• Approval of Minutes
  o Approval of Minutes for April 17, 2013
    ▪ Motion to Approve Minutes: Stefan
      • Absent: 2
      • Second: Brandon
      • Result: 21 – 0 - 0
        o Yes: 21
        o No:
        o Abstain:

• Approval of Funding Requests
  o Emily D: Presented budgets
    ▪ Lawufa: Asking for slightly more money – for train tickets and one car back to campus. More than last week.
    ▪ Men for Consent: For café for Date Week
    ▪ TNG: Should go to neighborhoods first – they have more money left over.
    ▪ Lit Review: Wanted them to come back with a new quote for 600 issues. Debate about how many issues they actually needed. Recommended block number they have to stay under.
    ▪ Telos: Asked us to support spring publication – double the production costs of Lit Review. Want them to do it for cheaper and do a fewer number of issues. Also Telos is over $1,000 in debt from last year – they overspent their account even though their allocation was lower. Part of a different discussion. So table for now.
    ▪ Sankofa: Were allocated less than usual for costumes. They kind of waited too long to do come with itemized budget. So kind of a mess, but I’ll sort it out. So table for now.
  o Erica: Spending 1/5 of remaining money on Lit Review?
    ▪ Emily: They are fairly popular and didn’t get a ton of money in the last semester.
    ▪ Motion to Approve Budgets as slate with further discussion on tabled items: April
      • Absent: 2
      • Second: Gia
      • Result: 21 – 0 - 0
        o Yes: 21
        o No: 0
        o Abstain: 0

• Debate Team Appeal
  o Emily D: First appeal. The debate team had two members go to worlds. Cost around $2,500. Money for entrance fee and two plane tickets. Earlier in the year, the debate team came to FinCom requesting money for this tournament. CC voted to allocate $0 for this request. Debate still has money left in their account, and they want to use this money to partially reimburse those who went to worlds.
    ▪ David Michael (Debate): We went to fewer tournaments because less freshman in the Fall. Debate had a need blind tournament to sent the
best team we could. Apparently CC voted to allow CC campus to vote on it. So I’m not sure that a vote to allocate $0 happened. Would like to be able to be reimbursed because we did not take into account ability to pay when selecting the team to go. Not asking for more money – just asking to spend money we have in a different way.

- Emily C: Sentiment was $0.
- David: Sentiment may have been $0, but not officially voted on. Could see it as entrance fee in place of entrance fees that we normally do.
- Emily D: When we made an allocation to the debate team, all the members were supposed to equally benefit. Allocating the test doesn’t really correspond to that.
- Max: Budget came to council in Nov. Sentiment in Council was concern about allocating so much of SAT to an event that would benefit so few people. It was tabled with the idea that it might be able to come back to Council. So it is perfectly valid for Debate team to come back, but the underlying issues are so there.
- Kate F: What I understand happened is that CC voted to approve that CC campus could vote to approve the budget over Spring break, but that is contingent on Hannah communicating with Krista and Peter that they were ready to vote on that request. The reason that was done was that there were time constraints, and we wanted to vote before we bought the tickets. So CC said if you get everything together, we’ll vote on allocation, and even help you find other sources, but the debate team did not contact us. Debate then bought the tickets with the assumption that they would be reimbursed later. This wasn’t something where it could be assumed that they would be reimbursed. There were a lot of reservations.
- Emily N: So is the debate team just asking to access funds that are in their accounts?
  - Emily D: Technically yes, but the money was allocated to things that we thought they were going to, but they didn’t. So they have the money, but it was allocated for different purposes.
  - Emily C: But we are all in agreement that it is cool if they have the dean’s money.
  - Emily D: Yeah, we don’t have control of that money.
- Emily C: Uncomfortable with money funding plane tickets, but not a problem with it funding entrance fee.
- David: The problem is that this is money that we spent as individuals.
- Emily N: Why aren’t we letting them use the money? We don’t do that with other groups.
  - Adrian: The problem is that they are not similar items that were substituted. And CC wasn’t in favor at the time. So we allocated money for the group, not for people in the group. And the sentiment in CC was not in favor at the time.
- David: Us going helped the rest of the debate team.
- Stefan: Is there any precedent for us funding worlds?
  - Ben: funded by old CC treasurer with no approval of Council
Kate: Retroactive reimbursement is not a good thing to do. We tried to reach out. And why is this coming up now? You’ve known that you’ve had the cost for months.
  David: It seems like the treasurer has been trying to get receipts.
  April: Treasurer is technically liable for all funding for all things in group. Any purchases made by group, have to be directly made by treasurer.
    Adrian: But people in actuality have wound up being personally liable.
    Kate: We are not liable to pay for it.
  David: We knew we had the money in our account though. It has taken us so long because we need the receipts.
    Kate F: Then how come the reallocation wasn’t done in the fall. You asked for more money.
    David: We were trying to do it the “right” way. And we were looking at all of our other options.

