1. Call to Order

- Attendance
  - Present
    - Jon Stanhope
    - Gillian Mak
    - Ramisa Tasnim
    - Jake Engelman
    - Max Kohn
    - Lilly Pieper
    - Noam Barnhard
    - Kureem Nugent
    - Marquis Palmer
    - Zach Oscar
    - Ysabel Coss
    - Jonathan Kirshenbaum
    - Casey Codd
    - Max Phillipps
    - Harry Dubke
    - Cesar Guerrero
    - Ben Katz
    - Jodan D’Addio
    - Nadav Konforty
    - Julian Perricone
    - Keith Ruggles
    - Gianni Hill
    - Elizabeth Groubert
    - Amanda Kim
    - Jiin Jeong
    - Maria Valencia
    - Diana Perez
    - Eseosa Asiruwa
  - Excused
    - Nani Suzuki
    - Molly Clark
  - Absent
    - Jack Fischman

2. Public Comment Period
Gwyn Sise, Katherine Barnes and Phoebe Keyes:

Gwyn Sise: Hi! Some of you may know us, I’m Gwyn Sise, I’m a junior, this is Phoebe Keyes, also a junior, and Katherine Barnes, a sophomore. First, we’d like to thank Student Assembly for allowing us to speak here tonight about a pressing issue on our campus, and on campuses all over the country. We’ve come to the assembly to address the issue of how speakers are brought to campus and why. As many of you know, Dr. Paul Gottfried was invited by AHI to campus to speak in two classes in two separate departments. For those who do not know, Dr. Paul Gottfried coined the term the ‘Alt-Right’ and has close ties to the Alt-Right. He’s said and written many racist things that directly contradict the message and mission of the College. I won’t repeat them again - if you’ve seen the posters we hung up around KJ you probably know them. We organized a silent and respectful protest outside the two classrooms Dr. Gottfried spoke in, and as we spoke to people about it, it was brought to our attention that students in the classes and the student branch of the AHI were unaware of Dr. Paul Gottfried’s work, and in some cases, did not know he was coming to campus until two days before the events. In addition, the lectures Dr. Paul Gottfried gave were in closed events and were required for those students in the classes. This is an issue for a list of reasons, mainly because it was done quietly, without any student input and integrated a rhetoric of hate into the curriculum.

We have come to student assembly because we believe that there should be a process in place for bringing speakers to campus. If a professor or an on-campus or off-campus organization wants to bring a speaker, there must be steps taken to ensure that speakers and their events are appropriate and thoughtful. Dr. Paul Gottfried coming to campus should have had student input, allowed those in the classes to leave, and most importantly should have been an open, all campus event that would have allowed for students to properly engage with, challenge and dismiss Dr. Paul Gottfried’s violent rhetoric. Rethinking how we do this isn’t an issue of free speech - in fact, the event and the way it was constructed discouraged open discourse around the issues. How are we to directly challenge this man and his ideas if he is only speaking behind closed doors and to small groups of students? If we must bring hateful opinions to this campus, bring them into the light. Let more of us decide how it happens - not just one professor who happens to share many of these beliefs.

We are not arguing that a majority of students, or even close to that, has to approve a speaker before they are allowed to come. We just want students to be able to give input on who teaches them. Forcing students to listen to a hateful person speak for academic credit is ridiculous and unnecessary. We want transparency, and we want a say. Here are some ideas we have to address this issue:

Notify the whole campus about outside speakers at least 1 week in advance.

Have small, diverse groups of students who are consulted about potential speakers.
If a speaker is brought to speak in a classroom, the students should be provided with adequate background on the speaker and their beliefs. Students should have the option to challenge the ideas of the speaker without fear of repercussions from the professor.

If a speaker can be considered to have extreme or polarizing views, they should be brought to campus for an open event (if students so choose), or there should be an open forum for discussion about the speaker or with the speaker in which anyone can come and challenge.

Organizations not directly affiliated with the College should be required to:

- Get permission from Hamilton College before pursuing bringing the speaker in.
- Get permission from the whole department that this speaker would be lecturing for/in.
- Have students voice their opinion on whether this speaker should be brought to campus or not.

We come to Student Assembly, not to silence differing opinions on this campus, but rather to prioritize student agency in the classroom and create an environment of discourse.

