

Students' Council Weekly Meetings
Minutes from 11/22/15

Members Present: Hunter, Jess, Jason, Claire, Jay, Emily, Deedee, Misael, Alana, Yan, Ian, Zach, Julia, Madeline, Dylan

Members Absent: Saumya, Tristan

Guests: Franklyn, Kristen, Deana

1. Moment of Silence

2. Franklyn Cantor talks about Smoking Policy

a. Introduced

- i. Last spring SC sent out a survey that included a section on smoking
- ii. Feedback from survey reflected that HC students would overwhelmingly prefer to live in smoke free environments but also want to preserve the right of people to smoke in certain places on campus
- iii. Since policy was created, there's been a challenge of making sure smoke free housing is actually smoke free and what to do when it's not
- iv. In May, started work on ways we can better change the status quo on campus to reflect the survey results (actual smoke free policy but still respecting people's rights)
- v. This Fall, started talking to Res Life committee to think about how we could change room draw to reflect what people want (accommodate range of everyone's needs and interests)
- vi. Need to have a conversation about perimeters around buildings (people should be able to enter and exit buildings without walking through cloud of smoke- general objections, health concerns)
- vii. President's office and senior staff are in process of talking about these issues
- viii. Student Council is ultimately responsible to determine the smoking policy (gave overview of the policy)
- ix. 2011 amendment: all 1st year residential buildings are smoke free spaces
- x. Res Life committee designates smoke free spaces (potentially expand this to let them also designate smoke friendly spaces and figure out perimeters around buildings- but this wouldn't be within the boundaries of the policy)
- xi. Signage- currently, choose housing in April, move in in September but sometimes it's hard to know what other buildings are smoke free- one of the components of whatever change does come is to have signage that clearly designates which buildings are smoke free or friendly

b. Questions/Feedback

- i. Rule is that if you smoke in a first year dorm it can potentially affect your housing for the next year- how does this work/is this being enforced? (answer: it's explained in the policy that if someone is smoking inside they should be confronted, process is detailed explicitly)
- ii. There's a difficulty with accountability surrounding smoking because you can smell it but that doesn't mean you know who it's coming from
- iii. Proposal is to reinforce the smoking policy as it is and specify housing designations more clearly so people can choose the best housing for them during room draw- smoke friendly housing (you can expect smoke here), smoke free housing (smoke is not allowed and should not be expected), smoke optional (dependent and trusting of students to communicate and come to an agreement- very flexible). Also, if issues arise we want to use DRPs
- iv. A lot of the major issues occur when you have people in smoking optional housing who do

smoke while others cannot be around smoke, and this clashes- idea is to make more smoke friendly housing to make the smoking optional housing more amenable to better conversations (get the heavy smokers out)- we need the mandate from SC to make smoke friendly housing

- v. Put together a survey to figure out smoke demand (we know who wants smoke free but we're trying to figure out who actually wants to smoke- not about giving them priority, just about making the standard smoke free) and which dorm makes the most sense- sending this out is the next plan of action
- vi. Probably one HCA, one Lloyd, and Lunt as the smoke friendly dorms
- vii. Possibly make the smoke friendly room draw a week or so ahead of the regular room draw
- viii. How will class years affect this whole process (as a rising sophomore there's a lot less choice in the matter when it comes to housing)? (answer: it depends on what dorms we pick. Ideally we could have a dynamic system where we have a survey every year to figure out which dorm makes sense that year for smoke friendly housing. Priority would remain the same as far as class years. Haven't actually discussed how we would implement this side of it that much. Also, want to make it so you can pass on smoke friendly housing without penalty)
- ix. If you're giving priority to smoke friendly by having it early, would smoking policy be more enforced in other dorms than it currently is? (answer: want to add an Honor Code agreement when people pick up their keys. We can't force people to abide by the rules it we have to trust them to- basically have them sign as a reminder of their responsibilities. We don't intend on having more active enforcement than already exists)
- x. As it currently stands, when you get smoke free housing you sign a sheet that says so
- xi. Would we have to do this through a plenary resolution or can we just reach consensus (answer: SC would have to consent- this would not have to go to plenary unless we feel that it needs to)
- xii. Why would we let those who want to smoke choose those dorms where they would want to be smoking- there are some dorms (like Lloyd 50s) that if they were smoke friendly would affect other dorms (Lloyd 40s and 60s) . (answer: we have to figure this out after looking at surveys. We aren't really letting them choose- we would only offer up those three dorms mentioned in (vi). We can't tell people they *have* to go to the smoke friendly housing so we're trying to gauge what they're interested in so the housing is desirable enough that the smokers actually live there)
- xiii. There are a lot of logistical questions here- what if smoke friendly housing isn't full- who goes there? Smitty and Nate have been thinking through these issues for a while
- xiv. Would this set back freshmen housing? (no- it would stay non-smoking. The signage would also be posted on freshmen housing, but we would not be offering smoke friendly housing to freshmen)
- xv. We would also work on getting good ventilation in whatever building(s) are designated smoke friendly
- xvi. Is this something that other institutions have done before or is this a revolutionary idea? (we are exceptional in the latitude that is granted to students to smoke. BMC went smoke free last year, most of our peer institutions are smoke free. Mostly it's mandated by state law but Pennsylvania doesn't have a law about it. Haverford used to have an application for smoking housing where you signed that you were going to smoke- this isn't a stretch for us. The only institutions Franklyn could find with a policy that even gets close to ours are Pomona and Claremont-McKenna)
- xvii. Can we focus a little more on the perimeter idea? (answer: we don't really have a timeline)

