Highlights

- Recommendations made on proposed Posting Policy.
- Proposed alternative to 25-Foot rule in Smoking Policy fails.
- Log Policy discussed.
- New FINCOM chosen.
- Spots in some committees still open. Selfnoms@wso

Open Time starts every meeting

No members from outside Council physically came in to address us, but the Muslim Students Union advertised, using Chin as their proxy, their talk on Tuesday, May 6th at 8 PM in Wege Auditorium. Dr. Ali Asani, a professor from Harvard University, is giving a lecture titled “On Tolerance, Intolerance, and Islam.”

Mike Henry noted that the Polshek Architects, the firm designing the new Baxter, are coming in at 7:30 on Tuesday, the 13th. College Council will advertise this meeting, as we feel it is important that students give their input as much as possible at this opportunities.

Dan Burns mentioned that the Williams College Debate Union will be having their last student debate of the year, the Abortion Debate. It will happen in Wege Auditorium at 8:30 on Wednesday, May 7th.

Philipp Huy (all-campus) took the floor to deliver his opinion on College Council’s decision two weeks ago to endorse Cap and Bells’ letter to the architects on the Multipurpose Room in the new Baxter. Philipp was not happy with our approach. He felt that groups outside of Council see it as the voice of the student body, and thus would give our opinion more weight. For this reason, though he liked Cap ad Bells’ ideas, he felt that CC should not have and should never endorse the opinions of one student group, as we need to be the voice of the entire student body. Finally, Philipp said that he thought it was important that CC let everyone on campus know that everyone can come to any committee meeting.

Budgets

Gospel Choir requested $350, the Allocations Committee concurred.

Federico Sosa (treasurer) explained that their request was for the rights to music they sing, DJs, gasoline, fees for pianist. He said their budget was very comprehensive, and their request a drop from the $950 they had brought last week, which they were turned away for due to a lack of the outside funding which they now had.

With no debate, the budget slate PASSED, 25-0-0.

Opinions

The following opinions were collected and delivered to Council by various members:

One student annoyed with weed smokers wanted them to have their own building.
One student felt her HC has done nothing for her.
One wanted better summer job information at the Office of Career Counseling.
One staff member was concerned with the blind curve at the back of Driscoll, which he felt could lead to death. He thought a mirror should be installed to fix this problem.
“No Dean Roseman; she is a fascist.”
“Currier needs a better kitchen.”

People parking in Brooks were complaining about suddenly getting kicked out of their parking spaces on Sunday and having to park in Greylock. Whitney Gee (Spencer-West), delivering the opinion, said housemates felt it was out of the blue; other members answered that there had been an email. Julia Karoly (Brooks-Chadbourne-Perry) said this was a valid complaint, as we pay for parking, and asked why this could not be fixed over the summer.

A request for someone to take up the project of getting more fans in the Estrogym. Geri Ottaviano (Frosh Council) said she would work on it.

A query as to how one should go about getting more fuzball tables on campus. Jim Irving (2005) suggested starting a club and seeking funding. Chin Ho (co-president) suggested talking to B&G, to get them to put some in in tandem with renovations. He also mentioned Nantucket Nectar caps (which can be redeemed by sending them to S.U. 2855).

David Roth (Pratt) mentioned that he had solicited opinions from his house on the Environmental Policy Statement before College Council tonight, and the consensus was that it likely would do nothing, but that there was no reason not to pass it.

Request for Dining Services to open halls longer on Sunday mornings.

The ladies in the activities office complained that the fax machine in Baxter mailroom never works, and people come to them to complain but there is nothing they can do.

A complaint that the length of time you get virtual catalog items for use from the library is, at four weeks, not long enough. Darlene Forde (Currier-Fitch) of the Library Committee says that they are looking into it. They are working on extending the Virtual Catalog Library checkout periods to 6 weeks, as opposed to the current 4 week period.

College Council now moved to discussion of an idea to get tee shirts to use for members doing Opinions Unplugged.

Jonathan Landsman (secretary) suggested that making a sign for each dining hall might be a better idea, due to the unnecessary cost of getting a tee for everyone on council, and the difficulty of sharing tee shirts, among members doing Unplugged.

Karen Untereker (sub for Maria Lapetina, sub for Nate Winstanley, 2004) suggested buying a B&G A-frame, which are useful and fairly cheap.