- **Conor O’Shea:** I was wondering how this proposal would relate to the contents of the syllabus. In both cases, the professor is choosing to bring material in for students to consume as part of their education. Should students and the campus at large have the same opportunity to challenge what the professor can put on one individual class syllabus? That seems to start getting pretty far down a slippery slope.
  - **Gwyn Sise:** A syllabus is provided to students at the beginning of the course. In this case this was something that was done two weeks prior.
  - **Conor O’Shea:** Were they not discussing this in class? This lecture isn’t operating in a vacuum; there’s surely no moratorium on discussion of the Gottfried lecture in subsequent class discussions.
  - **Katherine Barnes:** With this instance it was very different, a lot of students in the Modern Conservative Politics class were very surprised and were not informed about the speaker. Having a book on the syllabus is already informing the class versus bringing in a speaker. We heard some students challenged Dr Gottfried, and some felt more comfortable challenging Gottfried before talking to us protestors outside.
Conor O’Shea: So the big thing you’re concerned about is having enough time in advance to essentially ‘vet’ and discuss the merits of a speaker?

Landis Hagerty: There’s a difference between reading their work and inviting them to campus. Having dinner, drinks, etc. is somewhat celebratory and honorific of them. There is something about inviting an academic to campus, that this person is worth engaging with. I think it is a much greater step than “hey we are going to read this academics work.”

Ben Katz: Quickly on Landis’s points, the AHI and College do not have an official relationship. Secondly, although the appearances held by Dr. Gottfried could have been advertised better, they were open to all of campus, and Professor Kelly was extremely welcoming to visiting students in History 314 (Nazi Germany). It is unfair to say these events were closed to the public.

Katherine Barnes: It was open to the public in a narrow way, there was only so many open seats for students to come in. Having 10 extra students does not make it public.

Phoebe Keyes: The professors were very hostile towards on when we were protesting. We had one professor who was straight up yelling at us.

Ben Katz: I’m not sure about that specific professor, but Professor Kelly was very encouraging in the class I had with him.

Phoebe Keyes: It was the professor from MCP who was yelling at us.

Zach Oscar: I can’t speak officially on this but my understanding is that the AHI is an organization that is separate from Hamilton, so part of the discussion needs to be about whether an organization that isn’t part of Hamilton should be able to bring a speaker to campus if the campus does not want them. Professor Paquette brought Paul Gottfried, so it goes back to issues about the AHI. I think your goals are good ones but we need to be specific.

Gwyn Sise: Whether the AHI is affiliated or not with Hamilton it was a class for Hamilton students.

Noam Barnhard: There have been plenty of times where a professor has given out an article a couple days before class. Since that won’t be on the syllabus and will be on short notice, would it fall under your request to have it be approved before students are required to read it?

Katherine Barnes: With articles not on the syllabus, professors are sending out the articles to have a discussion on it. When you send out an article it is
purposefully to have a discussion about that article. My assumption is that this speaker won’t really be talked about in class.

- **Phoebe Keyes:** With an article you have an idea where it is coming from. Paul Gottfried on the other hand was simply advertised as an expert.
- **Noam Barnhard:** I strongly disagree with that assumption, I think the classes will talk about it. Also, if you don’t know where an article is coming from you can look at the sources. The students could have researched Gottfried before he came. Students should have some responsibility to make themselves aware of the information they are being presented with.
- **Phoebe Keyes:** That is a huge part about what we are advocating for, student agency.

- **Harry Dubke:** First, thanks for coming in. I will say that I like what you are saying about transparency and student participation. I do think you do need to draw a clear line. A lot of speakers will be brought in on short notice. That professors can bring speakers in on short notice is a great thing about a school like Hamilton. There are undoubtedly hateful speakers out there but I wonder how we draw the line of what is extreme and thus needs approval from some committee? And how do you draw a line without mucking it up for other speakers. It is a difficult process.
  - **Gwyn Sise:** It's not to say we don't think professors can't bring in speakers that I don't agree with, but if there’s a controversial speaker there should be an open forum that encourages open discourse.
  - **Harry Dubke:** My Himalayan mountain class bough in an engineer from Nepal for a short talk but I don't think that, for example, would be something that necessarily requires an all campus public forum. How would you implement what you're saying?
  - **Gwyn Sise:** These are loose ideas but we are talking about political speakers, and it doesn’t seem that a speech by a Himalayan engineer from Nepal would be particularly political.

