• Call to Order
• Minutes
  o Motion to Approve Minutes: Jake
    ▪ Second: Emily N
    ▪ Result: 22 – 0 – 1
• Sanctions Committee
  o Teddy: Deals with Student groups. Mostly for hazing. Instead of it going straight to the administration.
    ▪ Multi step process for complaint to be lodged against group.
      • Formal warning. Meeting for all of group where they talk about what went wrong and make sure that they understand the issues.
      • Possible CC Censure.
      • Suspension of Charter
        o Needs ¾.
      • Revocation of Student Organization Charter
        o Need ¾
        o May not ever be a group on campus.
          ▪ Only in the most extreme of circumstances.
    ▪ Dean resolves the right to veto any decision. The sanctions committee only deals with student groups. It will work like FinCom in that they will provide a recommendation to CC and we will talk about the correct option and have the final vote.
      • Adrian: Dean Bolton has said that she will largely defer to the committee. Also not adding or removing any power from CC – it’s only formalizing things that we could always do.
  o Jess: Don’t like the idea of putting a club out of existence permanently. Because hazing is largely in regards to context and personal members. It’s not so much institutional. Also isn’t hazing predominately sports teams?
    ▪ Teddy: No. That is a common misconception.
  o April: Are we setting the bar for hazing far too low? Are we punishing things that are fairly innocent?
    ▪ Adrian: Yes, that is why we wanted to create the committee. So that there would be student opinion and we could offer a greater student perspective on a school policy that we can’t really control.
  o Jake: Has there been any talk about including varsity leaders in this process? Should we have the conversation with SAAC?
    ▪ Teddy: Right now we are only working with CC groups in terms of groups who we might sanction. Varsity athletics are also working the Deans.
Max: Athletics is already doing a lot of this. We’re just trying to bring students up to start doing that type of thing.

April: Seems unfair to revoke club’s forever. Punishing those who had no relation.
  - Teddy: Can still reform group later with a different name, different institutions... will just be disconnected with the old groups.
  - Adrian: We were also told that we have to include this.
    - Kate: The way I interpret this is that it’s not about what this club does, it’s about the specific organization.
    - Emily C: The ambiguity of the word Charter may be making us confused.

Emily N: Why does this deal with groups only, instead of individuals? How would we deal with punishing whole group vs punishing “bad eggs”?
  - Adrian: We only deal with student groups, so we aren’t as concerned with individuals because we don’t have jurisdiction. We’re mostly looking at hazing.

Jake: A little concerned that, you can come back as another club isn’t in writing, and also that some clubs may not be able to come back under a new name. Could we give future CC the power to review it down the road?
  - Adrian: We don’t want to say explicitly that you can, but we also didn’t say you can’t. So hopefully give that freedom.
  - Jake: But will that be clear in 10 years?
    - Jesus: Danger to having it so ambiguous.
    - Gabe: Need to make sure that we have records of this for future council.

Jess: Would like to remove the expulsion section.
  - Teddy: We can’t do that. Dean Bolton told us that we must have, and right now, if we want student involvement in this at all, we must do it this way.
    - Kate: Remember that CC votes on all of this.

Motion to Pass Sanctions Committee Bylaw: Kate
  - Second: Victoria
  - Motion to Vote to Vote: Jess
    - Second: April
    - Result: 21 – 1 – 1
  - Result: 17 – 5 – 1 (Bylaw Passes)

CEP
Lee Park: CEP oversees curriculum at the college. We are trying to start looking at how students make curriculum choices in general. Are they taking advantage of liberal arts curriculum?

Melinda: Looking at increasing trend in double majoring. Trying to find the cause. Want thoughts of Council and student body as we make decisions going forward.

- What part of the academic process causes stress and anxiety for students?
  - Adrian: Choosing a major when you don’t know what you want to major in. Several students chose a second major b/c they had the courses for it, and felt it was a common phenomenon.
  - Caroline: Also a lot of prerequisites. Could be good if there were clearer paths and optimal paths for all students.
  - April: Pressure to double major. Maybe we shouldn’t be as fixated on it.
  - Ellen: Right now just the layout of requirements and class options is very confusing. Maybe a small tangible thing that could be done.
  - Jess: More emphasis on exploration.
  - Teddy: Are advisors given any kind of suggestions on how to be a good advisor? Seems like some professors may not be as involved?
    - Melinda: We were also curious about the general curricular advisory system – how upperclassmen, JA’s, advisors... helped
      - Dan: Not a big fan of advising at Williams. Really random based on whether you have a good one or a bad one. Some just sign off.
      - Adrian: Also seem to have a problem with major advising.
    - Kate: A lot of that is department specific. Also shouldn’t assume that double majoring is only bad, or that it is anti-liberal arts.
      - Prof Park: Not entirely focused on double majoring. Talking about exploring curriculum in general. Perception that you can only do
it if you get a “tag” for it.

- Adrian: You are afforded specialized privileges being in formalized relationship with the department.

- April: Would like to increase the opportunities for nonmajors? Our culture for advising works really well for some, but some really slip through the cracks. Could also be integrated with the Career Center. We should have great advising considering our low student to faculty advisor ratios. Should be holistic between career and academic.

  - Emily C: Some of these are relationships are happening but not as formalized. Also would like to talk more about Gaudino options.
    - Caroline: Maybe we could have students serve as advisors.
    - Lucas: Majority of entry met very little with faculty advisor. Relyed more on informal upperclass advisors and JAs.