Andrew Pocius (Sage) expressed a doubt that people who weren’t coming over to opin before suddenly would be drawn by a tee shirt.

Brendan Dochertry said that when he did Opinions Unplugged, a handwritten sign on two sheets of looseleaf and a frowny face saying “Please come talk to me” did the trick.

Philipp Huy (all-campus) said that he thought putting up a permanent posterboard where people could write their opinions to CC was a good idea. Other members expressed their doubts; especial concern was expressed for the fate of such a board on Friday and Saturday nights.

Project Time

Aaron Wilson (all-campus) said that he and Chris Ryan (Gladden) had met with Dave Boyer on the Log policy, and he had seemed receptive to changes. They are trying to get extended hours for Thursday nights, and also change the visitor policy and three-drink limit. One solution explored was to separate the dance area from the bar area for 21 and under-21 sections, to facilitate a more robust flow of alcohol.
Julia Karoly (Brooks-Chadbourne-Perry) said that she did not like the three-drink limit either, but that her freshman year the aforementioned separation policy was in effect, and it hindered class mingling. As this was more important to her, she preferred the system now.

Federico Sosa (treasurer) asked what had happened to the arrangement he thought Council had made with Jean Thorndike last year. Chris answered that, right now, the policy is that you must check in a guest with security by 3:30 that day, to get a temporary ID card, which will give access to your dorm. The ID requires you to lay down a deposit of 10 to 20 dollars against its return.

Chris Ryan (Gladden) expressed that he felt it was important to have a policy that would allow prefrosh to visit the Log, as this was an important experience for them to have regarding Williams social life.

Chin Ho (co-president) mentioned that a large part of the reason behind the current policy was that security wants documentation of guests so that if one gets sick or in trouble, they know whose responsibility he or she is. He also added that it was not just student guests who have a problem, but visiting performers too. He cited the well known story of the Guster drummer’s attempt to go in for a drink last year after a performance. The member of security on door duty would not let him in.

Many members wished to get rid of the deposit required for the temporary ID. Dan Burns (East-Fay) reiterated that you get the deposit back. Aaron said this was true, but paying it was a hassle. He cited that, for Spring Fling, people will be bringing hundreds of guests and there was no reason that all of them needed to pay 10 dollars. Aaron also said that part of the problem was that the communication between Security and Dining Services (who run the Log) is virtually nonexistent.

New Business from the Agenda

Approval of FINCOM Appointments

The Appointments Committee, which is composed of all reps elected by the full campus, including class and MINCO reps, plus a co-president and the secretary, met last Sunday to select eight people out of twelve selfnoms received to fill eight slots on FINCOM. The appointees, who needed confirmation from Council to be officially chosen, are:

Alex Bal, ’06 Andrew Pocius, ’06 Matthew Webster, ’04
Eric Hsu, ’05 Geri Ottaviano, ’06 Michael Sirigano, ’04
Rhiannon DeLeeuw, ’04 Spencer Wong, ’04

With no debate, Council moved to approve the appointees. Motion PASSED, 23-0-3.

Environmental Mission Statement drafted and brought by the CEAC

Brendan Docherty and Mark Orlowski from the The Campus Environmental Advisory Committee came to Council to lobby for endorsement of the Environmental Policy statement that their group had drafted and sent to various members of the administration for acceptance. Brendan took the floor to explain that, in adopting this policy, the CEAC hoped to make Williams more of a leader in the environmental field. He cited Oberlin college as a model, which
recently constructed a great environmental building. He said Malin Pinsky had done a lot of work on this and then passed it onto the current CEAC. He then read the policy proposal, which is printed below:

**Proposed Williams College Environmental Mission Statement**

Williams College is committed to environmental stewardship and leadership. We affirm an institutional responsibility to promote environmental consciousness in the daily life of the institution. Respect for the physical environment shall be one of the fundamental values guiding College practices, policies, and behavior. The faculty, staff, and students of the Williams community seek to uphold this mission by promoting environmental awareness, local understanding, and global thinking.

