The Central Council of Student Assembly, Hamilton College

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING
NOVEMBER 13, 2017

Link to Meeting Video

1. Call to Order

Attendance

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

- Absent
  - Max Phillips
  - Max Kohn
  - Jack Fischman

2. Public Comment Period
3. Moment of reflection for Professor Pellman
   - Please know that members of our community can always reach out to the Counseling Center staff (315-859-4340), the Chaplaincy (315-859-4856), and the Dean of Students Office who are all available to assist students. In addition, we have a wonderful team of peer counselors. If you find it necessary for more immediate support, there is a professional counselor on call 24/7 who can be contacted by calling Campus Safety (315-859-4000) and asking for the “Counselor on Call.”
   - **Marquis Palmer:** The Community of Care initiative is important not only as a specific initiative but as an idea in general. Right now, we should reach out to students who are impacted by Professors Pellman death, but also professors and staff. In the interest of caring for our communities, we should be conscious of the fact that the death of their colleague impacts professors. We're here as resources to help them in their time of need.

4. Funding
   Please roll your unused/ leftover funding back by emailing Jake Engelman at satreas@hamilton.edu. There are great orgs requesting money for end of the year programs and we are broke.
   - **Jake Engelman:** We have a discretionary proposal for $925 from Social Traditions to combine with reallocated money not spent on FallFest to buy Citrus Bowl shirts. So just a total of $925 for new funding.
     - **Jordan D’Addio:** This is the quote we got from last year so it is the exact amount of time as last year. It will give us around 300 long-sleeved shirts.
     - **Jake Engelman:** We have $1,648.56 left in discretionary and we would be left with $722.56.
       - **Ben Katz:** I remember there were concerns last year about not handing out shirts in women's hockey games?
       - **Jordan D’Addio:** Yes we will be handing out shirts in a women's hockey game in the spring.
   
   *Citrus Bowl Funding Passes as Recommended. Citrus Bowl will be on December 2nd! Keep an eye out for more information!*

5. New Business
   - **Gillian Mak:** Elections for Student Assembly President and Vice President are coming up! I’d recommend running to be a leader of Student Assembly, but also having a clear idea of what you are getting yourself into if you do win. It’s a huge time commitment--each week, Jon and I have multiple meetings with members of the the administration, Student Activities, students, and committees that we both serve on.
Platforms and signature sheets must be submitted by **Friday, November 17th at noon to box #907 (Gillian Mak) and email.** Electronic copies of both must be emailed to [SA@hamilton.edu](mailto:SA@hamilton.edu) by noon.

Candidates must attend a mandatory rules meeting on Monday, November 27th at 8:00 PM in Sadove Living Room. No candidate may begin campaigning on campus or online until after this meeting.

Candidates will participate in an all campus debate on Thursday, November 30th at 7 PM in Science Center Auditorium.

Online voting will open at noon on December 4th and close at noon on December 6th.

6. Old Business
   - **Follow up on conversation about bringing speakers to campus**— Amanda Kim
     - **Amanda Kim:**
       - I know we haven’t really discussed it much as an assembly and maybe we’ve moved on, but I’d like for us to revisit the issue of speakers on campus that Phoebe, Katherine, and Gwyn brought to us a few weeks ago. I feel like we may have dismissed their idea a little too quickly and unfairly, and there are a few words I’d personally like to say on the issue, at least so that they’re in the minutes and on the livestream.

       While I don’t think that having a committee or a vetting process in place for on-campus speakers is plausible or even necessary, I don’t think Paul Gottfried should have been allowed on campus and I believe we should hold the administration accountable. I know the AHI and Hamilton don’t have an official affiliation, but the fact of the matter is that Gottfried was on campus, and that makes it the administration’s problem.

       It should be administrative common sense to not allow white nationalists or naziONS onto our campus, because they directly threaten part of our community under the guise of free speech. Reading an article by a white nationalist and discussing it in class is vastly different from actually having a white nationalist in KJ and then discussing what they’ve said. While I’m sure a thorough discussion of his lecture took place, the problem is that he was here.

       This campus is where we learn, but it’s also where we live. This is our home, and Gottfried being here made our home an unsafe place for some members of our community. And that’s never okay. We are supposed to be a family, but I don’t think we’ve been acting like one recently. If someone was going around saying that my sister is inferior and does not contribute to society, there is no way that I would allow that person into my house. Would you?

   - **Ysabel Coss:** I agree. I think we did not give enough time to thinking about putting into place some strategy. I think we wrote off the first idea they had, but we did not do much to propose a new plan.

