This is a preliminary draft of the minutes (transcript). The finalized minutes will be published later this weekend.

CALL TO ORDER: 7:02PM

ROLL CALL: Peter Skipper ’13 (absent)

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. TED-Talk
   b. Great Ideas Campaign
   c. Broomball
   d. Memory Guides
   e. Faculty/Staff Member of the Year

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
    Approval of Minutes for January 5, 2013.

    Motion to Approve: Rani Mukherjee ’15 (Wood Board Rep.)
    Second: April Jenkins ’14 (proxy)
    Vote: 24-0-0

III. FUNDING REQUESTS
     Presentation, and approval, of funding requests for the week.

     Motion to Approve (General): Adrian Castro ’14 (Secretary)
     Second: Rani Mukherjee ’15 (Wood Board Rep.)
     Vote: 24-0-0

     Motion to Approve (Great Ideas): Katie Holmes ’13 (Class of 2013 Rep.)
     Second: Corey Michon ’16 (Armstrong/Pratt Rep.)
     Vote: 24-0-0

IV. WSO/FACTRAK
    There has been recent discussion on FacTrak and how helpful it is to students. Should the WSO moderators remove student posts after a certain number of years to ensure that the posts accurately represent recent sentiments and teaching styles?

V. DINING SERVICES UPDATE
    Presentation by the awesome Dining Services leaders and update on Lee After Dark!
**VI. SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION**

Student members of the Sexual Assault Prevention working group chaired by Dean B will stop in, as we focus in on the specific issue of the investigation process for cases of reported sexual assault: who should do the investigating? Should we considering bringing in outside experts for Williams cases? Should we create an incidents-response position? Should we stay with the current model, where Security and the Dean of the College do the investigating?

**Krista Pickett ’13 (Co-President) began by stating that the topic for this conversation is the process of investigation when a sexual assault is reported on campus. As it stands, Campus Safety and Security and Deans do the investigation, but also serve as a support role. When looking at other similar schools, they bring in outside people to help with the investigating to retain the connection between student and staff member. The Committee has discussed the pros and cons of this and wants Council’s input.**

To elaborate on the reporting process, the Dean currently hears the case and comes up with a decision. If either party wants to appeal, the Honor Committee would then decide on the case. Students would play a role in making a judgment only in the case of appeals. Appeals, though, are very rare.

**Tyler Sparks**, member of the Honor and Discipline Committee, explained that there are four faculty members and four students on the Discipline Committee, who all go through training for these types of issues as well. At the moment, they have cases in the pipeline with regards to sexual assault.

**Max Heninger ’14 (Currier Board Rep.) asked for clarification on the way the investigation period works. Marissa Thiel, co-coordinator of RASAN and member of the Mental Health Committee, explained that the Dean and CSS meet with both parties involved and anyone else they feel is relevant. From there, the circle widens and more people become involved in the case. Finally, a written report is presented. Abby Davies ’13, co-coordinator of RASAN, added that unfortunately, the numbers that get reported are lower than the cases that actually happen. It’s hard to report because of the stigma attached. The thought was that the bringing in an external investigator would help with this and create a distinction between on campus people and off campus. Krista jumped in and added that other schools saw an increase in reporting with this system.**

April Jenkins ’14 (proxy) asked if there was a difference in action from reporting to the Dean and WPD. **Abby** responded that the school only hands out disciplinary action (ex. removal from school). When the police get involved, it results in lawful action. Students typically prefer on campus because it is also
Krista added that this is something the Committee is working hard on to get right. Reporting is obviously difficult, so supporting survivors is at the core of what they're doing. Unlike some colleges that legally require administrators to file a police report, Williams doesn't force this upon anyone.

VII. HONOR COMMITTEE DISCUSSION
Continued discussion on the problem that the Honor Committee is currently facing (with regards to number of cases per number of members on the Committee), why this is suddenly a much bigger problem, and how we can live up to our "Honor Code institution" status.

Krista Pickett '13 (Co-President) began by stating that this year, there have been four times the number of incidents of academic dishonesty. The first issue with this is that it is an unsustainable time commitment for the members of the Committee. Secondly, does this point at a larger problem at Williams?

James Elish '13, chair of the Honor and Discipline Committee, and Tyler Sparks '15, member of the Committee, were in attendance.

