Wesleyan Student Assembly
End-of-Year Report
Spring 2013
## CONTENTS

**Members of the Assembly**

---

**I. END-OF-YEAR COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- President’s Report
- Community Outreach Committee (COCo)
- Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)
- Student Affairs Committee (SAC)
- Finance and Facilities Committee (FiFaC)
- Organization and External Affairs Committee (OEAC)
- Student Budget Committee (SBC)

---

**II. RESOLUTIONS**

- Academic Advising Resolution (September 30, 2012)
- Reading Period Resolution (September 30, 2012)
- Student Activism Judicial Response Resolution (October 7, 2012)
- URLC Resolution (November 18, 2012)
- Day for Community Building Resolution (November 18, 2012)
- Spring Fling Resolution (November 18, 2012)
- WesFest Scheduling Resolution (December 2, 2012)
- Washington Street Zoning Resolution (February 24, 2013)
- Chalking Resolution (April 28, 2013)

---

**III. MEMOS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Budget Task Force Items for Consideration Memo (December 2012)
- Diversity Recommendations (December 2012)
- Recommendations for ResLife Policy Changes (May 2013)
- Updated Leonard Prize Memo (May 2013)
Members of the Assembly

WSA Officers
Zachary Malter ‘13, President
Mari Jarris ‘14, Vice-President
Chloe Murtagh ‘15, Coordinator
Nicole Brenner ‘15, Treasurer

Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)
Sam Ebb ‘13, Chair
Aobo Dong ‘15, Vice-Chair
Lily Herman ‘16
Alex Rachlin ‘15
Jesse Ross Silverman ‘13

Community Outreach Committee (COCo)
Syed Ali ‘13, Chair
Glenn Cantave ‘15
Christian Hosam ‘15
Jacob Musinsky ‘15
Ellen Paik ‘16
Alton Wang ‘16

Finance and Facilities Committee (FiFaC)
Andrew Trexler ‘14, Chair
Adam Brudnick ‘13
Mary Diaz ‘14
Chase Knowles ‘16
Angus McLean ‘16
Sisi Miteva ‘15
Sam Usdan ‘15
Organization and External Affairs Committee (OEAC)
Mari Jarris ‘14, Chair
Chloe Murtagh ‘15, Vice-Chair
Grant Tanenbaum ‘15, IT Coordinator
Martin Malabanan ‘16
Wayne Ng ‘16

Student Affairs Committee (SAC)
Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Chair
Jacob Blumenthal ‘13
Kate Cullen ‘16
Lily Donahue ‘15
Scott Elias ‘14
Bruno Machiavelo ‘16
Jason Shatz ‘14

Student Budget Committee (SBC)
Nicole Brenner ‘15, Chair
Mansoor Alam ‘15
Arya Alizadeh ‘13
Rebecca Brand ‘16
Justin Gitlin ‘15
Ted Shabecoff ‘16
Nicki Softness ‘14
END-OF-YEAR COMMITTEE REPORTS

President’s Report
Zachary Malter ‘13, WSA President

Over the course of the year, the WSA tackled hard issues, performing its responsibility as a vocal advocacy body for students. We responded vigorously to both changes in the financial aid/admissions policy and to student concerns raised about diversity and campus climate. At the same time, we fostered new collaborations between student groups and with Middletown and worked hard to represent the student voice on issues such as Residential Life and Tour De Franzia. Last, we instituted new improvements both in academics and other realms.

Financial Aid/Admissions

The Budget Sustainability Task Force formulated tentative recommendations which were presented to the administration and e-mailed to the student body. These recommendations represented cost savings, budget cuts, or new revenues that would increase Wesleyan’s ability to support financial aid scholarships while remaining financially sustainable. After vigorous discussion and consideration of feedback, the task force devised a final set of recommendations. That report is being finalized and will be shared with the administration and the student body soon. The Board of Trustees Finance Committee has agreed to consider the report in its November 2013 meeting. In addition to these developments, the admissions committee was founded so that the WSA can have a consistent role in admissions policy.

WesMiles, a program whereby alumni donate frequent flyer miles to fund international students with need’s trips home, launched this year. It sponsored three students during Winter Break. We have worked with the Office of International Studies and the Financial Aid Office to institutionalize this program.

Diversity

After students voiced complaints about diversity and campus climate, the WSA worked to address these issues in earnest. We developed a set of diversity and inclusion related recommendations, strengthened the role and visibility of the campus climate log, organized a second Diversity University event (“Diversity University: In the Classroom and Beyond,” can be found in the Campus Climate Log), worked to improve P-Safe practices, developed new opportunities for social justice training, and underwent our our WSA social justice training.

Advocacy

The WSA this year were strong advocates for the student voice. Our many resolutions prevented Wesleyan from supporting the Washington Street Development and its developer’s plan for a new Wesleyan bookstore, blocked a shortening of reading week, expressed opposition to changes to Wesfest and to the current chalking policy, and affirmed our support for student activism. We
also worked to ensure that the administration takes a pragmatic approach to Tour De Franzia that is most conducive to student health and safety.

**New Collaborations - Student Groups and Middletown**

This was a year of new and improved community partnerships. We held summits both for student groups and Middletown related organizations, bridging gaps between student leaders and fostering collaborations. We continued the Second Annual Spring Student Groups Fair which offered a second opportunity for students to join groups and for groups to increase membership.

**Residential Life**

We spent much of the year supporting improvements to the residential life department, culminating in a proposal and an SLC conversation about how to improve residential life. We are confident that these proposals will result in stronger mentorship and support from RAs and better usage of ResLife resources.

**Academic Improvements**

We increased the number of minors, made improvements to advising through Cardinal Connect and a new advising video, and promoted new academic opportunities through the CSPL thesis lectures and new pre-major listserves. We continued to sponsor the *New York Times* program, bringing students 200 in-print and digital copies every day and securing a *New York Times* columnist, Jacques Steinberg, as our annual *Times* speaker. His public lecture “Beyond the Gatekeepers: The State of College Access and Affordability” was well attended.

**New Spaces**

A new 24-hour study space was opened up in Exley, creating one of the campus’ only open spaces for studying outside of dorms after 2 am. In response to high student demand, we also worked to increase the number of dance spaces available for student groups, and to install mirrors and sound-proof walls in Fayerweather to improve the space’s utility. In terms of increased services, we helped institute both a new, second ATM mission in the lobby of Exley Science Center and a new meal plan with increased flexibility for juniors and seniors.
Community Outreach Committee
Syed Ali ’13, Chair

COCo refocused its energies on issues of community this year, making inroads into new areas while redoubling on its traditional responsibilities. The Middletown Relations Committee (MidWes) went in strong to its first full year and two new subcommittees were formed: the Committee for Inclusion and Diversity (CID) and the Spirit and Events Committee (SEC). In addition, COCo liaisons to student group categories were introduced.

Student Groups
Recognition. We are ending with 302 total active recognized student groups. This represents an 8.4% reduction from the 330 that we ended 2011-2012 with, essentially in line with the objective a 9% reduction. The recognition process was reformed so that new groups were required to submit a 15 signature petition and attend a 5-10 minute meeting for approval.

Category Liaisons were introduced this year, pairing each COCo member to several student group categories. Rather than pushing out mass mailings through the student group listservs, COCo members reached out to the categories they were responsible for. The liaisons were also responsible for managing recognition requests for their categories and assessing their needs.