   - **Nadav Konforty:** Thank you so much Amanda. We talk a lot about processes as Student Government but we often fail to also look out for
each other as a community. This past semester we have focused significantly at mental health. What does it do to someone’s mental health when a speaker who thinks you are inferior is bought in to speak in front of you? As a student assembly it hurt that we focused on the processes rather than what it does to the students. We are a really small community and when things happen on campus, we can all feel it. While I support free ideas, I think Hamilton entertained the idea that some of our students are interior and saw that as a valid discussion to have in one of our classrooms. We should not have done that.

- **Ben Katz:** If you are curious of how Hamilton has handled controversial speakers in the past, I would look back to why the AHI was actually founded, which was because of the controversy surrounding bringing Ward Churchill to campus.
  - **Amanda Kim:** Thank you for letting me know that. I think we as an assembly should take a stance on this because Paul Gottfried’s rhetoric directly affects our community. I do believe in freedom of speech and I think it’s important, but it doesn’t mean you are entitled to ignorant or aggressive statements. It means that you can’t be prosecuted from government but it doesn’t mean you’re free of the consequences from civil society.

- **Noam Barnhard:** I am not defending Paul Gottfried but part of me feels that if a person is not inciting violence than he or she should have some right to be speak. People will have controversial views in life and the answer is not always to just ignore them or shut them out. At Hamilton, we are in a safer space than in the real world and being afforded the opportunity to talk with this person in a safer space might be a positive experience. Paul Gottfried was not set up such that this kind of discourse could happen. These controversial unpopular opinions might be effective for us if we can effectively engage with them.
  - **Amanda Kim:** I disagree. The platform of the Alt-Right, a party he helped found, is inherently violent. You don't have to be actively committing physically violent acts for your platform to be violent. His message that people of color are inferior and don’t contribute validly to society is aggressive and untrue. Negative attitudes towards marginalized groups aren’t always just opinions. When held by people in power they can and do kill. The idea that POC are inferior is not a new one. POC have to live with that prejudice everyday.
  - **Noam Barnhard:** I don't agree with his ideas, it is a broader point in for all speakers. Who decides something is controversial? Where do we draw the line?
  - **Amanda Kim:** That’s what I was trying to say with “administrative common sense.” I don’t know that the administration has to have an official process in place. I think it should be common sense to not allow people like Gottfried on campus.

- **Jon Stanhope:** To give this conversation a little more context, I’d like to cite some of the results from The Spectator’s recent free speech survey. When asked, “Should Hamilton College expose students to all types of viewpoints even if they are offensive or biased
against certain groups?" 100% of Asian respondents (n=19), 100% of Hispanic-Latinx respondents (n=17), 70% of African-American/Black respondents (n=10), and 54% of white respondents (n=203), all answered "Yes."

- **Gianni Hill:** I have heard a lot of valid points. Thank you for speaking on this. I know this has been a big issue so clearly it needs to be talked about. A valid point that stuck out to me was when Conor O'Shea came to speak. As Student Assembly, we have to speak out about this issue and we have the proper platforms and resources to say that we don't tolerate hate. How are we going to react to this now? Of course, in a perfect world we don't want to bring hatred, but it's inevitable that we are going to listen to different viewpoints. How should we react to it is the larger question. Also with some of these reactive measures, how can we be proactive about issues like this in the future?

- **Gillian Mak:** If we could move our comments towards possible actions that SA can take, rather than reiterating points already made, that would make this a more productive conversation.

- **Nadav Konforty:** Keeping that in mind and moving forward, I want all of us to acknowledge that we are all different people with different backgrounds. The notion that this man was a positive opportunity and that this man is the real world is absurd. Discrimination happens in the real world and on campus. There's this notion that students from traditionally marginalized groups are safe here on the Hill, and that is just so far from the truth. I have been called a faggot many times here more than anywhere else. Prejudice is not gone from this campus. The people who I see have been saying that this a positive experience to experience “differing opinions”, they are not the targets of speakers like Paul Gottfried's rhetoric. Going forward it’s important to understand where you are coming from and your privilege because you're not always the target, sometimes it's your peers.

  - **Elizabeth Groubert:** I deeply concur with everything Nadav has said. I think it is abhorrent that we chose to honor the “father of white nationalism” by having a dinner in his name. I am a proponent of free speech and for students to be well educated on issues even if they are controversial, but I feel this went too far. If the administration exercised common sense, then we can avoid an issue like this with a controversial speaker in the future. It is one thing to learn about Gottfried's works in a classroom and another thing to have him teach a class. This event was relatively inaccessible for most of the campus. The event should have been held in a more public forum so more students would have had a better opportunity to challenge his views.