Brian: Sets a bad precedent.
Matt: Don’t think Council should be making students personally liable.
Jess: Agree – some students may not have the capability to pay
Adrian: This is a bad situation – it’s a big concern because it wasn’t going to be approved by Council, and if we do it for one groups, we have to do it for all groups
  Jess: Are clubs coming after looking to use money that they have – a little different situation in terms of where the money is coming from.
    April: We need to look at our bylaws. We don’t apply the precedent of not letting groups spend money on different things in their group.
    Emily: We compare similar things.
    April: This was also spent on an invalid expense without approval because we don’t fund plane tickets. If we don’t handle this in the right way, groups are going to personally exploit this.

David: Can we separate the airplane fees from the registration fees?
Abigale: Think dramatic difference
Motion to Allocate $1,025.84 for registration, strictly out of the group’s account, and $0.00 for travel: Kate
  Absent: 2
  Second: Emily D
  Motion to Amend the Motion to Remove “and $0.00 for travel”: David M
    Absent: 2
    Second: Jess
    Vote: 11 – 10 – 0
      Yes: 11
      No: 10
• Abstain: 0
• Vote: 11 – 7 – 3 (by Roll Call)
  o Yes: 11
  o No: 7
  o Abstain: 3

o Visit from Dean Bolton
  • Dean Bolton: Work about sexual assault and awareness committee – best practices for investigating and adjudicating sexual assault
    • If a student experiences a sexual assault there are two routes
      o Legal route – processed through legal system, investigation done through police and court
      o Route at the college – whether the student violated the college’s policies, results in college disciplinary action
    • Student can pursue both routes or one or the other
    • Brought together many groups – thinking about the best way to meet the primary obligations
    • Right now at Williams all cases are carried out in the same way – things come to the Dean + she makes the ultimate decision, all parties involved have right to appeal to Honor and Disciplinary Committee
    • Many schools (Williams included) have been thinking about if this is the best policy for sexual assault cases
      o Obligations around good investigation, privacy concerns, difficult for students to have experiences gone through in detail with Campus Safety officers that they will see around campus later – very painful and personal experience
      o Try a process where investigations are carried out a private personal investigator, becoming a common practice among peer schools – some concerns about having someone from the outside, but committee thinks that having investigators that speak to students could be an important improvement, investigators are usually trained
      o Downside: investigations could be slowed down, but committee thinks trade off is worth it
  • Another recommendation: the way decision making is done – having only Dean Bolton making decisions is concerning, also if the process goes into appeal the students’ accounts will be heard by 4 students and 4 faculty - this is also very difficult for both parties
  • Still tradeoffs since it is important to have the community invested in these kinds of things
  • Recommendations that the committee is moving towards: 3 administrative staff making initial decision, appeals process would be heard by 3 people (not students or faculty), and rather than having appeal be for any reason and a full rehearing, have
an appeal process that can happen when there is new factual information or a procedural error, can’t automatically have an appeal
  
• Need to think about how to effectively have transparency. Community has to be aware of what this group is doing. Need to keep track of how this is influencing reporting.
• Many details left for the committee to work out – will be writing recommendations soon

- Gia: If you were to bring in someone not affiliated with Williams to do investigations, would that be in case by case basis, or have one person continuously coming back?
  
• Dean Bolton: Want one person continuously coming back.
- Erica: Are there ever cases that are extremely time sensitive? How would that influence whether it is security or third party?
  
• Dean Bolton: Great question – in those urgent cases, I already retain the possibility of doing interim suspension or calling police, campus security...
  
  ○ Even now it is done in advance of the full investigation
  
  ○ And going to campus security wouldn’t necessarily be that much faster
- Erica: Who decides what is a valid appeal during the appeal process?
  
• Dean Bolton: Hasn’t been decided yet. Will probably be internal rather than external. Mix of people who have and haven’t heard the case.
- Ben F: Can you talk about timetable regarding external investigation vs internal investigation?
  
• Dean Bolton: Process of talking to everyone talks about 2 weeks. Case internally often takes 2 – 4 weeks. Finishing the process can take another 2 – 4 weeks. So all in all about a month. External investigations are often 45 – 60 days on other campuses. But students involved feel the privacy trade off is worth it.
- Ben F: Once we get the external reviewer, how long till he/she would begin work?
  
• Dean Bolton: Depends on person – want someone who will be able to quickly respond.
- Kate: What offices are involved in this? Just Dean?
  
• Dean Bolton: No – not anyone who is primary support role on campus (like health services or chaplains office or campus safety).
  
  ○ Rather people in student affairs, but not in three aforementioned groups
- David: How to tell who gets interim suspension if needed? Can that decision be appealed?
  