WSA Tools & Applications Replacement. An ongoing initiative throughout the year has been to replace our aging student group management software. Initial research narrowed down contenders to CollegiateLink and OrgSync. Student group leaders and several administrative departments were engaged in the process, which involved the Community Outreach Committee (COCo), the Information Technology Committee (ITC), and the Student Budget Committee (SBC).

Student Group Leader Summit. We convened a meeting of all student group leaders in the beginning of the spring semester in which we shared information, encouraged collaboration, and took in feedback. We hope that this summit will happen once per year or semester in the future.

Student Group Handbook. Existing information on resources for student groups was reorganized, updated, and supplemented to create the new Student Group Handbook. The Handbook takes two forms: PDF and online.

190 High. We received requests for minor updates to 190 High and for the creation of a recording studio in the basement. The recording studio was approved but we are still awaiting an itemized budget for maintenance of the existing spaces.

Wes-to-Wes tried to engage students in fundraising for financial aid, starting this fall with the aim of creating opportunities for student groups to fundraise towards the cause. The group worked with University Relations to acquire a text-to-donate service and sell tees, but had trouble gaining support from the department. In the Spring, Wes-to-Wes shifted toward developing a scholarship funded by energy efficiency savings in Wesleyan residences.
Inclusion and Diversity
The Committee for Inclusion and Diversity (CID), a subcommittee of the Community Outreach Committee (COCo) founded fall semester, has worked to continue discourse around inclusion through many events. Members of COCo/CID participated in the Making Excellence Inclusive (MEI) Student Subcommittee and the CID published recommendations for the initiative. The CID co-sponsored a successful panel discussion entitled “Misunderstanding Minorities” towards the end of the fall semester. Chief Diversity Officer Sonia Mañjon came into a General Assembly meeting to facilitate a Making Excellence Inclusive (MEI) discussion that outside students also attended. Some members of the Assembly also attended dinner with Dr. Shakti Butler and attended a day of social justice and movement building training with her.

In February, the committee hosted "Allyship in a Post-Racial Society," a faculty panel that discussed the use of privilege for good and connected diversity and the classroom. A button-campaign was also used to increase awareness of the potential of allyship. Members helped organize and hosted sessions for the 5th annual Social Justice Leadership Conference (SJLC) geared towards current Wesleyan students and hosted a WesFest session on these issues geared toward prospective students. Some members also helped plan "Diversity Forum 2: In the Classroom and Beyond" in April. COCo worked to promote the Campus Climate Log and the Campus Climate Survey as well as survey students on their satisfaction with the administration's spring updates on the first Diversity Forum. Members of CID helped plan the second Diversity University forum, which took place in April. As Sonia Mañjon leaves the university, COCo/CID looks to ensure its voice on the search committee and that it's winter recommendations to Making Excellence Inclusive (MEI) are actually acted upon.

Middletown Relations
The Middletown Relations Committee (MidWes), a subcommittee of the Community Outreach Committee (COCo) founded last spring, has been developing programs that build strong relationships and encouraging partnerships. The committee is helping the Center for the Arts with Middletown Remix, an initiative to celebrate the sounds of the town. Members are working to fill a gap in existing programs by creating a mentorship program between athletes at Wesleyan and athletes at Middletown High School. By connecting with the Youth Services Bureau, the committee hopes to better the rich programs for children that already exist. A City Hall Internship is being developed through putting the Career Center and the Mayor's Office in communication with each other and should be ready for the next academic year. MidWes was heavily involved in communicating with locals and advocacy against the Planning and Zoning Change on Washington Street that would allow for a disruptive new commercial development. A member created a Google Group listserv so that student groups who work in town can better communicate and collaborate. Finally, the committee hosted a Middletown Wesleyan Student Group Summit in which all these different group leaders met each other and came up with a list of recommendations. Looking on to next year, the Middletown Relations Committee will be trying to actualize these recommendations and is already planning an event on September 20 to encourage student patronage of Main Street restaurants.

WEServe Week of Service is a revived project in partnership with the CCP, University Relations, and others to encourage members of the greater Wesleyan community to complete service projects during the week of January 20-26. COCo helped facilitate the involvement of
student groups and their members, in Middletown and in hometowns around the world.

**Spirit and Events**
The Spirit and Events Committee (SEC) was also proposed this summer and then formed at the beginning of the year, like CID. The committee aims to create a more cohesive campus culture through building school spirit and hosting events that effectively attract the entire campus community. All of COCo underwent Social Event Host Training to facilitate the effort. Under the leadership of Jacob Musinsky ‘15, SEC successfully put on Bandfire this year for the third time and wrote a manual to recreating the event in the future. They also worked with the Support Wes Music movement. In the spring, SEC took the lead in organizing the Student Group Leader Summit, mentioned above. The committee planned The Amazing Race: Wesleyan Edition, a team scavenger hunt across campus that tied together fun activities with Wesleyan trivia.

**Orientation.** Lydia Rex ‘14 took the lead on finding methods for WSA input in Orientation. Although there is no Orientation Committee during the school year, the incoming COCo Chair will serve on the summer Orientation Committee as a virtual member. Credit also to this fall’s WSA freshmen who worked with Dean Garrett to make suggestions towards improving summer communications to incoming freshmen.
Academic Affairs Committee
Sam Ebb ’13, Chair

Educational Policy Committee (EPC)

One of the major issues that was tackled by EPC during this year was the new 5-year academic calendar. The calendar has seen numerous iterations and lengthy discussion including two informational discussions at faculty meetings, a failed faculty vote on a new calendar earlier this semester and a second vote passed a 5-year extension of the current calendar. Other issues that were tackled during the Fall semester included the approval of the Wesleyan Pre-College Program for a four-year trial period, the approval of a second Wesleyan Summer Session and an accompanying change in the academic regulations to allow students to take an unlimited number of Wesleyan credits during the summer. The committee also approved a change to the academic regulations to add an academic warning for students who are enrolled in more than two but less than three credits as that student is not an official “full-time student” and therefore would face issues with financial aid. The warning is also intended to serve as a helpful push for students who would otherwise fall directly to strict probation for dropping below the two credit minimum for a single semester. The incoming AAC should look into this more next year with the Dean’s office to try to gauge if the policy has seemed effective.

This semester, the committee addressed the teaching evaluation form and approved a new form for consideration by the faculty. They will vote on whether or not to approve the new form for an opt-in trial period for tenured faculty at the upcoming faculty meeting. Another major issue that has come before the committee this year is the procedure for the approval of colleges within the university. The committee approved the College of Film and the Moving Image, but felt a need for more clarity on the process, which resulted in the creation of a document outlining what the committee looks for in a college. The committee has also recommended that all colleges be subject to a vote of the faculty before they can be approved. This recommendation was approved by the faculty. The committee also approved four new minors this year: French, Film Studies, Medieval Studies and Russian, Eastern European and Eurasian Studies (REES). This brings the total to seven including the three that were approved last year in Economics, German Studies and Archeology. Other issues that the committee has dealt with include the re-working of the curriculum of both the Writing certificate and Civic Engagement certificate, the approval of graduate concentrations for use on graduate transcripts, discussed the ideas of a student portfolio, an academic J-Term, the academic performance of student athletes and the external review processes for different departments.

Austin Dong ’15 is currently working on a proposal to bring to EPC on the extension of the deadline for grading mode changes (graded v. pass/fail) to two weeks after the end of drop-add. This was an issue that was brought before EPC via a WSA resolution in the 2009-2010 academic year, but the committee ran out of time to fully discuss the issue. The incoming AAC chair should work with Austin to get this proposal on the EPC agenda at the beginning of next year.
Minors
Many of the members of AAC have been involved throughout the year with various efforts to convince departments that they should create minors. The committee surveyed the student body and received vast amounts of interest in many different departments. Discussions are ongoing and there seem to be a number of newly-interested departments, particularly in the sciences.