- **Ben Katz:** I think in an ideal world the plan to have speakers vetted by some sort of faculty/student council could potentially be a good idea. But the indisputable fact is the vast majority of faculty members are liberal. For example, in 2004, over 30 colleges had brought Ward Churchill, a far-left speaker guilty of academic fraud and of making offensive comments regarding the victims of the 9/11 attacks. Hamilton almost brought him to campus, and he only wasn’t brought to campus because a student actually looked up what he had wrote about 9/11 (in an obscure vegetarian magazine), and sent it to Fox
News host Bill O'Reilly. The fact that he was able to speak on 30 other campuses shows how there is a bias among campuses towards allowing far-left speakers. This demonstrates the left-wing bias that would often allow far-left speakers, while denying the comparable far-right speakers.

- **Amanda Kim:** If someone’s message is threatening or devaluing members of our community, in my view, they’re not welcome here. It doesn’t matter if they’re left-leaning or right-leaning.
- **Ben Katz:** As an example that was briefly discussed in my Government class, Swastika, the symbol of Nazi Germany, is not tolerated (for very good reasons) on this campus, but, a hammer and a sickle, the symbol of Communism and Soviet Russia, is tolerated, even though in actuality, even me, the descendant of those killed in the Holocaust, can recognize how much more of a toll Communism has taken on the world.

- **Kureem Nugent:** Sorry to interrupt here but I think we are trying to propose ideas on what Student Assembly should do. Do we want to work on a guideline for administration to use when bringing in speakers or do we want to create forums for students to discuss speaker's’ views?
  - **Amanda Kim:** I think it would be great if we could come up with some plan of action.

- **Cesar Guerrero:** I wanted to say that with regard to action, I personally don’t believe we should force administration or faculty but we should condemn speakers like Gottfried. We can condemn speakers and give reasons as to why. I think making a clear statement in the speaker will show solidarity with students affected by the speaker.
  - **Lilly Pieper:** I agree with Cesar, there is a lot we can do. Is there any way we can say to the administration that if you are gonna bring a speaker in the classroom it should be approved by department head? Although most faculty members are left leaning, they are adults and can draw the line of differing opinions vs. hate. If there here is no way to formally approve a speaker or people don’t want that then I at least think we should encourage discussions within the department. I felt worried that the gov department was so blindsided by this. I would encourage more clarity in bringing speakers to campus.

- **Noam Barnhard:** I think Amanda started with a point about holding the administration responsible and requiring them to use common sense when it comes to controversial speakers. I am all for that idea but I think if we are gonna write a proposal, we need to be careful and use very concise language. Common sense and controversial are ambiguous terms. Anything can be controversial and common sense has no clear guidelines. Nadav made a good point - I personally can’t speak to the Paul Gottfried example because I am white and his comments don’t affect me the same way they affect other students. However, if a Holocaust denier came to campus I, as a Jewish individual, would say that I would love to hear them. I would welcome the chance to engage with this person so that if I ever encounter another Holocaust denier I can understand their argument and understand how to refute their points. Maybe I should have more power in deciding if this
speaker should come to campus because his or her comments would affect me more than others. If we are thinking about a specific plan to action it should consider the individual person’s ideology and who they affect on campus. These students should have the most say in deciding whether it is acceptable to invite them to speak or not.
  - **Amanda Kim:** Those are really good points that we should definitely keep in mind. I would be happy to draft a statement that would also address those points, if that's where we are heading with this.

- **Diana Perez:** The main reason for having controversial speakers according to this discussion has been to add thought and discussion. However, WE need to think about how this discussion affects the victims. Nadav already pointed out the discrimination that exist on campus. Controversial speakers target poc, minorities, we need to talk about how they are being represented in this discussion. The 54 percent who are in favor of these speakers coming to campus don't attend clubs that are having these controversial conversations. Racism and discrimination exist on this campus and although targeting faculty is a good thing, creating accountability among ourselves is better. Encouraging people to go to cultural clubs like BLSU, Rainbow, Womenx could allow students to have constructive conversations on campus without the need of controversial speakers to bring them up. Change starts by us inviting our friends to have these conversations.