- **Keith Ruggles:** I recognize and understand that a more public forum could be useful but we are falling into a situation where there are controversial speakers who are more celebrated.

- **Katherine Barnes:** The Govt department did send an email saying they had no idea Paul Gottfried was coming. Having more knowledge for the whole department would be nice. I don't think it would increase pomp and circumstance if there was to be a public event. It
would create discourse and facilitate conversation. How can the college want us to do it through Common Ground but then not give us an opportunity to do it when controversial speakers come to campus?
  - **Gwyn Sise**: We don't want these views to go unchallenged.
  - **Margaret Riordan**: Speaking about verbal harassment of a professor, which is what the MCP professor yelling at you probably is, has that been reported to the administration?
    - **Gwyn Sise**: Not yet.
    - **Phoebe Keyes**: We understand that he is a fellow of the AHI and a guest lecturer this semester.
    - **Margaret Riordan**: Is he a professor?
    - **Katherine Barnes**: Yes.
    - **Margaret Riordan**: I think it is important to talk about this especially in terms of power dynamics because professors have a lot of control over your future at Hamilton, in terms of recommendations and other things.
  - **Ben Katz**: I don't know if Hamilton has the resources to have open public forums for every speaker. The college many not have the resources to take on controversial speakers if you need them to have big public forums, especially when considering how students have reacted at schools like U.C. Berkley to conservative speakers. They dumped like half a million into security for the event. And from what we've seen, students often can’t handle public forums because they just interrupt the speaker and don't let them speak.
    - **Katherine Barnes**: I would disagree on the basis that actions are free speech, too. While we protested it in a quiet way, if it was an open forum it could have been a bigger more impactful display. There are ways to show dislike without showing aggression, walking out is not necessarily disrespectful, it is a poignant way to show that this person doesn't deserve your time.
    - **Ben Katz**: I was just saying in terms of instances of violence against speakers that have happened around the country this year.
    - **Gwyn Sise**: The student body does not have a history of responding to speakers with violence.
    - **Harry Dubke**: But we haven't had speakers that are super controversial.
    - **Gwyn Sise**: That's not true, there's no precedent for violence. I think we can trust student body not to be violent.
  - **Conor O'Shea**: I am glad to see students taking the initiative on this. But I think this is a discussion that also needs to be done in conjunction with the faculty. If the proposed
solution is a new-fangled set of administrative red-tape for professors to navigate in order to bring educational content to their students, that shouldn’t be shoved down their throats from a student-only coalition. We have to be concerned, when talking about free speech, about ‘What are the least restrictive means to achieve our ends, here?’ Does that have to look like some lengthy administrative red-tape process for the entire campus to assent to a speaker coming? I’d say no, it doesn’t. Furthermore I would like to unequivocally reject the idea that we don’t already have open fora on campus, the idea that we don’t have student agency as protesters on campus. There are several student publications that will publish articles from across the political spectrum – for example, I’ve published non-conservative pieces in Enquiry before. That’s one way to rebut an opposing viewpoint. I don’t want this student-led initiative to sell ourselves short. Today, right now, we have the means of having open fora to challenge these ideas that run contrary to our values. We have hundreds of acres on campus to hold protests and rallies. That’s another way to rebut an opposing viewpoint. Anyone can use 25Live to book a room in KJ to hold an event that will challenge a speaker’s views – yet another way to rebut an opposing viewpoint. And in terms of actually going about disavowing those views in public, why does that have to look like a Q&A session where we give this speaker a microphone and then pepper them with questions? No part of ‘disavowing their views’ requires that we – as Ben Katz rightly mentioned – pay for facilities and security to host a separate event that includes the speaker that will then be open to the public. There’s nothing logically necessary in disavowing a speaker’s views for the speaker to actually be there and have dissent rained upon them. Students can have their own protests. We already have the means and resources to have these alternative events, and this peaceful protest of Mr. Gottfried confirmed that. We just need to be willing to mobilize and make use of them and be proactive. It’s on us.