Study Spaces
Austin worked with Public Safety and Events and Scheduling to get six classrooms reserved by the WSA from 11pm-7am during the entirety of reading week and finals to provide extra space for students to study. The committee will attempt to create themes for the different rooms as a mechanism for creating communities within different disciplines and allowing people with similar academic interests to be able to work together and share ideas and questions. There was also discussion between AAC and COCo regarding the use of 190 High as a 24-hour study space during reading and finals periods. While this was not feasible for this year, next year’s AAC should look into this again. Also, the 24-hour study space was officially opened during first semester.

Cohort Building
The committee began work contacting members of majors committees and surveying the student body about the sense of community within different majors. This idea of cohort building within majors arose from EPC discussions of qualifications for a college and the WSA discussion of stress.

Peer Advising
Lily Herman ’16 worked to create an official proposal for the new head of the Peer Advisors including recommendations for improvements to the program. Next year’s AAC should follow up to ensure that these recommendations are enacted.

Advising
Nicole Updegrove ‘14 and myself were student representatives to the Advising Task Force. In conjunction with other members of the assembly, we passed a resolution enumerating changes that we would like made in the advising system, and particularly in the field of pre-major advisors. The task force discussed a number of different ways to improve advising, the course registration system and communication between departments and students (especially students who are not yet in a major or are in another major but have interests that lie in departments other than the one they are majoring in). Also discussed was the idea of having frosh register for all four classes over the summer before coming to Wesleyan. The student representatives voiced their discomfort with the idea, but agreed to continue conversation on the topic if the administration decided to pilot the program. The task force presented its recommendations to the faculty at the beginning of second semester and was met with general support (the idea of increasing the number of courses that frosh register for over the summer was not included in this presentation). The recommended changes to WesMaps were “added to the ITS priorities list,” though it remains uncertain what the time frame is for the implementation of these changes. Jesse Ross-Silverman is currently working to get in touch with IT and figure that out. Finally, Nicki Softness ’14, Zach Malter ’13, Christian Hosam ’15 and Nicole Updegrove ‘14 joined me in creating a videotaped panel discussion on advising that will lead to the
production of two videos. The first is directed at advisors and discusses advising from a student perspective and what makes good advising. The second is directed at incoming frosh and talks about what to expect from your advisor and some basic tips on the process. I am currently working with New Media Lab. They are completing a second rough cut this weekend and a final version will be available by t to create the final versions of the video.

**Pre-Major/General Interest List Servs**
Academic Affairs and IT have agreed to create them, but given that the university is likely shifting away from lyris at the end of this year, they did not want to put the time into creating these list servs through lyris. Next year’s AAC should ensure that these are, in fact, created.

**Provost Search**
Rob Rosenthal is stepping down as Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs at the end of this year. I was the student representative to the hiring committee, which decided on Ruth Striegel as our new Provost/VPAA. Professor Striegel visited the WSA on 4/28 to discuss her vision as Provost.

**Academic Stress**
The committee had several discussions about academic stress, its causes and ways that it can be mitigated. Ideas that were brought up included working with Academic Affairs to create a policy for mid-terms similar to the one that exists for finals regarding the number of “major” assignments or final exams that can be held in a 24 or 48 hour period for a single student. Other ideas that were discussed in coordination with SAC included working with CAPS to have them available in locations outside the health center especially during reading and finals period. This discussion also tied into the community/cohort building effort that was mentioned earlier.

**Honor Code**
AAC worked with SAC and the Honor Board to make recommendations for ways to decrease instances of academic dishonesty. Student Affairs agreed to institute a virtual re-signing of the Honor Code before every pre-registration period to keep students mindful of the code. Other ideas were discussed, though were unpopular among faculty and did not come to fruition.

**Center for the Study of Public Life (CSPL)**
Andrew Trexler ’14, Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Syed Ali ‘13 and myself met with Professor Jennifer Tucker—the head of CSPL—to discuss ideas for the center and ways to improve it going forward. AAC worked with Professor Tucker on a senior thesis talk series for people whose theses included work regarding public life and particularly within the social sciences. 12 students presented along with Steve Fuzesi who is a visiting instructor in the CSPL this year and was formerly vice president at Newsweek. The event was a success and the incoming AAC should continue to work with Professor Tucker and the CSPL to expand the event and increase advertising.
Student Affairs Committee
Nicole Updegrove ’14, Chair

Student Judicial Process Committee
In the fall, SJPC’s work focused on clarifying and streamlining the judicial process for students. Students received their first detailed explanation of the points system, the Notice of Pending Disciplinary Action (NOPDA) letter was revised to clarify the actionable steps that students ought to take before a hearing, and the process for non-fire-safety room violations became more automated.

During the spring, SJPC focused on changes to the Code of Non-Academic Conduct (CNAC). At the request of SJB members, revisions were made to Regulation 1 (Privacy and Tranquility) and Regulation 2 (Harassment and Abuse) to remove any mention of intentionality (because not all noise violations are intentional, nor are all damages to others). To compensate for the altered violation, the point range for Regulation 2 was expanded to 2-10 points, rather than 4-10. Regulation 1 was also changed in name to Disturbance of the Peace/Privacy, for social norming purposes.

SAC’s main focus with CNAC reform was a reexamination of the Disruptions policy in Regulation 12 and Regulation 15. A complaint was levied against the administration concerning potentially contradictory language in which Regulation 15 made illegal some actions protected under Regulation 12’s endorsement of a statement by the ACLU. A broader conversation between students, faculty, alumni and administrators has only recently begun, but already changes have been made to the employment policies within student affairs. Previously, any judicial record could prevent a student from being hired or lead them to lose pre-existing jobs; the new policy dictates a more case-by-case orientation, allowing employers to decide whether a protest-related judicial charge is grounds for dismissal.

Thanks to Jake Blumenthal ’13, Ted Shabecoff ’16, Scott Elias ‘14, and Jason Shatz ‘14 for their work in collaboration with Jon Connary, Dean Rick Culliton, and the SJB.

Work to be continued:
• The points system is still new to Wesleyan and must continue to be monitored, tweaked, and better explained to the campus at large.
• Process advisor use is still relatively low among students summoned to the Board. Better advertising and more frequent trainings would better serve the campus community.
• Activism (and subsequently, the Disruptions policy) remains a point of disagreement between students and administrators.
• Most importantly - write-ups from ResLife and cases heard by the SJB more than doubled in the fall of 2012 from the fall of 2011. AlcoholEDU data indicates that alcohol and other substance use has not changed. The judicial system at Wesleyan is meant to be more educational and reform-oriented than punitive. If behaviors are not changing, and fear of judicial repercussions are having little effect, there is huge room for improvement in the way Wesleyan responds to judicial infractions.
National College Health Improvement Project

Through the NCHIP project, SAC funded four student groups who put on campus-wide events on Friday or Saturday nights. For fewer than $300 each, these groups were able to attract at times considerable number of students for substance-free events. The best-attended events were high-energy events, especially those held outdoors, and attendance peaked around 10:45 p.m. More detailed data will be brought forward to the Usdan Center Activities Board (UCAB) in an attempt to make that programming better attended during peak drinking hours.