- **Jonathan Stanhope:** Just to summarize the conversation so far, two concrete ideas have been presented: the first is some kind of formal statement condemning views espoused by controversial speakers. It sounds like Amanda has volunteered to draft something. The second has been to create recommendations for an approval process for speakers.

- **Kureem Nugent:** I want to go back to the point Conor O’Shea made last week to create forums where students can discuss speaker’s’ ideas. As Student Assembly members, we should encourage these conversations.. I don't think the best solution is to restrict who the faculty brings to campus or what they teach in the classroom but we should instead create spaces, whether its town hall or something else to discuss and challenge ideas. As previously mentioned, the speaker doesn't have to be there for us to challenge their views. Also, I’m not in favor of another resolution as a solution I’m not downplaying the value of a resolution but without action behind, they’re just a bunch of words.

- **Ysabel Coss:** I want to reiterate Diana’s point about considering the type of community we want to build. It is part of the community's responsibility to look after one another. We should not put the onus of deciding for the entire campus on any one specific group of people, especially if they are the most affected. It creates unnecessary pressure and in turn takes some of that responsibility away from the rest of the community. If we do make a statement it should include all members of community.

- **Gianni Hill:** Resolutions should have action behind them. A written statement would be very important. On this campus, being a small school, oftentimes discussions are had where there are no a lot of voices in this discussions so decisions are made without including a lot of people. So maybe in the statement, we can say something about including voices. We could do an event, a public open space where we condemn hate.
Something like, “Hey, come eat pizza with us in KJ atrium if you don't tolerate hate as well!”

- **Keith Ruggles:** I think the bottom line is if we are inviting controversial speakers, we need to specify open forums where ideas are challenged and dismissed. It is important to have the opportunity to challenge. Another important thing would be to demand that departments know what is happening. One of the issues was the gov department did not know Gottfried was coming.

- **Cesar Guerrero:** In the mass email we send out, can we show a voting record of SA members?
  - **Gillian Mak:** Yes.

- **Zach Oscar:** This is difficult because I think a lot of people made great points about making everyone feel a part of the community, and then, on the other hand, defending free speech. The first thing I think we should do is get our facts straight before making a statement. Personally once the Gottfried thing happened I looked and read his views. I read articles where he said he opposes the Civil Rights Act, which is wild, but then also that he opposes White nationalism. I have heard people say he is a white nationalist. Those sources that I read could be wrong. All I know is that he came here to talk about his work on fascism which he is a leading scholar. We need to find out why the AHI bought him and what President Whippman’s opinion is on the situation and how students are feeling about. We take that information and, given that student body is our main concern, we respond. I am uncomfortable with labeling him as someone who promotes hate unless we can prove it. I am not saying I would love for him to come to my house for dinner. As soon as someone said he is Richard Spencer’s mentor, I think a lot of people on campus assumed that that means Gottfried is one in the same. I heard from Professor Kelly that Gottfried denounces Richard Spencer. I want to hesitate throwing these terms to the administration if we cannot truly identify him as a white nationalist. Like Karl Rove, very controversial, just because he doesn't talk about fascism doesn't mean he is not problematic. I would like to make a statement or resolution but we cannot know that unless we know what happened.
  - **Marquis Palmer:** To respond to Zach’s comments and protesters. I think they were clear with what Gottfried’s views are. They posted articles online written by him. His ideas preach hate. It was expressed as “We believe black people do not produce culture that is of the quality that the western world produces”. You can read that however you like, but to people like me that sounds like hate. We like to talk about free speech as an abstract idea. The truth is free speech is not free. When someone like Gottfried comes on campus he is empowered. He is given a platform where he can express his voice. He is being honoured. I am not interested in honoring a specific person for their academic success while, on the other hand, they are saying black people are inferior. Allowing this guy to come here does not uphold free speech when it is harmful to my community, and hindering others’ free speech. In this way we have to be careful about the idea that
free speech. Every speech has a consequence and one person's’ speech can limit other people's.

- **Nani Suzuki:** A few points from the Livestream: Yassine Dalek says “Let’s not confuse intellectual discourse with anti-intellectual discourse spread by problematic false ideas”. Another comment from Shelby Castillo included a link to an article about Paul Gottfried titled “The Jewish Godfather for the Alt Right Movement” published on Tablet Mag.
  - **Noam Barnhard:** The first comment stuck out to me and might help address some of the conflict and confusion here. There is no such thing as false ideas. There are false facts but saying that there are false ideas is problematic and inherently wrong. Paul Gottfried supposedly claimed that black people are inferior - that is an example of a false fact. And so, in censoring speakers, are we censoring false ideas or false facts. Are we saying controversial ideas are not welcome or just ideas that aren’t based on hard evidence? We need to focus on that.
- **Gillian Mak:** If anyone is interested in helping Amanda, please talk to her after the meeting! We can discuss this more after break.

