approve QEP………………………………………………………..Callinder
		1. Callinder: I think we had a productive conversation re: QEP. How do people feel?
		2. Soltany: I think they did a good job with their presentation. I agree that we should pass our partnership with them.
		3. Ferguson: Approving the QEP will solidify our partnership with them.
		4. Callinder: Motions?
		5. Soltany: Motion to pass QEP initiative?
		6. Approved.
	2. Approve ATC……………………………………………………….Callinder
		1. Callinder: I think we did a good job reviewing the budget. The ATC (and William Brown) offered a good presentation of the budget. I was quite content with what they presented. I believe that others share this sentiment. General discussion or vote?
		2. Yang: Motion to approve?
		3. Approved.
		4. Kudos to Elizabeth for all her good work on this initiative.
	3. Re-cap: Education Initiative………………………………………….Stoddard
		1. Callinder: Xan wanted to speak last week about the Academic Achievement Initiative. We didn’t have much time last week, so we’re doing that now. We want to address his questions about why we chose not to approve his initiative.
		2. Stoddard: I challenged the thesis that the relationship between successful academic performance and hours spent working is linear. I also proposed several ideas for reducing stress on campus. I proposed that we set up an academic achievement committee; however, the results from SGA were not favorable. I want to probe the SGA for their rationale behind vetoing my initiative.
		3. Sandlin: We considered your proposal and the data from the registrar. The data show that academic rigor doesn’t affect academic performance in the way that you described.
		4. Ferguson: We also thought that some of your proposed solutions had already been affected. For example, we had a consultant come in and review course the course evaluation process. The QEP, in addition, also satisfies the “diversity element” of your proposal. I encourage you to join one of those taskforces.
		5. Yang: Your proposal was valuable, but I agree with Dara. We believe that any process for revising the academic experience needs to be holistic.
		6. Black: I had two observations: when I evaluate what’s truly stressful, it is not the workload, but the personal standards of the professor. Professors are also very lenient and are willing to grant extensions. I think also that students should be more active in pursuing extensions or seeking out other arrangements.
		7. Yangzi: I believe that the personal standards of the professor are especially important, as Dan said.
		8. Kaya: How do course evaluations affect the learning experience here? Why do they need to be corrected/modified?
		9. Ferguson: We need to modify the scale by which students rate their courses. For example, if one student remarks in his/her evaluation that a course was “good” and another rates the course 5/5, then neither of those evaluations can be considered similar. We are trying to implement a standardized, quantitative scale.
		10. Callinder: We’re getting off topic re: course evaluations. Let’s get back to our questions for Xan.
		11. Ballas-Bograd: If we give students an opportunity to work towards a minimum grade, then we are helping them understand and internalize the information in the best way possible. This aspect of your proposal is very valuable in my opinion.
		12. Callinder: Whenever we try to dictate to professors how they ought to teach and assess their students, we begin going down a slippery slope. I don’t agree that the aforementioned aspect of your proposal is at all feasible: students should be able to make mistakes; professors should be able to exercise discrepancy when determining how to grade.
		13. Shandley: That is one difference between high school and college. This would be a big jump: to tell professors how to grade, etc.
		14. Stoddard: Is there any way for us to regulate this when it becomes unbounded?
		15. Black: Talk to your teachers!
		16. Callinder: If the conversation were not necessarily about the grading itself, we would be able to have a more productive discussion. Profs not receptive to conversations on grades
		17. Kaya: this is more about stress, not grades. I took a hard macro test and the professor apologized afterwards. Problem isn’t grades – tests often weighted. Problem is stress
		18. Ferguson: nobody said college would be easy – Davidson isn’t supposed to be a walk in the park. If it were, then half of us wouldn’t be here. We’re here because we chose a rigorous institution. Conversation devolving into hypotheticals. We choose not to pursue this initiative because there wasn’t enough data and we have similar initiatives already.
		19. Rapport: There’s precedent for this – we did “give us our break” initiative and it worked. Identify patterns. Identify a concrete issue that causes undue stress.