During the spring, NCHIP focused largely on efforts surrounding the Tour de Franzia, an annual campus event that often results in very high-risk drinking among students. Ultimately, students and administrators reached a compromise about sanctions to be imposed, which will include six judicial points and, for seniors, the inability to participate in senior week or to walk the stage for graduation. Measures taken to discourage the occurrence of the Tour were indeed successful and the Tour did not take place this spring, but many concerns have been raised among students about the approach being taken. Litigation risks require that the University not condone the event, but there may still be more creative steps that can decrease health risks for students if events like this occur in future years.

Wesleyan will not continue as part of the 32-college NCHIP project, and will revert back to the former Alcohol and Other Drugs committee.

Work to be continued:
- It should be very clear that there is much work left to be done. Wesleyan’s goals for the 3-year NCHIP project were to reduce binge drinking rates to 37% and reduce the associated harms by 50%. These goals have not been accomplished. SAC will need to continue collaborating the the administration on how to keep students safe during their time at Wesleyan while protecting the college residential experience as one of experimentation, learning, and personal growth.

Public Safety Advisory Committee

The Public Safety Review Committee was convened in the spring of 2013 to explore the role of the Public Safety Office, review the issues that were raised in the November 2012 Diversity forum, and make recommendations towards the improvement of departmental practices and protocols and serving the varied needs of safety and security for the Wesleyan Community. Additionally, the committee provided guidance to Margolis Healy and Associates, a leading campus law enforcement consulting firm that was hired to review the Office of Public Safety and met with faculty, students, and staff on April 30 and May 1st.

In response to vocal outrage by a significant number of students of color, and in light of the Diversity University Forum last fall, in which the topic of alleged racial profiling took center stage, alongside claims of Public Safety misconduct, the Public Safety Review Committee, recommended that Public Safety modify campus safety alerts, standardizing a set of descriptors to be used in Public Safety alerts. Race was not included as a descriptor to be used in Public Safety alerts, and Publicly safety has now adopted the practice of including the set of descriptors the committee agreed upon.
The current alert policy, incorporating our recommendations, means that Public Safety will include a brief description of the incident by the reporting party and/or any witnesses which may include the following: the number of individuals, gender, approximate age, mode of transportation and direction of travel as well as any other uniquely identifying information (clothing, scars, etc.) If there is a very good description of suspect(s) and it would stand out from the student population that will be shared; however, race or ethnicity will not typically be included in the email unless its inclusion makes identifying the suspect reasonably certain.

Thanks to Christian Hosam ’15, Lily Donahue ’15, Alton Wang ’16, and particularly Scott Elias ’14 for their work this year bringing student opinion to Public Safety.

Work to be continued:

- Create a modern Public Safety website, which includes but is not limited to Public Safety’s mission statement, pictures and bios of officers, a feedback mechanism for complaints, information about PSAC and PSRC and contact information of members
- Make transparent the Office of Public Safety’s established policies and procedures by publishing them on the website, including but not limited to the use of force and restraint, room entry, asking for ID's, loud noise complaints, camera/video policy, and where the Middletown Police Department has authority on Campus.
- Explore the possibility of a student job program (both work-study and not) where students can work to foster improved student-Public Safety interactions as well as maintain the Public Safety website
- Revamp Public Safety Hiring Practices and Training, to include more multicultural, sensitivity, and social justice awareness.

Report written by Scott Elias ’14, Chair.

Undergraduate Residential Life Committee

URLC spent much of this semester determining the future of 230 Washington Street, formerly jointly occupied by LightHouse and Interfaith House. Interfaith House was disbanded at the end of last year. A number of different permutations were considered for the space, including the movement of other program houses/halls into the space. Ultimately, a call for program house proposals was sent to the community. Four proposals were submitted, of which one was not considered because of its Greek status. After weeks of deliberation, URLC chose Studio House to share 230 Washington St. with LightHouse. Studio House was extremely successful in recruiting applicants and filling spaces in the spring.

Last year’s URLC made significant alterations to the General Room Selection (GRS) process for this spring, including changing location from Exley 150 to Usdan 108/110 and making shorter time slots during which smaller numbers of groups come to select. These changes were very well-received by students and by ResLife staff, who found the selection nights to be much less chaotic. Additionally, this year rising seniors were not allowed to split or merge groups while units of their housing group size were available. SAC polled students as they walked out of GRS and learned that ultimately, the inability to split or merge made the process less stressful. Next year’s GRS will use new software and will include Copenhagens and program houses, but at SAC’s urging selection will remain in-person rather than online.
After hearing many complaints about Residential Advisors this year, SAC spent a considerable amount of time and effort surveying the campus about the role of Resident Advisors. Kate Cullen ’16 spearheaded this work with help from Bruno Machiavelo ’16 and Ted Shabecoff ’16 in canvassing. Kate and Nicole conducted meetings with Area Coordinators and ResLife administrators, surveys of peer institutions, canvassing of all student dorms, a winter survey of ResLife student staff, and many meetings with ResLife student staff members. A final proposal has been submitted addressing concerns about hiring, training, assessment, and programming. Fran Koerting was very open to our input, and discussions about our recommendations will continue among upper-level ResLife staff over the summer.

URLC also effectively addressed many other, small-scale issues like guest card access (which will be reduced to 1 per person due to administrative time constraints) and the program house evaluation process (which will reflect with greater emphasis house involvement rather than house manager effort).

Thanks to Andrew Trexler ’14, Kate Cullen ’16, and Jake Blumenthal ’13 for their work collaborating with ResLife staff on this committee.

Fire Safety and Facilities Appeals Board
Fire safety had a great year and approved many fire safety and facilities fines. However, we also denied many that the committee did not feel should be repealed.

Work to be Continued:
• Continue representing the student perspective on the board.
• Increase advertising regarding fire safety seminars and the fact that attending them will reduce fines.

Thanks to Bruno Machiavelo ’16, Lily Donahue ’15 (Chair), Jake Blumenthal ’13 and Scott Elias ’14 for their work on this committee. Report written by Bruno Machiavelo ’16, Chair

Student Health Advisory Committee
The main accomplishment of the Student Health Advisory Committee (SHAC) this semester has been transforming from a report based body to an initiating body. SHAC has offered insight on many important issues pertaining to student health including the addition of a second party billing service and the hiring of a new Medical Director. After reviewing high satisfaction rates among the students for the Davidson Health Center (DHC), SHAC continued to push for more growth. These included transparency in billing, free STI testing, the renovation of the DHC website, and the accessibility of condoms in dormitories. Along with health from the Student Affairs Committee, SHAC has initiated discussion on Wesleyan’s medical leave policy, services for students with learning disabilities, and resources for victims of sexual assault. Next year SHAC hopes to organize more events such as a series of dinner lectures on sexual health and substance abuse issues. We also hope to open a larger discussion in the student body about rape culture and combat sexual assault on campus.

Report written by Kate Cullen ’16.
Sexual Violence Action Committee
SVAC organized the red flag campaign, a campaign intended to raise awareness about consent, sexual violence in general, and the culture surrounding these issues. They also worked to get SVAC recognized as an official student group and held many Awareness Events (Open Mics, Roundtables, etc.) to increase conversation about sexual awareness and the culture surrounding it. These awareness events also allowed survivors to share their stories in a safe space. The sale of “consent underwear” was also a big awareness campaign.