**NESGov Recap-- Lilly Pieper, Nadav Konforty, Jordan D’Addio, and Gianni Hill**

- **Jon Stanhope:** This past weekend, Lilly, Nadav, Jordan, Gianni, Gillian and I went to Colgate with other NESCAC schools to the NESGov conference. Friday was a dinner off campus, and Saturday comprised of small group discussions around diversity, inclusion, and social spaces.
- **Lilly Pieper:** I had a great time--I had gone Freshmen year and had a great time but it was nice to meet with other NESCACs this time. We focused on diversity and inclusion. A lot of people wanted to focus on race, and we wanted to focus on diversity and inclusivity through the scope of mental health. In my group we also talked about accessibility for students who are physically disabled. I think that is a big issue for us and something we don’t talk about often. When athletes get injured they realize how impossible it is to get around this campus. There’s not a lot of elevators and buildings like Rootare impossible because of the steps and lack of ramps. I liked hearing viewpoints on how they interacted with administration. Some had great relationships and others had limited relationships, while I thought we strike good balance. Our Student government clearly has many benefits. It seems like we get a lot done and that people actually read the minutes and that we are pretty accessible. In terms of taking things out of the meeting we're all dealing with differently things in our campus, but it was good to look at diversity in context of mental health.
- **Nadav Konforty:** I also had a great time. Other schools were very fascinated with our dark side light side culture. I was with Gianni in our working group and we talked a lot about diversity and inclusion with social spaces. They were fascinated that we even had social spaces like Bundy dining hall, the Annex, or the Hub. Moreover, we learned how to engage students. I learned about at least one initiative from each school that could be implemented at Hamilton and I thoroughly enjoyed learning from our peer schools.
● **Gianni Hill:** We did talk a lot about light side, dark side. Another relevant idea, Bowdoin shared with us about an issue with anti-semitic hate on their campus. Rather than reacting to that specific incident, at start of new academic year they put up posters saying “we do not tolerate hate.” Going about how we do things is important. I found that valuable. Again, they loved how the student body is interested to hear what we talk about, Our Student Assembly is ahead of others. Coming in this year, I thought we didn't have a voice, but our voice as a student government association is stronger than that of others.

● **Gillian Mak:** For me, I think the most valuable thing I got out of the conference is something I want to pass on to the incoming administration. So much of what we do is difficult because our roles on SA are not clearly defined. It hurts accountability internally and makes it so more work falls on a select few people who show initiative. Other campuses have one specific person that liaises with a clear member of the administration (kind of similar to how our food committee has been operating with BA). I think this adds accountability but also gives clarity about whose job is what. I think our Class President position, in particular, needs to be elaborated so it is distinct from a representative. I am very glad that our SA is not entirely programming focused and I definitely saw things that I think we do well. It’s a little late in our term for Jon and I to help develop your roles, but I think it’s definitely something helpful that you should all be thinking about as you go into a new semester. I’ll be submitting recommendations for the VP role within the next week or so.

● **Jordan D’Addio:** What I took away from the conference this past weekend were both things we do really well that we need to work to continue, and things we can work to improve. Things we should be proud of, for example, are the minutes, which have been mentioned, and accessibility of SA members. Gillian has set a great example meeting with students, especially in the week our campus dealt with student death. If all of our members are as accessible to the student body, I think that could be great for the culture of our campus. The theme of the conference was diversity and inclusivity, which we looked at through the lens of mental health, and I think something we can work on is being more proactive. Something we also spoke about was that since we are for the students first and foremost, there is a degree of our position that has to be reactive, but the point Gianni made about posters that say we don’t tolerate hate I think is a good example of how we can take steps towards being proactive. Also, just an aside that as the NESGov coordinator I’m happy to draw up a document with all of our suggestions and plans moving forward.

● **Gianni Hill:** We have some tangible things we want to keep working towards in the future. Something we thought would be ideally helpful, for committees to have these smaller conversations within themselves. So that we can make these larger meetings as productive as possible.

● **Jordan D’Addio:** This is a bi-annual conference and we will be hosting it next fall.

