Penultimate, Mightier
College Council’s Minutes for the
7:30 P.M., 18 February 2004, Regular Meeting in Hopkins 1964 Classroom
Constitution Determined Offices
Bylaw Determined Membership Composition

Open Time starts every meeting
Jacob King came from Williams
Outwardly Reinvigorating Democracy
WORD to address Council. He said there were about 15 to 30 students working on
“starting the idea of a MassPIRG chapter at Williams,” a driving vision being to help
students have an impact outside of campus.
He called PIRG a “very nonpartisan
moderate group” that has done work on
student financial aid, environmental
protection, and campaign finance reform. He
mentioned also a recent report on price gouging by textbook companies.
Williams had a chapter from ’84 to ’98, said Jacob. Back then, it was funded by a charge
to the term bill, which students could opt out of and which needed to be reaffirmed by
election every year. Now, however, he said WORD was talking about other ways to fund
MassPIRG as a group, perhaps by an opt in fee, or from alumni or the administration.
Jacob welcomed questions from Council. Godfrey Bakuli asked why MassPIRG left
campus for 14 sic years? Jacob answered that the leadership then “started getting not
very organized. Nadia Moore Armstrong asked how much he thought he’d need to start
a PIRG chapter for a year. Between 5 and 10 thousand dollars, said Jacob.

Dan Rooney Mills, Thompson spoke against an opt out system, his objections
centering on a feeling that the system was for the group’s own ease of fundraising, and that
method of having the charge on the term bill was “maybe a trick.” Jacob responded
directly that WORD’s intention was not to trick anyone into giving funding, and restated
that the group was seeking other methods.

Jonathan Landsman secretary asked for a breakdown of how money collected was used,
and distributed to chapters at various levels. Jacob said there were 23 chapters in the
state, and all students have representatives on the chapter board. Students decide where
money goes, and gave lobbyists, researchers, and campaigns at schools as examples of
funding targets.

Phoebe Rockwood asked Jacob to address claims she’d heard regarding Ralph Nader’s
involvement with PIRG. Said Jacob, every school has equal representation on the board,
and Williams, in the past, was actually head of the state board. Nader founded the first
chapter, and now has no connection.

Andres Schabelman all campus mentioned that WORD would be putting out a
petition this week, and stated his view that “funding should not have a role in deciding
whether or not to sign the petition.” He thanked Jacob “for his leadership,” saying that
“he’s been great about coming out slowly with MassPIRG.”

Godfrey asked what actual successes PIRG has had. “Tremendous,” said Jacob. “Most
recent thing is students got together and put a referendum on the state ballot to ban toxic
pesticides, and less recently had lobbied successfully for 1.5 billion extra in student loans.
Federico Sosa treasurer stressed that the petition for which WORD was to gather
signatures next Wednesday Feb 25 is in no way an endorsement of opt in funding or an
increase to the Student Activities Tax, and only a petition to support PIRG on campus.
Jacob agreed, and said that if there were to be a fee “we’d definitely have an election.”
Andres contributed the opinion, “Imagine if we get 1,500 signatures on that petition,
maybe the administration would even think of funding it themselves.”

Committees and Groups

Jessi England Class of 2006 of the OCC Committee spoke to how the committee
hopes to make the OCC “a little more user friendly.” The office is apparently to publish a
one page, double sided pamphlet of the top 15 areas people go into every year, what each
field is, and what websites you can go to to find out more information.

Jessi England of the Library Committee reported on discussions on the Stetson
Sawyer plans. The new Sawyer will be to the east of Stetson; the old Stetson will stay
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where it is. First, the current Economics houses will be taken down and a new, “huge”
building for faculty will be erected. A smaller building where the current Sawyer is will
allow a “beautiful vista” to Stetson from Baxter. It may start as soon as 2005, and will take
7 years in total, 2 for each building. Most construction will not be visible to Route 2. Jessi
added as good news. Ali Moiz and 'Dodd Quad' asked how much it was costing. Jessi didn’t
know; Chin Ho suggested 75 million, but qualified his certainty as low.

**Budgets**

**Federico Sosa** treasurer brought the usual budget recommendations from the
Financial Committee FinCom.

Figure Skating Club requested 150 and was recommended 0. They were asking for
registration fees for tournaments in addition to past requests, but FinCom deemed they
already had the money they needed.

Ethics Bowl requested 3,595 and was recommended 245. The group was not a
registered college organization. They have three students and a professor. Budget cuts
included cutting all funds related to the professor, and all money for meals.