Work to be Continued:
• Plan more effective and powerful awareness events (postering, banners, campaigns, etc.)
• Work to increase SVAC’s role on campus and solidify it as a group of leaders in the war against sexual assault
• Work with the SART intern to increase SVAC meeting attendance

Report written by Bruno Machiavelo ‘16.
Overview

The Finance and Facilities Committee had a fantastic year, achieving many successes and with much progress yet to come in future years. A special thanks to the members of the committee: Adam Brudnick ‘13, Benny Docter ‘14 (Fall), Mary Diaz ‘14 (Spring), Sisi Miteva ‘15, Sam Usdan ‘15, Kehan Zhou ‘15 (Fall), Chase Knowles ‘16, and Angus McLean ‘16 (Spring).

Budget Priorities Committee

The Budget Priorities Committee (BPC) has also had a particularly active year, meeting frequently to discuss ramifications of last year’s change in the Wesleyan’s financial model. In particular, our ongoing purpose is to establish written guidelines on institutional priorities and their ideal financial appropriations, particularly with respect to the future of Wesleyan admissions and financial aid. The Committee was hampered in this work in the Spring semester by the also-important need to address new money requests for the University. Our hope is to eventually produce a set of “thermometers” by which the Wesleyan community can determine how and when Wesleyan should shape its admissions and aid policies for optimal quality, affordability, and sustainability of Wesleyan’s educational and social mission. We hope that the Committee may then provide regular (annual) assessments of where Wesleyan is on its road back to need blind admissions.

Thanks to the help of Zach Malter ’13, Evan Weber ’13, and Nicole Brenner ’15 for their work on the Committee.

Business Continuity Committee

Despite several weather-related shut-downs, business has continued. Incorporating many of the lessons from last year’s October blackout, the University has made real progress in addressing needs during disasters. The Committee continues to reshape policy and train additional staff for response to a great variety of possible scenarios. Leadership of the Committee will need to be established and supported in Fall 2013, after the Chair Cliff Ashton left the University mid-year and his replacement Dave Meyer is now retiring at the close of this semester.

Campus Climate Log Committee

The Campus Climate Log Committee (CCLC) has met more frequently in the past year and will continue meeting on a monthly basis. The Log has seen increased activity as the committee has focused on logging education efforts in addition to incident reports. The main hurdle we currently face is visibility, and to aid in this effort we have added several new members to the Committee so that they may regularly discuss the Log with their own constituencies.
Cogeneration Facility at Freeman Athletic Center

Over the course of the year, the Facilities Department and the Finance Office collaborated to devise a plan for a new cogeneration natural gas plant underneath Freeman Athletic Center. This plan is intended to satisfy several of Wesleyan’s energy needs, including the increased generation of our own energy, the use of Freeman as an Connecticut emergency shelter facility, and increased response capabilities for the core campus in the event of a natural or other disaster. Significant student opposition to this project was presented primarily on the grounds of environmental complications with natural gas, and FiFaC supported this opposition to the administration and the Board of Trustees. Both the Board and the Sustainability Advisory Group for Environmental Stewardship determined that the project should go forward nonetheless.

Committee for Investor Responsibility

The Committee for Investor Responsibility (CIR) has had a very active year. The Committee is rigorously pursuing new avenues for community investment in addition to two $250,000 Certificates of Deposit invested from the General Operating Fund in local banks. In addition, the CIR has filed its first shareholder resolution, filing a resolution with Rockwood Chemical requesting stated ecological goals for the company. Unfortunately, this resolution had to be withdrawn due to a clerical error; the Committee is re-examining it for a potential re-filing in the Fall.

The Committee hosted a Town Hall style open forum on the Endowment in the Spring, allowing community members to ask questions of the Committee and of the Endowment. Also in the Spring the Committee secured and conducted a meeting with the Chief Investment Officer Anne Martin; we hope that this will become a regular (semesterly) occurrence.

Finally, the Committee will be shortly producing an informative document on the question of fossil-fuel divestment and what that means for Wesleyan.

* A special thanks to Kate Cullen ’16 for her work on the Committee.

Dining

The Dining Committee has produced some exciting results in the Fall semester. We are pleased to announce that a new meal plan will be made available to juniors and seniors starting in Fall 2013 that will entail 50 meals and 1225 points. Our hope is that this option will help bridge the gap between the costly all-points plan and the over-abundance of meals in the 105 block plan. We anticipate that this option will be popular.

To help relieve some of the stress of the dish-room, Usdan has purchased two dish carts, one located in Mink Dining Hall and one on the first floor, where students can leave their dishes instead of having to use the small dish-room window. These dish carts have already seen extensive use by students, and we hope that this continues in the future. Usdan Marketplace also began post-consumer composting for all wasted food passing through its dishroom. This compost is donated to local composting projects.

In addition to a large variety of menu changes and adjustments, the Committee made several minor adjustments to Dining facility hours, most notably the adjustment of Weshop
opening on weekdays from 11:30am to 11:00am to accommodate those with busy class schedules on the South end of campus. This change will be going into effect for Fall 2013.

The Dining Committee was unable to secure a replacement for early weekend breakfast options, although Red & Black Café does open at 9am. There is significant possibility of a pilot program for a hot weekend breakfast option at Summerfields, 9am to 11am. Discussions on this topic are still ongoing.

Two additional issues remain outstanding for next year’s committee. The first is the continued incorporation of labor representatives in Dining discussions. The second involves current plans for a shortened J-term installed in the near future. Due to an apparent miscommunication, earlier discussions for the use of Weshop and the installment of an optional meal plan over Winter Break were lost and must be renewed with great urgency. Some preliminaries will begin over Summer 2013.

Thanks to Benny Docter ’14 for his leadership in the Committee in the Fall, and to Mary Diaz ’14, Sisi Miteva ’15, Sam Usdan ’15, Kehan Zhou ’15, Angus McLean ’16. and Chase Knowles ’16 for their contributions.

Environmental Protection

Angus McLean ‘16 has led efforts this year to encourage Wesleyan to divest from companies supporting the extraction of unsustainable energy resources. Amid growing national, international, and alumni support for this existential effort, we hope that Wesleyan may play the right role in protecting the environment.

Financial Aid Committee

This year, the Financial Aid Committee and Work Study Board concentrated on improving educational efforts around the financial aid process and streamlining the efficiencies in scholarship allocation within the context of a changed admissions-aid model. A handbook was created to assist low-income and first-generation students adjust to college life.

President Roth has asked the WSA to help identify the greatest hardships students and their families face in affording a Wesleyan education. This should be a major focus for the Committee in the coming year.

Thanks to the efforts and leadership of Sisi Miteva ’15 and Austin Dong ’15 and the contributions of Benny Docter ’14, Ting Zhang ’15, and Chase Knowles ’16.

Freeman Athletic Center Advisory Committee

The Freeman Athletic Center Advisory Committee had a rather inactive year after the chaos of a new athletic director. The Committee seems to have finally recollected its strength at the close of the academic year and looks to rebound in Fall 2013. Thanks to Nicki Softness ‘14, Arya Alizadeh ‘13, Lily Donahue ‘14, and Mary Diaz ‘14 for their help with this year. A particular thanks to Mary for her continued energy in bringing forward a proposal to install generators on the work-out room’s stationary bikes to generate power for the building.

Green Fund

This year the Green Fund actually ran out of money with quite a few unfunded proposals. A full report is still waiting on Adam Brudnick ‘14.

Lighting

FiFaC conducted an extremely successful annual Light Tour, registering dozens of fixtures in need of replacement and identifying several locations for new lights to be installed,
including a new blue-light outside of Olin Library. Thanks to everyone who participated in the effort!