To implement this mission we shall strive to minimize the adverse environmental impacts in all College activities by:

- Conserving natural resources and supporting their sustainable use.
- Conserving energy and reducing emissions of pollutants while actively pursuing opportunities to make use of renewable energy.
- Reducing the consumption of materials and purchasing renewable, reusable, recyclable, and recycled products whenever possible.
- Reducing waste by continuing recycling and composting programs.
- Reducing the use of toxic substances using alternatives whenever possible.
- Providing healthy and safe work, study, and recreational environments on campus.
- Including environmental impacts in the cost-benefit analysis of campus planning, design and construction projects.
- Promoting a regional economy by purchasing sustainably produced local and regional products when feasible.
- Conducting research and teaching in an environmentally responsible way.
- Encouraging students, faculty, and staff to develop environmental initiatives.

Dan Burns (East-Fay) asked if it was possible for Council to amend the proposal. Brendan answered that it was not, as it had already been sent to many groups for ratification. Dan pressed on to ask why it was good to buy from local groups. Mark answered that it was good to support local businesses when there was no extra cost. David Roth (Pratt) chimed in to justify this on the fact that a lot of what attracts people to our college is our location, and its atmosphere. Andres Schabelman, all campus rep and town liaison, said that students have a reputation in the town of being just consumers, and we should strive to do things that will improve our relationship with the town, as our relationship is one of codependency.

Jonathan Landsman (secretary) accused Mark of dodging Dan’s question [third sentence of this paragraph]. He asked why, if the true intent of this policy was to drive local consumption when it did not cost more, than why were the words [in bullet point 8] not “when more costly” rather than “when feasible,” which Jonathan asserted could be read and used many ways. Brendan answered that feasible can be taken a lot of ways, and suggested that “it may be worth an extra 2 dollars a box” if better for the environment. Mark added that the college will not approve spending extra money because something is produced locally. It will always come down to financial numbers, he said.

Chris Ryan (Gladden) asked if following this policy would be more expensive for the College. Brendan answered that the new dishwashers coming into Baxter, for an example, were saving the College money because their lifetime cost was much cheaper. Mark added the example of the COGEN facility, which saves money using the College’s steam from heating to generate electricity.

At this point, a motion to end debate and vote passed, but Dan Burns (East-Fay), who had his hand raised as the motion was made, invoked his right to speak for 30 seconds before the vote actually occurred. He said that the things this policy urged were things that the College
already did when cost effective, and having this policy would only shift the college in a direction of doing these things when they were not cost effective.

*Endorsing the CEAC's Environmental Mission Statement PASSED, 24-2-0.*

**Smoking Ban 25-Foot Rule Change, proposed**

In following up the letter on the Smoking Ban sent by College Council February 26th and a suggestion by Dean Roseman that she would consider changing the part of the Smoking Policy to take effect next year that required smokers to go 25 feet from a building to smoke, **Jonathan Landsman** (secretary) drafted a proposed substitute for the 25-foot rule, which he based on Wesleyan’s smoking policy. His proposal is below. The bolded area was intended for Council’s especial consideration as to whether to retain it or not:

> College Council, in the spirit of protecting student health by and while harnessing the informed cooperation of the students, proposes that the following paragraph be added to the Smoking Policy to take effect next year, in place of the current proposed 25-foot radius around all buildings:

> In light of compelling research findings about the dangers of secondhand smoke, the College also strongly discourages students from smoking in any area that unavoidably exposes non-smokers to smoke. **The spirit of this Smoking Policy is to protect non-smokers from dangers to their health from secondhand smoke, not to ostracize or inflict unnecessary hardship on students who smoke. In this spirit, common sense no-smoking areas, such as near doorways, windows, and ventilation systems inlets, will be enforced to a degree and strictness necessary to protect the health of students.** Students who feel that a student is smoking somewhere that poses a health risk should speak to the student, or to [the appropriate authorities listed elsewhere in this policy for modes of redress. Students who repeatedly violate this policy may be [fined, disciplined with whatever penalties this Policy carries elsewhere]

**Pete Applegate** (co-op) said that he was strongly in favor of dropping the bold section, and that his main concern was the part that says it will be “enforced to a degree and strictness necessary to protect the health of students.”

**Aaron Wilson** (all-campus) asked how this was better than the 25-foot rule. It was too vague now, he said, and cited the example of it being hard to tell where inlets are. **Dan Burns** (East-Fay) agreed, and, in answer to Pete’s concern, said this was a positive change, as it would leave enforcement up to security’s discretion, not limit them. **Kelsey Peterson** (Carter) added that she liked the vagueness, as it would let students work things out for themselves while still allowing for enforcement. **Chris Ryan** (Gladden) answered this by saying that it is hard for students to confront smokers in this way, and is even harder to confront non-student smokers, such as professors or members of security.