  - Teddy: What about allowing coaches to serve as informal advisors? They spend so much time with the students.

  - Victoria: Have a good advisor, but still find the process confusing. Having trouble knowing what I need to do.

  - Emily C: There are some pressures that are just the nature of liberal arts colleges. Williams Alumni network are best at dealing with that.
• Jake: As a JA, felt unprepared to serve as an academic advisor. Also didn’t really have relationship with my frosh’s professors to function in that role.
• Teddy: Are real reasons/concerns about double majoring, especially for international students.
  • Ali: Often stress with prerequisites.
    o Ellen: A lot of the reasons why you don’t branch out as early. Most interesting upper level classes are blocked by prerequisites.
  ▪ Melinda: Are division requirements helpful? Or are they limiting?
    • Nicholas: Diversity requirement seems very inconsistent. Why some classes are and some classes aren’t. Feels contrived.
      o Professor Park: We worked on that last year – we are looking at it, but we have kind of moved past it.
    • Dan: Felt divisional requirements got in the way of taking that classes that I was into.

• Budgets
  o Kinetic: Think tank. Getting money from other sources.
  o QSU: Money for event. Met all criteria.
  o Williams Homeless Outreach: New group. A few technical issues in the budget. Double counted some stuff, and had for budget for too many weeks. Working with homeless children.
  o Belly Dancing: Hoping to replenish stocks of costumes. But we’re getting enough from other sources to fund their required sources.
  o Williams For Life: Going to a conference about life and fidelity. Includes registration fees. Nothing to cut.
  o Law Society:
    ▪ Mediation: Miscalculation for lodging that we fixed.
    ▪ General Expenses: Found lesser cost items. Recommended they look at other sources for funding for food for faculty student event.
    ▪ Mock Trial: Already funded some of this in subgroup.
  o Williams Christian Fellowship: Wanted to go to Fall Conference and Year End Retreat. We thought lower numbers of people would attend based on historical amounts of people that would go.
    ▪ They also didn’t come for subgroup.
  o Photo Club: Large sum requested with a considerable amount of repeat items from last year. CC protocol is that we don’t refund stuff that we
already gave them money to purchase. Only allocating stuff that we didn’t allocate for last year.

- Most of the things they purchased instead were actually okay purchases that we would have funded. So yes bad, but not as bad as it could be. Groups can do that, but then we have the discretion not to fund them.

- Lehman Council: Cut some of their funding for events in terms of food. We also already funded a lot of this stuff during subgroup. Also some errors in the spreadsheet. Also wanted money for a fund through which they could fund things.

- Jess: Why do we cut some teams/people who can go and not others?
  - Kate: Not a comparable scenario. Based on their estimated attendance and what we think the attendance would be at the previous event.

- Motion to Approve Budgets as a Slate: Jake
  - Second: ?
  - Result: 20 – 0 – 3
  - Abstain: Jess – Kinect, Olivia – Belly Dancing, Emily N – QSU

- Superfan
  - Adrian: Last year, CC passed a resolution saying Superfan would be given a budget to do as they wished with. Right now we are talking about funding the fall and winter season.
  - Emily D: Trying to be cognizant of the amount of money that CC has left. FinCom decided to make a recommendation. Want SuperFan to be more about getting people to the game.
    - Kate: Would actually like to cut more. Think it should be a greater effort to get all of this stuff.
    - Kate (SuperFan): Trying to create more of an identity for SuperFan. Based on having a huge percentage of people having the shirts. Tanks are supposed to be further incentive that no one has.
    - Kate F: Could the deans as an extra funding source?
  - Jake: May make more sense to focus on just one thing and blanket with that?
  - Kate F: Should look at other ways of increasing variety other than just giving away different things.

- Motion to Allocate Sunglasses and T-shirts to SuperFan and we will have conversation about the rest next week: Jake
  - Second: ?
  - Result: 23 – 0 – 0

- Extra Budgets
  - Motion to Allocate money for YANA: April
    - Second: Jess
• Result: 23 – 0 – 0
  o Motion to Allocate money for NYT (25 weekday copies and 10 weekend): Emily D
    ▪ Second: Jess
    ▪ Result: 21 – 0 – 2
  o Motion to Extend Meeting by 5 Minutes: Emily C
    ▪ Second: Jake
    ▪ Result: 23 – 0 – 0
  o Consulting Club: Need money for this guy by Tuesday. We can fund know, CC campus can fund it, or we cannot fund it.
    ▪ April: They have gone everywhere. We should fund it.
      • Kate: We can have creative solutions but we are still committed to funding it.
      ▪ Emily: Think it is too much to fund.
      ▪ Jess: Think we should support the event.
    ▪ Motion to Extend Meeting by 5 Minutes: Emily C
      • Motion to Vote to Vote: Kate
        ▪ Result: 15 – 5 – 0
        ▪ Result: 11 – 9 – 0
      ▪ Motion to Allocate $0 to Consulting Club: Kate F
        ▪ Result: 11 – 6 - 3
  • URLAAC
    o Talked about quiet housing. Went through all of the places to see what was more/less attractive than Tyler.
    ▪ West residents: Just getting involved in this discussion now. Are a number of reasons relating to why students decide to live in quiet housing. Seems not fair to moving them to Tyler just because they are prevented in some way from living in normal housing.