for that yet. The student process is totally self-contained in SC and ResLife committee. If the college is thinking about setting a perimeter for academic buildings, there are conversations underway with staff and faculty) -- our focus is on residential buildings right now

- xviii. Question for SC: do you want to grant ResLife more power to designate smoke free/friendly housing, or do nothing, or find another plan
- xix. In whatever publication we have informing about these changes we would reiterate that this applies to all kinds of smoking, burning, vaping, etc
- xx. Question about clarifying why we should make smoke friendly, not just smoke optional (answer: we already basically have the smoke optional housing, but we're getting a lot of complaints about how it has been hard to find a good compromise- see point (iv). We're trying to make these conversations easier by offering two more extreme options so the students in the middle don't have as difficult a time and can actually talk through it)
- xxi. Smoking is bad for you healthwise in the long term, and obviously we can't tell people what to do, but wouldn't putting all these heavy smokers in one place just aggravate the situation? (answer: yes- healthwise, this solution wouldn't be that great. But we can either value student health or value student choice, and we're choosing to value student choice. But if SC wanted to decide that there should be no more smoking on campus in residential buildings, that would be that- we can do that)
- xxii. We're not really sure where money would be coming from for some of these potential changes
- xxiii. This would hopefully cut down on secondhand smoke (if smokers are in smoke friendly housing)
- xxiv. People have to choose to live in smoke friendly housing, right? (answer: We are really hoping that we have enough demand to designate a dorm where everyone who is there opts in by choice)
- xxv. If one building for HCA ends up being smoke friendly, would potentially fill up top floor first before anyone is placed on the bottom floor
- xxvi. Would there still be any smoke optional housing under this plan? (answer: yes, we're planning on keeping the majority of housing smoke optional- we would just have probably one building that is smoke friendly)
- xxvii. This could seriously affect housing when people are applying in groups (but to some degree you already consider smoking when figuring out which friends you want to live with. We aren't sure of the extent to which these decisions are actually happening right now)
- xxviii. If someone's smoking marijuana, are you technically allowed to confront them because they aren't technically sober? (answer: no great solution because you might only be seeing them when they're high)
- xxix. Is there anything in the freshmen housing dorm about whether you smoke? (answer: no, because it's supposed to be smoke free so they just assume- this can create difficulties when you do have a freshman who is smoking. Currently it's stated that SC made all freshmen housing smoke free, and if we wanted to actually do anything we need to give ResLife more power. Do we want to ask if freshmen smoke, and how would this end up affecting their housing? Hopefully signage would help here, and we can also provide people with info and resources etc)
- xxx. All administrative and academic buildings are smoke free
- xxxi. Is there any way that ResLife can be a part of the process if it doesn't work out between two individuals who have a conflict over this? (answer: yes, we could potentially

work on that. The confrontation process definitely needs to be outlined more)

xxxii. What does smoke optional mean exactly? (answer: that it's not designated and people have to figure it out. Currently, if a single person does not want smoke, it should theoretically become smoke free- but that is not always an actuality)

xxxiii. Might want to talk to HCO co-heads about this so we have better communication to freshmen (to be perfectly honest, though, working on room draw is already a really big process and we're probably focusing on that right now)

3. President Updates

- a. Met with Jess Lord with Jess, Julia, and Yan
 - i. Did not meet with Jess Lord, meeting is now 3:30 Monday
- b. Meeting with SAAC on 12/2 to discuss athlete/non-athlete divide
 - i. We have been summoned
 - ii. We will try to work this out and have productive discussion