• Dean Bolton: Obligations are clearly defined by federal law. Have to offer change of housing and put in place no contact orders if asked for. Very clear under federal law that obligation
is to student who reports to have been assaulted. Interim suspension is slightly different – fairly rare.

- David: If students want just arbitration or mediation for sexual assault, is that still in option if requested by the person who was sexually assaulted?
  - Dean Bolton: Strongly discouraged by federal law – but often students who have experienced sexual assault would like change of housing and support or no contact and support
    - So our goal is to best help the student – sometime that means disciplinary processes and sometimes that means only support
- Max: Thank you so much for coming to talk with us

### Student Debt
- Max: Lucky to have Emily really looking closely at the budgets. And she has found that a lot of subgroups have overspent their accounts. So given the attention that Council has given to address these issues, we should look to address this.
- Emily: There are about 30 groups that are in the red. 2/3 of them have been problems for more than one fiscal year. The rest of them I’ve been in contact with and it’s mostly just waiting for other funding sources (except for one or two cases). So how am I to approach (and if necessary punish) groups that had debt that resulted from when they weren’t even members?
  - Groups have been spending more than we’ve allocated them and not correctly submit audit forms (which is grounds for censure).
  - Should groups with debt be allowed to ask for funding?
  - What is way to handle this?
- Kate: Can we cover this now, but then deduct this from what they get next year?
  - Adrian: The reason why we want to talk about this is that we technically can, but we are affecting next year’s groups. We have treasurer and treasurer training so that treasurers are responsible and liable for that debt.
  - Kate F: But the ones that are in debt from years ago are still a problem. Not fair to punish current treasure and doesn’t make sense to hunt down old treasurers.
- Max: One of my biggest concerns is inconsistency. Maybe the right solution is to have safety threshold, and then a standard procedure after, where they have to come and explain to council.
- Jess: Club is still supposed to be continuous. If club can’t provide service because of decisions they made, then that is the fault of the club.
- Stefan: The reason why every subgroup has a treasurer is that so this doesn’t happen. Just because treasurer graduated. We should not allow groups to go into the red.
- April: Former precedent: For past three years, if you overspent, you had that amount money deducted from next years allocation, plus 50 – 100% of what the overspending was. What I did last year was just used treasurers discretion if they were under $20. If they were over $20 I emailed the entire leadership of and said they had to come sort it out, but most did not.
- Ben F: How can this problem exist? How can they skip this process?
  - April: Often lack of continuity in groups? Often complicated when groups work with departments.
  - Emily D: No caps on p cards so they just overspend? I can’t oversee over everything.
- David: Why do we need a systematic response to this? Can’t we just look at this on a case-by-case basis? Don’t set up a procedure to induce claims.
- Kate: This has to stop now. We need to figure out the maximum at which we are covering the debt. Every other student group has to come and talk to us within the next 3 days and have meeting within the year, their club will be defunct.
  - Adrian: If you overspend, you pay for it.
  - Kate: Shouldn’t be afraid to come if a rational reason. We need a reason for them to come – we will shut down their department id if they don’t.
  - Max: We need to consider the logistics – would probably shut down 10 – 15 clubs.
  - Stefan: Really agree with Kate. Like the idea of a rule, and we’ll take appeals on a case-to-case basis. As long as we have the institutional memory we can do it effectively.
  - Ben: Maybe not do this through the mailboxes.
- Laura: Having been on the other end, you really need to have a system of accountability set in year by year.
- Clyde: Instead of getting rid of the club, we could censure them (maybe with stronger ramifications).
- Jesus: We cannot long organizations take advantage of us.
- Alphayo: No easy solution. People treat CC money different than their own money.
- Gia: Agree that not a good situation. Concerned about ramifications shutting down groups. We’re not going to look good. How will that impact people coming to us in the future? We should consider what will happen in the future.
- Jess: Williams College is made a richer place by clubs – problematic to shut down club. So should probably censure first.

**Motion to Extend Till 9:05:**
- David
  - Second: Clyde
  - Absent:
  - Result: 12 - 6 – 3
    - Yes: 12
    - No: 6
    - Abstain: 3
- Erica: Censure needs to have more teeth
- Emily N: Should remember we are dealing with our peers – should do appeals on a case by case basis
- April: Let’s integrate this with the audit process. Any group in debt could go through an audit process. Also, not all organizations in debt are entirely our organizations. We will have to work with MinCo on some of this.
- Teddy: Not shutting down a club, just freezing an account. Can’t just spend money that is not yours.
- Straw Poll: Should we start this now – should Emily sent a strongly worded email to old and new groups in debt (no bylaw yet that says we can freeze accounts)?
  - All in favor
- David: Some clubs, it may be good to actually shut them down. Should consider using surplus sweeps from other clubs to pay debt. Do we really have to pay negative balances? They are CC debts that we are carrying. The comptroller is not crazy about it.