- **Jake Engelman:** What can Student Assembly do to help you?
  - **Gwyn Sise:** I don’t have a history of speaking with SA, so Katherine might be the best person to speak to this.
  - **Katherine Barnes:** We outlined some ideas we have when we spoke before. We were hoping that SA can bring these issues to the administration and maybe create a committee around this, or some student initiative around this, so that next time this happens students can have agency and know ahead of time what to do.
David Sills -- Rogers Estate:

- **David Sills:**

  Good Evening. My name is David Sills, and I currently serve as the R.A. in Rogers Estate. Like most Hamilton students, each week I find myself casually perusing the minutes of Student Assembly meetings for matters that might concern my residents and/or myself. With all of the recent unrest regarding the role of Resident Advisors and the Office of Residential Life, in Rogers we have been fortunate that most of the controversy has passed us by.

  However, on two occasions so far this semester, Rogers Estate has been mentioned in Student Assembly minutes, both times having been cited as an example of administration overreach with regard to its designation as “substance-free.”

  For those who may not be aware, Rogers Estate is the closest thing to off-campus housing at Hamilton College. We are located approximately 6/10ths of a mile northeast of the Admissions Office, at the end of an access road adjacent to Eels House that was built to access the grounds when the College purchased the Estate in the mid-1990s after the passing of Professor Philip V. Rogers (Class of 1930). The residence hall currently houses 16 students, primarily sophomores, and most students commute to and from the Estate via bicycle or motor vehicle.

  My purpose of speaking tonight is simply to refute the recent myth that Rogers Estate was unjustly designated as “substance-free” as a part of the administration’s alleged efforts to curtail the number of student social spaces on this campus.

  Rogers Estate was not originally a substance-free option, and in fact it only became this way several years ago. Despite ill-informed rumors proposed by a variety of members of the student body, this decision is justifiable on three critical grounds.

  Firstly, what became an issue during the pre-substance-free era at Rogers Estate is exactly what one would expect when college students are given free-reign over a large, secluded mansion on the outskirts of a rural college campus -- wild, out-of-control, and dangerous partying habits. In particular, because of the Estate’s isolation, campus EMTs were unable to reach the grounds in a timely manner to help someone in an alcohol or drug-related emergency. In reaction to Campus Safety’s efforts to drive the EMTs to respond to Rogers Estate calls, the problem was further exacerbated by students’ use of personal motor vehicles to barricade North Rd. in an effort to keep Campus Safety Officers away. These practices created a danger to the wellbeing of Hamilton students, and on their own were grounds for a substance-free designation.
Secondly, the decision was made for purposes of preserving the integrity of the building. If any of you have ever been inside Rogers, you’ll find the building lavishly appointed with thick red carpeting, beautiful original furniture in the common spaces, and Prof. Rogers’ untouched library and reading room which is open to residents. Perhaps most of you do not also know that Rogers Estate is wedding venue during the summer months. As a matter of fact, I’ve recently received word that there are two college employees who are planning their wedding at Rogers Estate shortly after commencement in May. After students’ partying habits led to the careless destruction and degradation of the building attributes that make Rogers a desirable space for members of the College community to use for special events, the case to make Rogers substance-free was further solidified.

Finally, the deciding issue originates from a point I briefly discussed earlier. The majority of Rogers Estate residents, and the overwhelming majority of guests to the premises arrive and leave via motor vehicle. Allowing massive partying to take place at such an isolated location exponentially increases the likelihood of creating a problem of DWI (or DUI), which is both a serious criminal offense in New York State, as well as a 10 point judicial infraction at Hamilton College. Additionally, because of extremely-limited turnaround space at the end of North Rd., having a Rogers Estate stop on the late-night jitney service is simply unfeasible.

At this point, I’d like to draw everyone’s attention to a comment made at Student Assembly’s meeting last week. With regard to a proposed “resolution” with the Office of Residential Life, an Assembly member mentioned, and I quote, “They [Res Life] will announce that ‘Rogers Estate is sub-free’ but won’t ask us how that is affecting our time on campus.” A comment of similar substance was made at the public comment period at the Student Assembly meeting on September 25th, suggesting Rogers was taken away from students by an aggressive act of the administration. For the reasons I have cited above, I believe we should all be in agreement now that Rogers Estate’s transition to substance-free was not only justified, but long overdue for the safety, wellbeing, and enjoyment of the greater college community. Since Rogers has been made a substance-free option, each year the building is occupied by a variety of residents who enjoy the wilderness, peace and quiet, and unmatched sense of home that this unique residence hall offers students who might not fit-in in the more traditional housing options.