**Major Maintenance**

The Major Maintenance Committee is moving forward with this year’s recommendations on major maintenance allocations. The Board of Trustees has approved a renovation to the outdoor track facility at Freeman, as well as a fully donation-funded turf infield to be installed at the same time as the track renovation.

The Green Building Committee has approved new and exciting green landscaping proposals similar to the ongoing renovation of the West College Courtyard, as well as several for an Outdoor Classroom. Current projects include the WestCo Courtyard, the renovation of the slopes near Summerfields at Butterfield C -- including new stone steps up the formerly muddy bank -- and a permaculture garden in the areas around Green Hall in Butterfield C. Thanks to Sam Usdan ’15 for his contributions on the Green Building Committee.

**Sustainability**

SAGES met actively throughout the Fall semester to discuss the pros and cons of installing a second cogeneration facility at Freeman. After extensive analysis and lengthy discourse, the group (and the Board) has decided to move forward with the project. SAGES is, among many other things, also beginning a revamped recycling campaign and a continuing campaign to reduce overall energy consumption campus-wide. SAGES explored a wide variety of subjects in the Spring Semester, eventually re-envisioning itself as the group responsible for bringing Wesleyan to its looming 2020 and 2050 climate commitment carbon reduction and neutrality agreements.

Wesleyan is now entering Phase 5 of a multi-step program to renovate buildings with more ecologically friendly and energy efficient innards (pipes, pumps, wiring, etc.).

An opt-out program is now available for the mass mailings in student WesBoxes. Please be advised that this program is all or nothing, despite our best efforts otherwise.

Working with Wes-to-Wes, FiFaC has succeeded in achieving a green-light for a program committing to increasing the financial aid budget any demonstrable energy savings from students in their residences. This will be a major campaign for the coming year. Thanks to Ellen Paik ‘16 for her leadership here.

FiFaC and Physical Plant have worked together to put forward four proposals for electric vehicle charging stations around campus. It is our hope that these will be funded by the Green Fund this coming Fall, as the Fund ran out of money this semester.

Negotiations for a Green Revolving Fund are ongoing. Thanks to the Wesleyan Consulting Group for their continued help with this.

**Student Budget Sustainability Task Force**

Working with Zach Malter ’13 and the rest of the Task Force through extensive research and much debate, we have produced a preliminary findings document (available on the WSA website). Research for many aspects of this work is ongoing, tasked to Andrew Trexler ‘14 over the course of Summer 2013 for final release in September 2013.

**Transportation**

FiFaC worked with the Box Office and the Transportation Department to successfully run shuttles and buses for all breaks, including the second annual run of a DC/Philly bus for Thanksgiving Break. This route has now become regularized into the schedule. FiFaC was also
able to secure limited special-need student parking in the Butt A Parking Lot starting Spring 2013.

The Transportation Committee has merged with a Sustainability Advisory Group for Environmental Stewardship (SAGES) subcommittee for Transportation. Under this new framework in the Spring Semester, the Committee laid groundwork for a new University air travel policy which would limit University-sponsored air travel to reduce carbon emissions. The Committee has also laid the groundwork for a new program sponsored by the Connecticut Department of Transportation called CTRides that encourages use of public transportation. This program will begin at Wesleyan in Fall 2013.

**Washington Street Development**

FiFaC’s normal operations were interrupted temporarily by a community debate on the merits of a potential new development on Washington Street and a relocation of Wesleyan’s Bookstore there. Joining with vocal members of the Middletown community and the faculty, FiFaC successfully conveyed the majority student opinion in opposition to the project and Wesleyan has decided not to participate in the development. The development is unfortunately still moving forward (and Wesleyan’s property in the area is still for sale) We will continue to be engaged in the ongoing public discussions.
Organization and External Affairs (OEAC)
Mari Jarris ‘14, Chair

WSA-Admissions Committee
The WSA-Admissions Committee formed last semester in response to the change in the need-blind policy and in order to allow student oversight and feedback into the admissions process. The student representatives are Scott Elias ‘14, Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Mari Jarris ‘14, Christian Hosam ‘15, Grant Tanenbaum ‘15, and Lily Herman ‘16. The committee met several times over the course of the semester with Dean of Admissions Nancy Meislahn and rotating members of Admissions. We reviewed admissions materials and sample applications, discussed current admissions practices and changes to the need-blind policy, methods for evaluating applicants, how to target students based on different kinds of diversity (including political and geographic diversity), utilizing students for recruitments, the transition to paperless application reading, and removing the financial aid indicator from applications. The committee will continue next year under the Vice-President.

WSA-Career Center Committee
The WSA-Career Center Committee resumed meetings this year. All members of OEAC met with Persephone Hall and rotating members of the Career Center (CC) including Interim Director Gemma Epstein, Jim Kubat, and Jennifer Healey. After participating in an extended interview process, we were thrilled to see a new CC director for the CC, Sharon Belden Castonguay, who will join us this May. We are optimistic about her ability to reform and improve the CC. Throughout the year, the WSA-CC Committee discussed major issues including, reorganization of counseling resources, improving the CC website and other forms of outreach, diversifying job and internship opportunities, Peer Career Advisor reform, and non-credit Career Center courses. Based on the year’s work, OEAC compiled a set of final recommendations for the new director.

New York Times Readership Program
This year, the New York Times Readership Program shifted to online and print offerings. We received positive feedback from students on this new feature. Additionally, Zach Malter ‘13 arranged for journalist Jacques Steinberg to speak at Wesleyan through the program. We will be deciding shortly on plans for the continuation of the New York Times Readership Program.

Social Media and Outreach
This semester, OEAC continued the usual forms of outreach, including the Facebook page, twitter, newsletter, all-campus emails, and flyering, in addition to organizing an all-assembly canvassing night. Chloe Murtagh ‘15 has maintained the WSA Facebook page this semester and seen increasing activity. The Facebook page has served as a platform for advertising WSA events, elections, and soliciting feedback. Chloe sent out a weekly WSA newsletter to report on the WSA’s activities and the General Assembly meeting agenda. Chloe organized a night for all assembly members to go door-to-door to solicit feedback from students. Martin Malabanan ‘16 has been an enthusiastic blogger and written regularly about serving on the WSA, the Wesleyan experience, activities on campus and in Middletown, and how to find a summer internship. Each committee blogged on a rotating weekly basis. Wayne Ng ‘16 has been a lively tweeter for the WSA, getting the word out to the student body about WSA issues, meetings, and events. As a
result of OEAC and Assembly outreach efforts, there have been increased levels of attendance at General Assembly meetings.

**Elections and Appointments**

Elections during in the fall semester ran smoothly and all spots were filled by elected candidates. Throughout the semester we held appointments for three WSA positions and multiple ex-officio positions. We held the spring elections at the end of the semester and eight new members were elected or reelected: Austin Dong ‘15, Christian Hosam ‘15, Bruno Machiavelo ‘16, Chase Knowles ‘16, Samuel Usdan ‘15, Glenn Cantave ‘15, Angus Mclean ‘16, and Nicki Softness ‘14.

**Technology (ITC)**

Grant Tanenbaum ’15, Chair

**Environmental Sustainability**

Thanks to help from Erik Islo ’15, ITC worked with ITS to reduce paper waste, in the order of 6,000 pieces of paper a week from WesBoxes. Moreover, we worked with ITS to install more energy output monitors in dorms and make that information available across campus.