James began by giving a breakdown of the committee and how the process works:
- Comprised of students and faculty members
- A quorum (of 2/3) is required for all meetings
- Format of hearings:
  - The student chair (James) meets with the students to allow them to answer any questions at all
  - Once committee members are present, the Dean and the Professor(s) enter before student. Then, student will enter room.
  - Next, evidence is presented and the professor walks through the allegation. Following that, the professor is questioned.
  - Following that, the student can address the Committee and the professor, followed by the departure of the prof. This allows for the students to address the Committee sans the professor to allow them to bring anything else up.
  - The Committee then deliberates. There are three questions asked are 1. What is the nature of the allegation and is it a violation, 2. Did the student commit the violation and 3. What is the recommendation to the Dean?
  - After the meeting is over, James meets with the student and lets them know what happens. They don't want students to wait. A week or so later, the disciplinary measure is given.

James added that he believes the procedure itself shouldn't change (splits the difference quite well). The system has worked well in past years when they had the
"normal" amount of cases. But, perceptions of the Honor Code need to change. Students—most of the time—appreciate the expediency and the process itself (informal nature of it), so that needn’t change. It becomes an issue if the year continues on the way it has, with 3% of student body is guilty. That means 4-5% of the student body that actually cheats isn’t. It strikes at the question of whether or not we can be an Honor Code institution and how we value academic honesty. Most Williams students probably don't cheat, but even so, there are certain things that go along with an Honor Code institution: 1. Everyone is honest with themselves, 2. Honest with professors (no prof. supervision), 3. Intellectually accountable to others. Most students don't report, which is the part of the code that is often broken. There is a communal appreciation at schools like Davidson and Swarthmore, which isn't present here.

Tyler: Last year, an overwhelming majority were freshmen. This year, roughly 15% were freshmen. James: There are a couple structural changes. For ex., the way we sign the honor code. They want to eliminate ignorance as a defense. Maybe, students can go through a program. Also, students should have to sign a physical document.

Corey: At other schools, they celebrate the HC. Could they talk to schools to look at that pride?

Tyler: Some schools have an Honor Code day.

Jessica: Are there different gradations, or is plagiarism plagiarism?

James: Try to look at each case differently and don’t go into cases with a set repertoire of questions. There are things that violate the HC, but it would be Draconian to punish by failing. They do use lesser penalties when called for. Students are typically surprised that even a lazy paper may result in a failure in the course.

Jessica: Should we be realistic and not give take home exams, for example, or consider them differently?

James: Students don’t realize that our professors are suspicious of us. Students are largely unaware of students, but fans aren't. We may see fewer take home exams this upcoming semester. As an academic community, do we want them to be academics and critics? It would be a mark if we can't do this anymore. We need to police one another.

Harry: What is the process of recusal? And, with the increase of cases and members, is there an anticipated in number of recusals?

James: Every time they have a case, they give committee members present to recuse themselves. Those who feel there is a conflict of interest are able to excuse themselves. The problem, though, is that they know everyone. You recuse yourself if you're directly linked with them (high standard). In response to second question, there hasn't been an increase with number of recusals and wouldn’t anticipate this being a problem.

Carrie: Is the use of prescription focus aids a violation? Since illegal, how is this seen?

James: Realistically, they have to think about how the case would come forward. Professors wouldn't be able to tell, so they'd have to rely on the student body to do it. If they see a case like this, it would be seen by them.

Ben A: The idea of signing something is a start, but not perfect. What about transcribing a text?

James likes the idea.

Gia: Entry is a good place.

Max: Class signing.

VIII. INSTITUTION OF SUPERFAN PROGRAM
Preliminary discussion about College Council’s SuperFan program, ways to institute this successful program, and overall talk about the best way to make this program sustainable.

IX. **STAFF APPRECIATION DAY UPDATE**
Brief update on the status of the upcoming Staff Appreciation Day in February and solicitation of self-noms to work on this great project.

X. **COMMUNITY MATTERS: THE SOCIAL SCENE**
This is obviously a topic that we as CC hear a lot about/fund/and so on. What do we, as elected representatives, need to get out of this conversation? Which questions should we ask? Who should we specifically reach out to, in addition to ACE, to be there?

XI. **ROOM DRAW**
Gail Rondeau of OSL is looking to put together a panel about Room Draw so that students who are entering it for the first time will know what to expect. There are many questions surrounding the process and it can obviously be very stressful. She asked that I get student input on what would be useful. What do students need to know about Room Draw, how can we communicate, and who should do it?

XII. **ARTS EXPO/COMMUNICATIONS LIAISON UPDATE**
Rani Mukherjee ’15, a member of this brand new CC committee, will hopefully stop by to recap plans for the Arts Expo and to update/answer questions about the way Communications tells 'the Williams story.'

XIII. **OPINIONS@WSO.WILLIAMS.EDU**

XIV. **OPEN TIME**

**ADJOURNMENT**