Before I conclude, I would like to briefly relate my argument to the broader issue. As I mentioned, Rogers has been cited as an example of Residential Life executing
administrative overreach to add to what has been characterized as an excess of substance-free offerings. Now that I have clarified why Rogers is currently and will remain substance-free, the aforementioned arguments by students are fully invalid. Why? Because once Rogers is taken out of the picture, not a single other substance-free residence hall does not get fully filled each year at the substance-free lottery. Each Spring, there are students seeking to live in a substance-free environment who get placed in the general lottery. If anything, the number of substance-free options should be expanded, not reduced.

For the reasons cited above, to try to use Rogers Estate as grounds for continued hostility towards the Office of Residential Life is a weak, unjustified argument, and is certainly not representative of the kinds of persuasive rhetorical skills Hamilton College aims to instill in its students through a curriculum focused on effective communication and strong critical reasoning skills. Thank you for your time.

- **Harry Dubke:** Thanks so much for coming in. I probably was one of those students who made the comment. I did not know any of that info, thanks for bringing that in our attention. A big part of the resolution that I wrote has to do with the transparency in the decisions that are made by Reslife. Although members in Rogers Estate may understand the reasoning as to why it is substance free, a lot of other students do not know. It is important that our student body has access to this information so we are all informed.

- **Noam Barnhard:** It is hard to argue that Rogers should not be sub free after your argument. You made the point that sub free is constantly being filled. We discussed that a lot of students signed up for the sub free housing don't actually want to be in sub free housing, but that they choose to live there their Sophomore year to avoid Bundy. Students who aren't interested in living a sub free live will taint the experiences for those who are genuinely interested. We need to fix housing so that students don't feel obligated for signing up for Sub free housing.
  - **David Sills:** I fully agree with your penultimate point. Although the vast majority of my residents are committed to a substance-free lifestyle, there are several who are not and it is generating those exact problems for everyone else in our building.

- **Conor O'Shea:** I think the issue is not mischaracterizing dorms like Rogers as sub-free (and as a former RA in Rogers, I agree it should be sub-free), but rather I think the issue is that we’re failing to provide housing that a middle group of people want. This middle group doesn’t want to live in the suites with loud parties on Thursday nights; they also don’t want to totally abstain from alcohol. Instead, they might want to just have their own
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supply of wine or beer in their room for personal consumption or with friends in a non-party setting. That middle group is the group that’s ‘abusing’ the sub-free lottery – that’s using it for something other than its intended purpose. We need to focus the resolution on them.

- **Max Kohn:** I agree with Conor, and to me it seems like Rogers could be the perfect example of a place where a middle ground would compliment the specific space. Does Rogers fill up on a year to year basis?
  - **David Sills:** It is not full right now, but we are just two residents shy of capacity.
  - **Max Kohn:** As you’ve said, this is an amazingly beautiful space, and the fact that it’s not totally full, and is mostly sought after by sophomores indicates to me that something isn’t right. I think there is a reason why it is not sought after, and that there must be some potential for a middle ground that allows Rogers to be more appreciated.
  - **David Sills:** Are you suggesting that there should some allowance of alcohol in Rogers? As I mentioned earlier, this policy would greatly increase the risk of residents drinking and driving.
  - **Max Kohn:** Drinking and driving is totally against the law, and while we should always be wary of situations that promote drinking and driving, I don’t think the answer is always so starkly policing any and all drinking itself.
  - **David Sills:** Everywhere else on campus, people who have consumed alcohol migrate from dorm building to dorm building to socialize. However, Rogers almost requires that people commute by car -- when the only way off of the grounds is a half mile uphill, I cannot assume that someone who has had a few too many drinks would then exercise the proper judgment to avoid getting behind the wheel. As a result, I truly cannot picture safe alcohol consumption at Rogers Estate.

- **Ysabel Coss:** Back to the point of too much free sub housing, if we try to change that we will be narrowing the options for those who want to to be sub free. You should not have to pick between your level of comfort and dorm choice.