Entrepreneurship Society requested 3,265 and was recommended 600. They’ve done
a good job, said Fede, and have brought many speakers to campus without asking for money.
The 600 recommended was for a lecturer. Money “slashed” was for food, 2 websites they
wanted to develop, the defunct “Ephby” site and a new club site. FinCom thought this
was bad use of funds, and that funding a group’s website set an unwanted precedent.
Williams Outing Club requested 1,000 and was recommended 500. The money was
for unexpected shortfalls in funds for the carnival due to low due revenue from team
signups for events, and a required police presence at fireworks. Fede commented that
their presentation was good, and FinCom agreed to cover the unexpected fees.

**Project Time**

**Federico Sosa** treasurer opened with the surprisingly controversial topic of pizza
vouchers. He said He had wanted to distribute them to reps to use to buy pizza for
gatherings in their houses before the elections, he felt that giving reps who were running
for reps would present a conflict of interest, so he would give vouchers to the house reps
who were not running. The first representatives to speak immediately took a stance
against this, saying it was unfair, but those speaking later favored Fede’s idea, saying that it
was better to wait and avoid any possibility of perceived impropriety. Some reps the
proposed allowing reps with no conflict of interest to have a party in a candidate rep’s
house in their stead. With Council divided, Mike cut short discussion to move on.

**Ezemudi Okaonu** Tyler, Tyler Annex broached a project he’d dreamed up when he
“looked into the library buying movies and they said ‘No, we don’t do that,’” and it was,
like, a five minute speech on no.” The project is discussed further in New Business.

**Mike Henry** co pres brought Council up to speed on the discussion at the recent
Health Center Forum. He said that the administration has, so far, committed to two
things: an on call physician for students at all times, and a person on call who could help
people diagnose by phone whether or not they should go to the ER. Increased training in
first aid was discussed. They alluded to helping with the copay for ambulance trips, but
have not promised that yet. An ambulance costs 500 a trip; insurance usually pays from
300 to 400 of that. He expressed the view that Council should press the
administration to cover the full copay. At that point, **Veronica Mendiola** Gladden said
that, “considering it’s something we she and Ilunga Kalala, co president hopefuls have
been working on, we’ll continue.”

**Jim Irving** Class of 2005 somewhat bashfully interjected, “I think both pairs are working on that,” referring also to his own ticket of
him and Marissa Doran. Council had a laugh and made good natured catfight noises.

Veronica said there were a lot of people “really concerned about the issue, but not
interested enough to go to the forum.” She asked if it was on tape or transcribed. Chin
Ho co pres answered that the administration is putting together a sheet of the questions
that were brought up. One could also email Ruth Harrison, he said.

**New Business from the Agenda**

**Housing Redistricting** A committee presents its recommendations on
redefining housing groups for purposes of Council representation

**Philipp Huy** all campus presented the results of a provisional committee’s
deliberations on how to housing groups should be defined in Council bylaws, a discussion
sprung from the sentiments of Peter Tosirisuk. Morgan, Lehman that freshmen were underrepresented. Philipp said the committee tried to "find a compromise between ensuring competitiveness and that each individual is able to have a personal relationship with his or her house rep. With that objective, we tried to keep the number of students per house rep between 80 and 100."

Below is the summary of the proposal presented on behalf of the committee by Philipp:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Reps</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>Reps</th>
<th>Spr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frosh Quad + Lehman</td>
<td>4 reps</td>
<td>85 spr</td>
<td>3 reps</td>
<td>101 spr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>1 reps</td>
<td>111 spr</td>
<td>Agard + Garfield + Wood</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East + Fay</td>
<td>2 reps</td>
<td>72 spr</td>
<td>Perry + Brooks + Spencer</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosh Council</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
<td>78 spr</td>
<td>West + Woodbridge + Chadbourne</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong + Pratt</td>
<td>2 reps</td>
<td>79 spr</td>
<td>Coop/Off campus</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennett + Mills</td>
<td>2 reps</td>
<td>97 spr</td>
<td>JA rep</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler + Tyler Annex + Thompson</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
<td>115 spr</td>
<td>Currier + Fitch</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier + Fitch</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
<td>102 spr</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodd + Dodd Annex + Hubbell</td>
<td>1 rep</td>
<td>100 spr</td>
<td>w/o Coop/Off campus rep</td>
<td>82 students per rep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Row Houses were grouped with regard to which were commonly referred to as "party houses," said Philipp. Grouping West and Spencer in the past, he said, was a bad idea. Jonathan Misk sub for Williams objected to the whole scheme. "It’s not 85 per they identify with, but if you’re from Williams the dorm you identify with Williams."

He observed that if the proposed system you can end up with 4 people from Williams and no one from Sage or Lehman. Jonathan Landsman secretary argued against this, saying that while that was possible, it would require members of the Sage and Lehman houses to vote mainly for Williams candidates instead of those from their own house. A situation in which all four winners were of one house would be unusual indeed, said Jonathan, and would likely be indicative of a good reason for the outcome.