**Printing**

This year, we worked with ITS to procure new printers that can be accessed across campus and helped them choose their locations.

**Lynda**

In cooperation with ITS, the Career Center, and academic division heads, we launched Lynda.com, a resource for students, staff and faculty to use to be instructed in hundreds of types of software. As of early April, more than 700 students have used the service.

**Streamlining Student Group Resources**

Alton Wang ‘16 created a new page for student groups to one-stop-shop for listservs, websites, and email addresses at wsa.wesleyan.edu/groups/online/.

**ATAAC**

ITC collaborated with the ATAAC extensively throughout the year. We discussed matters such as classroom technology, electronic student portfolios, and areas of improvement. Together, we diverted resources towards equipment rental. Next year, discussions will begin with the entire campus community on envisioning a central resource on campus to combine technology resource.

**WesMaps**

ITC—specifically Jesse Ross-Silverman ’13—worked with AAC, the Registrar’s Office, and ITS to craft and introduce new changes to WesMaps. These features include searching for classes by professor, finding classes that fit in your schedule with one click, highlighted courses that will fulfill major requirements, and more. In the long run, this means new features that help you plan out your four year academic calendar, taking into account all of Wesleyan’s major and general
graduation requirements. These will be implemented by ITS programmers over the summer.
**Summary** - This year, the Student Budget Committee funded $811,109. The total amount requested this year was over $1 million ($1,060,510).

### Group Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Group</th>
<th>Requested Funds</th>
<th>Granted Funds</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Processed Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example Department 1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Department 2</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Department 3</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table continues with data for other departments and groups*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Group Name</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Expected Income</th>
<th>Dept Funding</th>
<th>Funds Granted</th>
<th>Funding Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>297,804</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>279,370</td>
<td>-9,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>133,515</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>33,023</td>
<td>87,967</td>
<td>-7,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Senior Class Officers</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>146,907</td>
<td>29,290</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>71,211</td>
<td>-32,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>103,442</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>7,925</td>
<td>68,507</td>
<td>-1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>91,655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>64,110</td>
<td>-25,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>26,620</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>24,552</td>
<td>-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism: Political</td>
<td>23,920</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>20,870</td>
<td>-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism: Health</td>
<td>17,927</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>12,998</td>
<td>-2,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: A cappella</td>
<td>13,356</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>11,656</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism: Environmental</td>
<td>13,662</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9,638</td>
<td>-3,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism: Social</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>8,470</td>
<td>-985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>8,005</td>
<td>-995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Dance</td>
<td>11,164</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>8,004</td>
<td>-1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism: Tutorial</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Writers’ Bloc</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>7,675</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Religion</td>
<td>17,724</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Sexuality</td>
<td>9,738</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7,238</td>
<td>-2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: WeSlam</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program House</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4,925</td>
<td>-925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Wesleyan Homebrewers’ Alliance</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>-940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Wesleyan Mock Trial</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism: Economic</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>-324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Comedy</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 2014 Class Council</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Projects</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: WSA Cafe</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Quiz Bowl</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism: Health/Sexuality</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>-789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: TypeClub</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Wesleyan Pre-Law Society (WesPLS)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Wes-To-Wes</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Freeman Asian Scholars Association</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Largest Funding Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Group Name</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Funds Granted</th>
<th>Percent Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>297,804</td>
<td>279,370</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>133,515</td>
<td>87,967</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Senior Class Officers</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>146,907</td>
<td>71,211</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>103,442</td>
<td>68,507</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>91,655</td>
<td>64,110</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Category</th>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Funds Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>The New Wesleyan Concert Committee</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>$87,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Spring Fling Committee</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Underdog Music Collective</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$28,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>WESU-FM</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>$27,570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Wesleyan Sound Cooperative</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>$15,565.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>WESU</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>$9,029.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Crowell Concert Series</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>WESU Events</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>$4,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Experimental Music</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>$4,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Wesleyan DJ Co-Op</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Rap Assembly at Wesleyan (RAW)</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>$2,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Folk Revival Initiative</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Usdan Student Music Co-Op</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>$884.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Living Room Collective</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Klezmer Band</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Aural Wes</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>$426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Cardinal Players Pep Band</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>$411.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Music</td>
<td>Harmoniclub</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Category</th>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Funds Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Cardinal Velo - Cycling Club</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Men's Water Polo</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>7,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Nietzsche Factor</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>4,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Old Methodist Rugby Football Club/ Men's Rugby</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Outing Club</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Temple Shaolin Kung Fu</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Throw Culture</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>4,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Vicious Circles</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Group Name</td>
<td>Group Number</td>
<td>Funds Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WesRugby</td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WesRun Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wescapades</td>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Badminton</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Body and Mind (WesBAM!)</td>
<td></td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Boxing Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>519</td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Club Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>943</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Club Volleyball</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Equestrian Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan FC (Club Soccer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Fencing Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>795</td>
<td>7,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Jiu-jitsu</td>
<td></td>
<td>868</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Kendo</td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Men's Club Lacrosse</td>
<td></td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Ski Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>15,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan University Sailing Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>17,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Women's Club Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identity Group: Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Category</th>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Funds Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>African Students Association</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>4,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Ajua Campos</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>5,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Asian American Student Collective (AASC)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Caribbean Students Association</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Invisible Men</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>4,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Japan Society</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Korean Students Association</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>PINOY</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Para La Familia</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>SUYA</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Shakti</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Taiwanese Cultural Society</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Ujamaa</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>10,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>WesQuisqueya</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>33,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>Women of Color Collective</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance: Theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Category</th>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Funds Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Absent Toast</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>$1,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Cinema Sorcery Front</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>$4,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Draw Cult</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>$4,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Drawing Cooperative</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Second Stage</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$25,612.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Wesleyan Film Board</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Wesleyan Women in Film</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance: Theater</td>
<td>Zombie Art Collective</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Category</th>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Funds Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>The Wesleyan Argus</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>$36,145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Samizdat Press</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>$4,315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Unlocked Magazine</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>$3,986.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>VOID</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>$3,599.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Stethoscope Press</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Method Magazine</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>$2,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Waves</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>After Hours Literary Magazine</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>$1,109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Historical Narratives</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Resonance Magazine</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$1,026.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>The Ankh</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>$558.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>The Hangman's Lime</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Swerve(d)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>$417.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Wesleyan Undergraduate Journal for Humanities</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Argus News Radio</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>$131.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTIONS

Resolution (2012): Advising Resolution

Sponsor: Samuel Ebb ’13, Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Andrew Trexler ‘14

The Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA),

Recognizing advising as a cornerstone of the academic experience,

Concerned by knowledge gaps both among advisors of the course selection process, about other departments, and among students about the role and expectations of advising, pre-major advisors in particular,

Lamenting the “punishment” of good advising, as students enlist good advisors and thus increase inequity in advising loads,

Recognizing the need to increase the equity of advising loads,

Acknowledging the need to recognize and reward good advising,

Supporting faculty interests in keeping advising evaluations out of salary and tenure discussions,

Recognizing that students have needs that the current system does not address, such as the needs of sophomores for in-depth departmental expertise prior to choosing their majors,

Concerned by student dissatisfaction with advisor knowledge about other departments and the lack of involvement and time spent with their advisors,[1]

Concerned by reports of students who receive harmful misinformation from their faculty advisors, especially during pre-major advising,

Recognizing that first-year students and first semester sophomores would benefit from receiving more information about their prospective majors;

Concerned by the lack of official information regarding courses that are particularly difficult to enter,