  ○ **Nadav Konforty:** Also Middlebury and Colby decided to follow our initiative for our tampon intiative! I’ll be helping them implement it on campus.
7. Acknowledgements
   - Thank you to our Publicity Committee for organizing our Student Assembly Thanksgiving dinner!
   - Thank you to Jordan D’Addio for organizing our delegation to the EGov conference this weekend!
   - Shoutout to the Class of 2021 Delegation for putting the lights on the bridge!

8. Committee Reports
   - LITS:
     - We created a voice-over video on how to print/web print for incoming students— we plan on creating more videos in the near future.
     - We’ll be doing tabling after break to get feedback on the Hamilton App.
     - Over 50 new movies were uploaded to the Movie Channel last week.
     - We received over 400 responses to the annual Wifi survey (thanks everyone!).
   - Cultural Affairs:
     - Jiin is still working on organizing her international student panel.
     - We are helping the Levitt Center put up international flags, but the initiative is on hold as we look for flame retardant flags.
   - Publicity Committee:
     - SA Appreciation on Social Media— we have been posting SA class pictures on our Instagram to thank each member for their hard work.
     - Organized the SA Thanksgiving dinner as a thank you to the Assembly!
     - We are working on coming up with ways in which we could promote some of the "wins" that SA has had this year, through poster, social media, an article in the Spec, etc.
   - Social Traditions:
     - Citrus Bowl is December 2nd!
   - Facilities:
     - Julian Perricone: Where the Farmhouse used to be there is a dumpster filling up with water/spilling water everywhere. Do we know why?
       - Ben Katz: It is just pumping out the water. Facilities will look into that.
     - Cesar Guerrero: Sunday, Elizabeth messaged me about the delay in jitney. The reason no email was sent out was because the coordinator was not on campus and one did not have their phone.
     - Elizabeth Groubert: Just to clarify my role in this, on Sunday afternoon I witnessed a group of students waiting outside for the Jitney. When they came inside looking discouraged, I asked what was going on and was informed the Jitney hadn’t come in two hours. I messaged Cesar in facilities and worked with Kaity Werner in Student Activities to correct the situation and have an all-campus email sent out. It concerns me that
students were waiting in the cold for two consecutive Jitneys that didn’t show up. They didn’t know what to do which is why I got involved to help.

- **Esoesa:** As a response to the jitney thing, students should be aware of the track manager app.
- **Elizabeth Groubert:** Students were using the track manager app and saw that the jitney hadn’t left its position in two hours. There should be a procedure in place for students if a jitney doesn’t show up on time or fails to come at all.
- **Keith Ruggles:** Speaking of that, we received 166 responses on the survey about the Jitney. I am working on compiling that information to send out.
  - **Harry Dubke:** On faculty parking lots, I want to remind everyone please do not park in those faculty lots after Midnight on Sunday or you will get towed. Frank Coots wanted to remind us that it is a privilege not a right.
  - **Ben Katz:** How long are you allowed to leave your car in the South unloading spot?
    - **Gillian Mak:** I’m not sure, but it would fall under Facilities, which is your committee.

- **Food:** New coffee machines in Bundy Dining Hall
  - **Condiments**
    - Softer cream cheese → hard to do because of temp log guidelines, but thinking of getting longer handles for cream cheese/peanut butter/etc. Scoopers
    - Chive cream cheese (especially more variety at McQ), soy sauce at Commons
    - Designated soy sauce dispensers in Commons and McEwen
  - More standardized food selections between Commons and McEwen
    - Deli meat, etc.
    - Olives
  - Why paper plates at community lunches?
    - To use china, they need to pay extra cost, but paper plates are compostable.
  - Soup spoons in McEwen
  - Events: Table manners, chopstick seminar
  - Cold brew coffee: In the works at the Pub and will work on getting that into the other dining halls
  - Thanksgiving Dinner this Thursday night at Commons and McEwen!

**Working Group Reports**
Funding Codes, Club Registration Processes-- Recommendations due today. Jon will send them to the Central Council by Wednesday. Please review and comment over break!

Mental Health Working Group Recap-- Julian Perricone

- Had a meeting last week with Lorna Chase and a number of students who are committed to the mental health initiative. We have a ton of ideas in the works and will have more concrete projects/plans to report after our second meeting.
- Gillian Mak: Lorna Chase has taken the working group we made and it has grown to about a forty person group that is going to be divided into multiple subgroups. It is really great and I’m very happy that there was such large interest from our community.

9. Announcements

- If anyone has suggestions for the Sadove Basement, please email sadove@hamilton.edu!