3. **Funding**

Amount Remaining: **$722.04**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Items/Services Requested</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Resubmit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society of Physics Students</td>
<td>Better GPS &amp; mileage</td>
<td>$139.18</td>
<td>$139.18</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>Snacks for Speed Dating</td>
<td>$119.45</td>
<td>$115.01</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Continents</td>
<td>Cooking Event</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Microfinance</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>$42.06</td>
<td>$42.06</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount Requested: $580.69  
Amount Recommended: $536.25  
Amount Remaining if Funding Passes: $185.79

- **Jake Engelman:** So we have 4 non-strategic budgets and 1 discretionary. SPS is requesting a better GPS and mileage reimbursement, we recommended in full. International Student Association is requesting snacks for a speed dating event, the discrepancy in what we’re recommending is just a miscalculation on their part, so we’re still funding all that they asked for. African Continents are hosting a cooking event where they cook and serve to thirty plus people. They requested $280 but we’re recommending $240 to stick to $8 a head for thirty people. Finally, we have a discretionary budget to fund travel and registration to the NESGov Conference on 11/11.

**Society of Physics Students, ISA, African Continents, and Hamilton Microfinance funding passes as recommended.**

- **Jon Stanhope:** The discretionary funding is for the the NESCAC government conference. It was hosted last year at Bowdoin, and it will be at Colgate this year. They have a limit on the number of students (4) that we can bring. Jordan drew up the budget for this. We would like to see who is interested in going and potentially pull students from each class year.
  - **Jake Engelman:** The budget is just for registration fees and travel. We have $2,111.00 dollars left in the discretionary fund.
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○ **Diana Perez:** What happens at this conference?

○ **Jordan D'Addio:** It was the pilot year last year. We came up with the most important topics that each school was working on addressing. The idea is that because we have similar demographics that we can come up with similar solutions. We discussed how we can best serve our campuses and students.

*Discretionary Funding passes as recommended*

- **Jake Engelman:** One quick note to Student Assembly members - if you are submitting a budget for discretionary, please submit it as a nonstrategic budget via the Student Activities website by Saturday at noon so that the treasurers can consider it along with the other budgets. Thanks!

4. **Old Business**

○ **Travis Hill, Director of Residential Life**

○ **Residential Life Resolution-- Harry Dubke**

○ **Travis Hill:** I have a list that I’ll hand out tonight that has all of the information requested as to the decisions we have made about closing social and informal spaces and I am happy to answer any questions about that as well as the pieces of resolution. I wanted to say a quick big picture thing. Being a part of this community, some of what is at the heart of these arguments is the struggle of transitioning to college, which is hard, the struggle of coming back from being abroad, and of getting ready to move on from Hamilton. Since we’ve become a 100 percent residential campus, I’ve become very interested in looking at the experiences of all types of students and trying to find a home for everybody. I want to acknowledge that it’s hard living all four years in College owned housing, I understand that. There are challenges we are trying to work through. I’ve been here for 15 years and don’t have plans on leaving, so I want to get in place a system that will meet student needs and work for us going forward. My team and I are committed. If you have any ideas or opinions don't hesitate to come to us. I also want to say I am sorry. Sorry for not making it clear enough at times that our doors in Res Life are always open and we are always willing to set up appointments with students. Truth is you understand what it means to be a Hamilton students. I wasn’t a student, but I have been here for 15 years so in reality I feel like I know what I am talking about. But your voices are something we will do a better job of hearing.
What I want to tell you about the document is, the first line or two is off the top of my head this is what was happening with the spaces. The rest of them, came directly from the email that went out to all students when the lottery booklet came out. In recent years we have come to SA and we said here are the changes we are making, admittedly after the decisions have been made. The sub bullets are explanations as to why these decisions were made

- **Harry Dubke:** Travis has been super helpful. I honestly want to give him a round of applause. I wish more people took this track. I’ll outline the big changes made to the resolution: First, we changed the focus from accountability to transparency as discussed last week. Article 1 calls for a record of any changes made. I think Travis went even further with the draft that he just passed around than I expected, so I am super impressed. I added in the formalized process we discussed last week. That is saying there will be some kind of process that students know about with regard to closing spaces and making decisions affecting students, I think it's important that we know rationale of the decisions before they are enacted. Article 2 focuses on student partnership with Res Life. It is calling for a small committee of three students to represent student voices in Res Life decisions. They can report back to SA. I think it will be super helpful. Article 3 is, as of now, incomplete. Max and I talked about mental health and the issue of isolation on campus. I am not familiar on how to deal with the mental health problems. I would love to discuss it further with everybody today.

- **Travis Hill:** I think the rationale piece is easily accomplished. I think there are a things that stand out for me, but I would first like to explain to you the decision making process, in terms of locations that have been closed off. In a lot of conversations, it has been characterized that I just sit in my office by myself and decide when something will be closed. While I understand why students might think that, the process has been when issues and policies are being violated, we use case by case judgement, and the nature of the issues has dictated the decisions have made.