6. (8:40) New Business……………………………………………………………Callinder
	1. Budget Proposal for beer truck…………………………………………..Yang
		1. Yang: beer truck is the senior class party that happens the night before graduation. We’re $5,900 short and are asking the SGA for an additional $1000 (brings total SGA contribution to $1500). Half of our donations have been from our website, [www.davidson2016.com](http://www.davidson2016.com), where we have a paypal account.
		2. Murphy: We’re good with $$.
		3. Rapport: we want to set a precedent of juniors staying to help at beer truck
		4. Yang: Thank you!
	2. Finals Feast…………………………………………………………….Ferguson
		1. Ferguson: We need people to hand out finals, as well as people to volunteer at the Finals Feast
		2. Ferguson: we will send out a doodle, but:
			1. 8:30-9 (Zi, Maya, Dara, Donald, Ben, Emily
			2. 9-9:30 (Grant, Aman, Kevin $oltany, Kyle, My\_
			3. 9:30-10 (Summer, Dylan, Nate, Yangzi, Houston)
			4. MBB????
		3. Ferguson: We will do finals sign-ups next week. Read and respond!
		4. Callinder: People in the past have missed their shifts. Don’t do that and leave the registrar’s office to do it all. Put yourself in their shoes.
	3. EMT Services Update……………………………………………………….Martin
		1. Ferguson: Met on 4/19 w/ Sarah Phillips, Chief Sigler, Fire Chief, Dean Shandley, and Andrew Nielsen
			1. Liability falls under Davidson fire department. Sarah Phillips proposed to structure the program with Davidson student sign-ups, but wholly organized by the Davidson FD.
			2. The Davidson FD will provide education; class will come to campus if at least 10 sign up, 19 have. Five students are already EMT certified
			3. Students will have a station on campus, location tbd.
			4. Certification is approximately 200 hours, but this should not be a deterrent. Pre-med students can present this as community service.
			5. Friday and Saturday nights will be on-duty nights, in shifts
		2. Shandley: By the time students go through hours, realistically, this will begin next spring.
		3. Callinder: We are looking into starting in the fall with the students who are already EMT certified, should the number be high enough. BOLO for an email to the student body asking for students who are certified.
		4. Ferguson: Chief Fitzgerald presented the option of students completing their EMT certification through Handshake.
	4. Frolics Update……………………………………………………………Callinder
		1. Re-cap from Dean Shandley……………………………………Callinder
		2. Shandley: One of the best things about Frolics is the partnership between students and representatives from public safety. I would like to hear back from the Union Board re: how students dealt with the ID checkpoints.
		3. Ferguson: I don’t think that GoogleDoc was a sufficient platform for the guest list. I had some trouble with that.
		4. Shandley: Any of these ideas should be submitted to me so that I can review them and help establish them.
	5. Logistics re: survey reveal……………………………………………….Callinde
		1. Ferguson: We still have to reveal the survey results from the “Dinner Date with President” contest. That reveal will occur next week, before reading week. We should also consider whether or not to announce these results via Internet.
		2. Harding: It is important to consider what the goals are for this reveal. Perhaps a conversation would be more effective.
		3. Ferguson: Is the general consensus for a website. This is an informal voting. Yea or nay.
		4. Approved.
	6. Faculty award nominations…………………………………………….Callinder
		1. Callinder: SGA nominates faculty annually for SGA Faculty Award and SGA Faculty Advisor Award. Let’s take names now.
			1. Names for FA: Chris Alexander (Poli-Sci), Rebecca Juben (Arabic Studies), Sham (Econ), Ben Mangram (English), Jonathan Burke (History), Ewoodse (Sociology), Ceka (Poli-Sci) Crandall (Poli-Sci)
				1. Can only vote for one.
				2. Chris Alexander – 3
				3. Juben – 3
				4. Sham – 4
				5. Ben – 1
				6. Ewoodsie -2
				7. Ceka – 1
				8. CA – 9
				9. Sham – 6
				10. Chris Alexander, winner, winner
			2. Pre-Major Advisor: Vasquez, Sham, Johnson, Burkey, TO
			3. Vasquez – 7 – 6
			4. Jamie Johnson - 1
			5. Sham – 7 – 7
7. (9:25) Announcements……………………………………………………………Callinder
8. (9:30) Adjournment……………………………………………………………….Callinder