Ikem Joseph Dennett inquired as to the rationale behind grouping Mission reps.

Jessi England Class of 2006 explained with an example from the recent elections; that while a few were running in Pratt, none wanted to in Armstrong. The new grouping would allow reasonable spillover. "In reality Armstrong Pratt, Mills Dennett, it’s one long corridor," she said.

Lehman proved a challenge to reps in discussion, as it could not be grouped with any area but the Frosh Quad, and yet some members felt that the Frosh Quad dorms were so large that their constituencies were likely to overwhelm Lehman, leaving Lehman with no native rep. Working from the insinuations of Jonathan Misk, Godfrey Bakuli Sage moved to amend the proposal to have 3 representatives for the Frosh Quad and 1 from Lehman. But he also spoke in favor of grouping: "You can’t just know people in your house if you want to do something for the whole class. It’s good to do some grouping; it makes a rep feel they need to know people in more than just their own house."

Godfrey’s amendment to Frosh Quad area representation PASSED, 19-9-0.

Andres Schabelman, after a suggestion from Mike Henry that it may be best to get to the agenda’s constitutional amendment, successfully moved to table discussion of the districting bylaw.

**Constitutional Amendment to eliminate all campus representatives, and create a Committee President and a Head of Communications Officer**

"A smaller Council increases competition for elections," began Mike Henry co pres, "and decreases diffusion of responsibility." He said the four all campus reps "have historically not done much;" the position was an "elevation in prestige but not an elevation in responsibility." The amendment thus proposed to replace the all campus reps with reps who had the duty they were supposed to. Chin Ho co pres spoke to committees, stating their importance as the "largest decision making body on this campus." Mike added that a lot of the inspiration for the Communications position had come from ACE, which he said had done a "good job of putting its face in the Record, getting its name out there. That’s something Council could benefit from."

Mike now read through the proposal, the question for consideration being whether or not to put it to the campus for approval with the elections to open the next night. It is reprinted here, without the portions that comprised changes made solely for consistency:

1. Representation, Section A. The members of Council shall be:

Four representatives elected at large during the second full week of spring semester.
1. Elimination of the four all-campus reps.

2. Creation of an all-campus position to oversee college committees.

3. Creation of an all-campus position to work on Council communication.

3. One representative, designated Committee President, elected at large with a specific focus toward committees during the second full week of spring semester.

Section E. Duties

2. The Committee President shall chair the Appointments Committee, and shall maintain the connection between Council and all College committees, and stand vigilant over the committee system as a whole.

IV. Officers, Section B. Duties

7. The Head of Communications shall:
   a. Publicize to the student body the business of the Council.
   b. Serve as a conduit for information to the student body.
   c. Coordinate dialogue between the student body, the Administration, and the Council.
   d. Assume the duties of the President when the President and Vice President, or both Co Presidents, Secretary, and Treasurer are absent.

Jim Irving Class of 2005 was first to speak on the amendment, and he opposed it fully in a speech that went for no less than 20 minutes. He expressed the view that all campus reps were useful and active. He said reductions in the size of Council should take place at the house rep level. He disputed claims that shrinking Council would “streamline” its function: “ ’streamlining’ is a code word for cutting out debate” which is the “key to good decisions.” He continued to object to nearly every part of the amendment, part by part, to such a length as will not be reprinted here, nor is recorded in the secretary’s notes due to his engagement in preparing to attempt to break what seemed to be a filibuster.

Jim closed with the main thrust that there had not been enough time to consider the amendment it had been first distributed to Council less than a day before the meeting and it had been drafted in haste by a committee that met between 4 and 8 a.m. There was no rush “to push this through now,” he asserted.

Godfrey Bakuli Sage supported eliminating all campus representatives, saying that if those positions did not exist, the people who would run for them would run for their own house rep spots. “I do a lot of work for Sage, but I’m not swamped by it. I don’t want to see house reps as these poor creatures who carry stones up hills. We have time; we can do more extra work.” He cited the situation in the concurrent elections of having four people running for four all campus rep seats as evidence that they had to go. He also echoed the point made by Jim and Peter Tosirisku that a communications person was needed, but he should be selected in a manner other than all campus election.

Gerry Lindo all campus was the most theatrically against putting the amendment on the ballot. He stressed how soon the ballot would go to a vote, and said that putting it before the campus that quickly was “just a no.” He opposed having the communications officer be a Council member. He said the position seemed mainly work of a nature more akin to that of a student manager, and said he was “not convinced they should have a vote.”