4. Co-Secretaries Updates

- a. Update Constitution with passed resolutions (from last Plenary)
- b. Facilities Fund
 - i. We have \$25,000
 - ii. Presidents meeting to figure out the next steps
 - iii. Co-Secretaries are chairs of committee and all of class reps and class officers are on committee

5. Appointments Committee Updates

- a. No appointments anymore
- b. Still clearing up old stuff
- c. No progress on elections software

6. Budgeting Updates

- a. Had a meeting with Mike- trying to figure out digital process (clubs' treasurers have debit card sand we see when the spend money
- b. It seems like it might make sense to open a third budgeting period (people are not necessarily enthusiastic about this idea). It would probably be halfway through next quarter
- c. If we made it digital we could see who wasn't using money and rebudget as we see fit
- d. It is a debit card to a bank account so if they do not use the money then it is easy to get that money back for rebudgeting.
 - i. They would likely not give out 120 debit cards for security reasons
 - ii. How else could money be spent? We can't really give them cash
 - iii. We have to find out from the bank what the deal with this actually is
- e. Office hours will be spent focusing on this and making sure they buy what they asked for.
- f. We can keep track of receipts but they do not always bring the receipts (this is the problem, and it's on them)
- g. We have not had to enforce the 30 day rule yet
 - i. They end up bringing the receipt eventually
- h. There has already been a lot of surplus money
- i. People should know what to do, but still don't follow guidelines
- j. Should we group club (pre-professional, special interest, club sports, etc) and have set number of debit cards that a club can check out for a given day?
 - i. How do Donkeys, for example, pay coach if they only have debit card
 - ii. How do you factor what you don't pay with a debit card?
 - iii. If we find another way to track budgets, debit cards would not be necessary
 - iv. It would be terrifying to have hundreds of SC debit cards floating around

- v. There are already clubs (like QB) that have their own bank accounts but it doesn't make sense for every club to do it this way
- k. Idea is for one central account (under SC) with each club having a sub-account that they manage
 - i. We tried this with Lunt Cafe and it took 2 hours at the bank
 - ii. Would have to come in with every club individually and would take far too long
- l. Most important piece is that we have money rolled over into next year because clubs do not spend could be used this year
- m. If we have access to money at the end of the semester we can use it for stuff we need now (we currently need two soundboards)
- n. Other schools should be contacted to see what they do- we are old-fashioned here
 - i. Contact schools of similar size such as Swat, Vassar, Williams, Middlebury
 - ii. We are special as far as budgeting goes (in that there is little to no administrative oversight)

7. Officer Updates

- a. Academics
 - i. No updates
- b. Arts
 - i. No updates
- c. Athletics
 - i. People hated the survey- Jess got interrogated about SAACs (Student Athlete Advisory Committee so then they summoned the Presidents to come meet), as they were concerned about what the survey touched on and why there wasn't more communication between groups
 - ii. Going forward: meeting with Jess Lord, follow up survey for non-athletes about extracurriculars, goal is to have better communication and to address the issues
 - iii. Discussed trends from the survey
- d. Campus Life
 - i. Going to have another transportation meeting after Thanksgiving break
- e. Multiculturalism
 - i. Been doing a lot of work with Solidarity Collective and have set up meetings with the SAO, the OMA and the CCPA talking about diversity initiatives
 - ii. Still making plans for Rufus Jones MLK Day of Service, getting in contact with facilitators, etc

8. Class Year Reps

- a. 2016
 - i. Supposed to have meeting a week and a half ago
 - ii. Trying to extent grants and fellowships to graduating seniors
 - iii. Only talked to Dean Watters so far
 - iv. All chopsticks are wrapped in paper (sanitation issue) so we were discussing whether we need chopsticks and if they should be put in a dispenser
- b. 2017
 - i. Transportation things are moving forward
 - ii. Getting good at writing checks (Ian has terrible handwriting)
- c. 2018
 - i. Emailed about 3 S project, should be getting an update very soon
- d. 2019
 - i. Tomorrow we are finalizing First Year Dean's Council and getting new members

- ii. Meeting with Jess Lord upcoming
 - iii. Movie night went very well (The Proposal)
- 9. Non-Officer Updates and Comments
 - a. Answer email by Santa's Little Helper/Ian!
 - i. People have not responded- there is a great deal of confusion (nobody has responded)
 - b. If you want to use banner paper to advertise for an event, email Claire
 - c. Officers to meet with Co-Presidents after SC meeting or during office hours
- 10. Moment of Silence