**Chris Ryan** (Gladden) said he felt this was not necessary at all, and that it was understood that the 25-foot rule was not going to be enforced stringently. **Jonathan** argued that there was no reason to have a rule on the books that “everyone understands will not be enforced,” and that the goal of this proposal was to allow and show trust of students in keeping with this policy, rather than having a too-encompassing 25-foot ban.

**Karen Untereker** (sub for 2004) said that the 25-foot rule at least guaranteed people places to smoke. This, she said, would not, as anything could be a “common-sense no-smoking area.” Aaron added that his concern was that when someone violates the 25 foot rule slightly, they are at least still far enough away that the smoke still does not get into a building. With this rule, a violation means the smoke gets in.

Time ended and, with insufficient desire to extend debate, brought the letter to a vote.

*Sending the letter to Dean Roseman FAILED, 2-22-0.*
Posting Policy Proposal – a letter expressing Council’s recommendations based on its debate on the issue last week

The following letter containing Council’s recommendations about the Posting Policy to perhaps take effect next year, discussed in the meeting April 23rd, was drafted by Jim Irving (2005) and Jonathan Landsman (secretary):

Dear Dean Roseman,

College Council would like to thank you for informing us of your consideration of a new Posting Policy Proposal, and express our appreciation for your willingness to hear our ideas. This topic was raised at our meeting on April 23rd and it precipitated considerable conversation.

The consensus of our discussion was that the proposed Posting Policy, if applied to modes of communication besides campus mailings in Student Union boxes, would hurt campus life. Student activities and advocacy cannot thrive without effective publicity, which is the primary challenge to the success of student initiatives and events on any campus. For this reason, limiting the spaces in which posters could be put up was generally unpopular, as it would engender fierce competition between groups for limited advertising space. In the interests of fairly regulating use of limited space, Council approved of having all posted materials removed within seven days of the event, however it seemed unrealistic to expect student groups to remove their posters. Requiring compliance would double the efforts needed to advertise, as students would now have to travel around campus to put posters up and take them down, and this would thus limit advertising capabilities. Furthermore, a seven day policy seemed unenforceable, and very likely not to receive compliance.

The proposal's section mandating that each poster be identified with some person or group was met with mixed opinions. Some members felt that many students could be turned off to an event if they realized that a group they disliked was sponsoring it; others believed that such an choice is a personal decision, and favored the self-identification clause of the policy. However, this section of the proposal, too, seemed hard to enforce. In many cases, it would be difficult if not impossible to identify who was posting without identifying themselves.

Members did distinguish, however, between requirements applying to mailings to Student Union boxes and those applying to postings. Most members felt that it was reasonable to regulate mailings to a student's mailbox, as this is a semi-private space that he or she should have some control over.

In conclusion College Council cannot support the Posting Policy as proposed, though we do support the proposed clauses that regulate mail to Student Union boxes. We thank you for your continued consideration of our ideas and would enjoy hearing your response.

After corrections to punctuation; a comment from Karen Untereker (sub for 2004) that she, as somebody from outside of Council, felt that our position letters would be much more effective if shorter; a responding comment from a member saying, drily, “You should have been here for the room draw letter”; the letter came to a vote.

Sending the letter to Dean Roseman PASSED, 23-2-0.

College Council then adjourned at 8:30, with the intent of allowing its members to attend the Take Back the Night rally being held later that evening.

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

Marcos Sahm (Mark Hopkins) Mike Graham (Armstrong)
Hiteshwar Walia (Dodd Quad) Michael Leparc (Dennet)

Elizabeth Woodwick (Morgan-Lehman) came late enough to the meeting that the bylaws defined her as absent, but the secretary decided to pardon her due to the meeting’s being a half hour earlier with less than a week’s notice, and the fact that Liz emailed a satisfactory explanation for her lateness, and missed little of the meeting. Daniel Klasik (Bryant-Woodbridge) was excused for an absence due to a friend’s tragedy. These members’ absences will not count against them.
Mike Graham and Hiteshwar Walia now have two absences, and will lose their seats on
College Council if absent one more time this semester.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Landsman,
Secretary of College Council