Andres Schabelman all campus raised his own eternal struggle with defining his position as proof against the all campus position, and said the best way to tackle the “overarching issues” all campus reps were supposed to was to have house reps take them. “There is no reason I’m here.” He opposed taking time to deliberate the amendment.

“For me, spending time on Council lowers my morale, and that lowers productivity. We spend a lot of time thinking on Council and not acting and I think it’s about time we act.”

Ezemudi Okaonu Tyler, Tyler Annex was most interested in the communications officer, which he felt was sorely needed. “We need this communications officer to help us improve our image. We haven’t cared enough about our image. . . . The communications officer is a vital piece.”

Ezemudi moved to amend the proposal to include two committee presidents instead of one, saying that his idea was that a deeper involvement with committees would be best achieved by having the committee presidents attend, between them, every single committee. There was virtually no discussion germane to Eze’s amendment, though the vote on it came quite after its proposal.

Ali Moiz Dodd Quad supported the content of the constitutional amendment, but saw no need for hurry, and advocated its postponement. He recanted this position only a few minutes later. Federico Sosa treasurer said an immediate decision was needed because postponement would doom the amendment to failure, as it is very hard to get students to vote on something on its own. He then successfully moved to vote, to expedite the issue.

A handful of reps used their 30 seconds to support passing the amendment now to increase its chances of passage by the student body, but as many called for its postponement. Gerry, in one of the more memorable moment of the meeting, called the reasoning behind swift passage “straight dooky.” If we cannot come to a decision on this now, he asked, how can we give the student body less than 24 hours to do this?

Ezemudi’s amendment to add a second Committee President FAILED, 7-16-0.
Jonathan Landsman  secretary, in what was likely his second worst misreading of the room’s persuasions in his career, now moved to split the motion at hand into a part to remove the all campus reps, and the parts creating the two new positions.  Jessi England  Class of 2006  gave the only comment on the quickly disposed with motion, saying that if striking the all campus reps was put before the student body without the simultaneous creation of the two positions, they would not see the rationale behind the move.  She then successfully moved to vote.

☐ Jonathan’s motion to split consideration of the proposal **FAILED, 6-19-0.**

Federico Sosa  treasurer spoke to support eliminating all campus positions, saying “there is all this redundancy of representation out there.”  House reps would become more active without all campus reps, he said.

Philipp Huy  all campus: “This amendment to the constitution is everything that students have ever asked for.”

Peter Tosirisuk  Morgan, Lehman  said he believed the communications position could and should be appointed by Council, not elected by campus.  Godfrey Bakuli  Sage agreed, and answered other reps’ claim that the all campus quality was needed to make it a more prestigious and accountable position by citing the concurrent election for secretary, which had one person running unopposed.  It is a similar role, he said.  He moved to amend the proposal to have the communications officer appointed by a Council majority.

☐ Godfrey’s amendment to communications officer selection **FAILED, 5-20-0.**

Council now moved to vote on the main motion: putting the amendment on tomorrow night’s ballot.  This required 2/3 to pass and, as it turned out, was never a legal vote at all, as the constitution requires 2 weeks of publicity before an amendment may be offered.

☐ Placing the constitutional amendment on the February 19th ballot to seek ratification by the campus at large **PASSED, 18-7-0.**

**New Business from the Floor**

**Video Purchase Program** for Council funded campus library acquisitions

Ezemudi Okaonu  Tyler, Tyler Annex  now explained the details of his envisioned program for purchasing videos for immediate donation to the library, for student use.  Five DVDs would be purchased each month, in three categories: 2 popular films, 2 independent or foreign films, and one of any genre.  In all cases, which titles were purchased was to be determined by the student body by popular vote.  Eze said he had books of titles in his room that could be used for this purpose.  He had investigated the costs of doing this and determined them to amount to 70 a month for the five DVDs.  He said he envisioned this being done on the website, where students would make suggestions for titles, and cast votes online.

Council voted to fund the program on a trial basis until the end of the year, thus voting to allocate 70 a month for each of the remaining months to the project.

☐ Funding Eze’s proposed video purchase program this semester **PASSED, 25-0-0.**

**Absentees** Two absences in a row or three in a term result in a member’s expulsion, unless overridden by the secretary’s discretion or petition to the Council

- Nate Winstanley  Class of 2004  all campus
- Lindsay Dwyer  Bryant, Woodbridge  Andrew Nathenson  co op, off campus
- Evan Schutz  Mark Hopkins  Sabrina Wirth  Prospect

This is Nate Winstanley’s second absence this term.  One more absence this term will result in his expulsion from Council.

This is the third absence for Lindsay, Dwyer, Andrew Nathenson, Evan Schutz, and Sabrina Wirth.  They have been expelled from Council.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Landsman,
Secretary of College Council