As you see in the document, Eels have had a large history of having parties with alcohol. We became aware because of noise and were notified that trash from the parties were found. We acknowledged that new students would come in, so each year we would open and then close it when the policy was violated. The Co-OP is a different situation. When we met with them, we
explained to that the reason the CO-OP decision was made was uncharacteristic vandalism earlier in the year. We then became more aware that gatherings were happening. Then, towards the end of the year, we had specific student say “I don't want that type of atmosphere here but I feel uncomfortable saying that to the group.”

Currently, we are in a great conversation about this issue with members of the CO-OP. I have drafted a few lines to Dean Martinez. WE are going to show to CO-OP residents and have a back and forth until we can get to a spot where everyone is happy.

Here is how the process typically goes: I call college offices that are impacted and we take it on a case by case basis. For instance, in Bundy lounges, students threw a party and there was damage, we did not close it down because it was an one-time circumstance. We would consider doing that if it became a consistent problem, but so far that has not happened. I would not create a three strikes policy because I’d worry that the first time would be ridiculous and Residential Life would be unable to react appropriately.

I am happy to instate a process that includes Student Assembly in providing feedback. With advice from you, I would like to create a larger group, with many identities and activities of students represented. I want a more widely representative student committee that can work in subgroups. It would be great to have students involved in the process. For this reason, I’d like the section about the committee to be less defined in your resolution.

In terms of the last article, we are looking at the residential experience across the board and what could exist, at what cost. Part of the exploratory process will include looking at theme housing, and other ideas. Right now we are in the process of doing some benchmarking and see what other schools are doing but it's difficult because our stock is so varied compared to other schools where students really only get the choice of a double or a quad. We will do some benchmarking and through the advisory committee work to get student voices engaged in the conversation. One of the things I have heard is what seniors experience includes a totally separate set of needs than what we currently offer. I would really like to get a handle on that, as well as working to help freshmen and sophomores find their people.
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- **Harry Dubke:** I think that it all sounds great. I would love to see a large committee that works to give feedback. I am glad you brought that up. SA can only be representative of a small section of the student body and this affects all our students.

- **Travis Hill:** Yes, and vice versa, I would love feedback from you. Ideally I’d like to have a sufficiently large group, but not that large of a group that we can't accomplish anything. Maybe we could explore the idea of subcommittees for specific experiences.

  - **Jon Stanhope:** Travis thank you so much for putting this together so quickly. I am wondering if we could send this document the start of every semester?

- **Travis Hill:** What seems like the better answer is including it on the website. I have a perspective of history that I tend to lose over time. STudents have been talking about this beloved memory of what Rogers used to be like, but perspective is important. The first academic year that Rogers was substance free was 2013, but because of student lore, it feels like much more recent, as opposed to things that are actually more recent, like Anderson, Off Campus Housing, and the Farmhouse.

- **Jon Stanhope:** I am really interested in the Reslife council idea. HAving a perma nic group seems like a good idea, And HArry for article 3 resolves,maybe we could send that to the 19 person mental health working group for recommendations.

  - **Elizabeth Groubert:** I think that a potential solution for getting students involved in the res life process would be to send a survey out at the end of the year where students can request the type of housing they would like to live in whether it be sub-free or not. We could track student demographics to see which sports teams and clubs would like to live together as well as the demand for themed housing. This way we would have a more accurate representation of where students want to live on campus and what groups they are affiliated with. I think this might give residential life a better picture of the student body’s needs.

  - **Travis Hill:** Interested in seeing how this looks like. The issue is we start the housing process early in the year. Non sub free in sub free, we know that. I will not dissuade those who want to live in sub free. Pres Stewart made a promise that anyone who wanted to live in sub free would be able too. It is hard to find that sweet process. I cannot identify those who are only pretending to live in sub free.
This can be a conversation we discuss going further. With the existing housing stock and making those assignments is not easy. I know some people want to live in a Kirkland loft well me too. Someone could definitely say “I need sub free” and I have no way of saying they don't. We think maybe if first years lived in wellness housing could be top of the year in picking housing sophomore year.

- **Ysabel Coss**: I wanted to mention, there is an off campus study abroad re entry program that is trying to be made for returning juniors/seniors?
  - **Travis Hill**: Yes, we are looking to include them in this conversation.

- **Landis Hagerty**: I’m here to give an update on the Co-Op’s conversation with Res Life and give some due credit. Travis and Robin came in and had an open Q & A with us which was greatly appreciated. The conversation helped build understanding and clear the air about some of the things that got lost in electronic communication. We talked about putting some of our suggested policy changes in motion. For example, we are going to change the policy to acknowledge there is a difference between the CoOp common room and the Eels lounge room. We are going to change the designation of our spaces from “residence hall lounges” to be more like a dark side suite common room. We did also talk about reopening the basement which is on the table, but still not decided. Also, Terry Martinez came to CO-Op dinner last week, and we talked informally about our perspectives. We greatly appreciated this gesture. She had a chance to see what themed communal living looks like and seemed excited about the prospect of expanding similar opportunities around campus. I have full confidence that things are moving ahead in the right direction, and I’m looking forward to seeing concrete changes materialize. This is the first time I have read this Res Life resolution and I do want to voice my support for it. I am a big believer in greater transparency. I think actually making these sorts of open discussions a formalized, institutionalized process, ensures that these conversations happen even in times when there is not direct political pressure. Thank you Harry for putting this together.

- **Conor O’Shea**: I like this explanation document. I would, however, like some clarification on a few points. For example, on the second page, the Root, Mac, and Minor sub-free bed exchange. Having lived in a darkside single, I think these are actually great places for the middle-ground “wine and chill” spaces for alcohol that we were talking about earlier – they’re spaces that aren’t big enough for ‘parties’ but people can still responsibly enjoy alcohol in their own room if they
choose without disturbing their neighbors. So, I don’t know if this is an issue with Harry’s resolution, or what Travis was able to put on the document for us, but in the interest of transparency I would hope to see ResLife take this explanation one step further. Like, okay, we’ve increased the number of sub-free beds since 2013-14, but why? Why increase instead of decrease? That rationale is what I’d like to see, too.

- **Travis Hill:** I would hope that the addition of a kind of student committee can speak on that in the future. I can speak on this right now, a lot of it has to do with numbers. We are looking at it from how it affects student experience. For instance, right now we are working on a system that includes 1900 beds. 250 of the 1900 beds (13%) are committed to substance free students. The game we are playing was trying to make sure that the twenty added beds were enough to increase the substance free lottery without worrying that we would not have enough. Now getting this ball rolling, one of the conversations we will have is this the right amount? Students seeking substance free housing deserve to have access to a diverse range of options too.

- **Travis Hill:** I want to say one of the things I appreciate with the conversation and work we’ve been doing with the CO-OP and Landis is the idea of the spaces could function as a common room and that their motivation for doing so is to create gatherings that include alcohol but where alcohol is not the main focus. We are going to create a set of guidelines that allow that to happen. I am not kidding when I say of you all of you can help me create a space where students drink wine in their room and talk politics. This is my ideal situation. I want to encourage the student body to help the CO-OP be successful. As a specific example, Anderson Road was a hot mess before it was Substance Free. We had fist fights on the front lawn, and residents were bothered about this because it became this informal social space that was overrun by people looking for that type of atmosphere. But informal spaces need to follow policy and law. From student efficacy side of things, if you can help each other be successful, it will helps us find ways to help you in the future.

- **Zach Oscar:** I think the conversation we had with Tavis was great. I was thinking about the ResLife resolution and how we talked about accountability. A lot of what we are talking about boils down to accountability, but not just of administrators.
The problem that I am having is that we aren’t holding ourselves accountable. For example we haven’t talked about the fact that the List party that happened. We want social spaces and a formal process to get them, but when students use an academic building not meant for partying by possibly breaking into it and then vandalize it, and they did so by circumventing Noelle and all those people that we want to include in conversation to get this done officially. We need to say that things like that are not ok. We can't say we want administration to let us have these spaces and then also circumvent them and break the rules. We are trying to create something that is lawful. I ask that everyone think about that. I think what we are doing right now with Travis is highly commendable.
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6. Announcements
   ○ Organization leaders, please submit your rollbacks!
   ○ Ross Szabo will be giving a talk on mental health in groups at 8 PM on November 8th in the Chapel. It is open to the whole campus. It is a discussion with Q&A.