Supporting the standardization of resources available to students and advisors as well as between departments,

Recognizing that the necessary resources exist but are imperfectly advertised and distributed,

Supporting the initiative formed by the advising task force,

1. Urges the University to expand the number of prospective major forums to a minimum of two and a maximum of three, ideally occurring the day before classes begin in the fall semester, the first weekend of the planning period during fall semester, and the first
weekend of the planning period during the spring semester;

2. Calls upon departments to provide a list of departmental advising experts complete with information on areas of expertise, office locations, office hours and email addresses;

3. Requests that the University maintain and distribute this list to both students and faculty as an advising resource;

4. Calls for the creation of prospective major listservs for dissemination of information about lectures, events, new classes, internship opportunities, and information sessions;

5. Supports the creation and distribution of an advising award given based on student nominations and a student voting process, through a coordinated effort by the WSA and Academic Affairs;

6. Encourages the University to video tape panel discussions between students on the topic of “What Makes Good Advising;”

7. Calls for the creation and dissemination of an advising expectations worksheet as a cooperative product of work by the WSA and appropriate departments and administrators;

8. Recommends the broader and more effective advertisement of the sophomore major declaration timeline;

9. Supports the creation of a course selection video tutorial to be made available to first-year students during the summer registration period;

10. Supports the creation of an amazon.com style “Students who requested this course also requested” section on WesMaps;

11. Encourages the creation of a course heat map that demonstrates the typical level of interest in courses from past years, and/or the inclusion on WesMaps of typical waitlist length;

12. Supports the continued involvement of students in the yearly advisor-training meeting;

13. Resolves to remain actively seized of the matter.

[1] WSA Survey, Fall 2012. 58% of students chose “lack of knowledge of other departments” as the the “biggest problem with pre-major advising;” 36% chose “too little involvement/time spent with advisees” as the same.
Reading Period Resolution (2012)

Sponsors: Zachary Malter ’13, Mari Jarris ’14, Sam Ebb ’13

Recognizing the importance of giving students adequate time to study before final exams and complete final projects and papers,

Acknowledging that according to an official 2012 Education Policy Committee (EPC) survey, 77.3% of students, 78.8% of faculty, and 70.6% of staff, a vast majority of all three groups, supported either continuing the practice of 4 days of finals and 4 days of reading period or expanding reading period,

Bearing in mind that during the anecdotal portion of the 2012 EPC survey, faculty wrote that students have “no time to prepare for final papers and exams,” and that “the students really need at least 4 days of reading period, especially for advanced courses that require long final assignments”,

Aware that there is student demand for a longer reading period,

Observing that students have struggled to effectively manage all of their work under the current calendar, with 4 days of reading period and 4 days of finals,

Noting that no additional time is provided for packing and moving out at the end of semesters, forcing students to take time from reading period and finals,

Concerned with ensuring that students maintain healthful sleep habits and positive mental and physical health during reading and finals period,

1. Urges the Educational Policy Committee to pass a 5-year calendar with no fewer than 4 days of reading period.
Resolution (2012): Student Activism Judicial Response Resolution

Sponsors: Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Grant Tanenbaum ‘15, Zach Malter ‘13

The Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA),

In light of pending judicial actions for students who allegedly disrupted the 2012 Board of Trustees Retreat,

Respecting university concerns about the nature and timing of the alleged disruption,

Affirming all students’ need to comply with Public Safety and with the Code of NonAcademic Conduct,

Acknowledging the distress of valued trustees after students entered the meeting,

Simultaneously acknowledging other trustees’ verbal support for Wesleyan’s continued history of activism,

Noting that many students are unaware of the nature and meaning of an Executive Session of the Board of Trustees,

Noting the importance of student input to trustee decision-making,

Appreciating the peaceful and respectful nature of the sit-in,

Pointing to inconsistencies in the language of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct about disruptions,

Gently noting that business continued as usual after fewer than twenty minutes,

Acknowledging the crucial role of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct in upholding Wesleyan’s community standards,

Admiring the perpetuation of Wesleyan’s time-honored standard as supporting an activist subset of the community,

Concerned by potential long-term consequences of the pursuit of judicial actions in response to this issue both for the students involved and for relationships across campus,

Noting the opportunity for the administration to initiate a productive conversation about the role of and avenues for activism,

Hoping that the administration will openly recognize this incident as an example of peaceful, respectful, productive activism,

Deeply convinced that the entire community will learn more from such a dialogue than from a hearing with the Student Judicial Board,
1. **Urges** campus employers to disregard these judicial charges in decision-making about students’ employment status at Wesleyan;

2. **Entreats** the administration to drop all judicial charges against the students who entered the Board meeting;

3. **Invites** the initiation of a conversation between students, Public Safety, staff and faculty with experience in activism, and any interested local trustees, about the nature of and productive channels for activism.

4. **Resolves** to remain actively seized of the matter.

---

[1] In video footage of the incident taken by Benjamin Doernberg ’13, Amy Schulman ’82 P’11 is heard to say, “Students barging in is a long and time-honored tradition at Wesleyan.”

Resolution 4.34 (2012)

Sponsors: Melody Oliphant ’13, Alex Pack ’14, Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Andrew Trexler ’14

Topic: A Call for Equal Opportunity throughout the Program House Application Process

The Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA),

In light of the call for program house proposals by the Undergraduate Residential Life Committee (URLC) this month,

Recognizing that the criteria for evaluation in this call for proposals purportedly revolves solely around demonstrated interest of the student community and the ability to sustain a program over time,

Noting with approval that all programs must complement the mission and celebration statements of Wesleyan’s Residential Life program,

Observing that application is purportedly open to all students and student groups,

Highlighting the Greek organizations’ compliance with the aforementioned mission and celebration statements,

Hoping that any proposal that fulfills the aforementioned conditions should wield the right to apply and receive equal consideration from the URLC in the evaluation process,

Reaffirming Wesleyan’s commitment to coeducational program housing,

Noting that Greek life need not be antithetical to Wesleyan's progressive values, and indeed that the support of newer Greek institutions may help to modernize Wesleyan's Greek system as a whole,

Alarmed by the administration’s decision to prohibit any student organization associated with Greek life from receiving a fair evaluation by the URLC,

Convinced that the URLC, being comprised of Assembly members, Residential Life staff, and the Assistant Dean of Student Life, is best capable of assessing the relative values of potential programs,

Deeply concerned with any administrative action that interferes with the otherwise seemingly autonomous procedure for the URLC,

Reaffirming the WSA’s role as the representative student legislative and deliberative body of Wesleyan University,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Wesleyan Student Assembly,
1. Supports the right of all student groups, including Greek organizations, to apply with equal opportunity for program housing under the URLC’s standard, autonomous review process;

2. Entreats the administration to acknowledge that no student organization ought to shoulder unfair prejudice or discrimination in the program house application process on behalf of the administration, Residential Life, or the members of the URLC;

3. Calls for all student organizations to receive equitable treatment through the application and evaluation process for program house proposals under the URLC;

4. Resolves to remain actively seized of the matter.

*Introduced 18 November 2012 / Adopted 18 November 2012*
Resolution 5.34 (2012)


The Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA),

Recognizing the demonstrated desire and need for expanded dialogue involving the greater campus community,

Recognizing community members’ vocal expression of strong interest in issues of diversity, inclusion, social justice, and other timely campus issues,

Acknowledging that course schedules and administrative responsibilities leave no available times conducive to community activities that include all students, faculty, staff, administrators, and other community members,

Further acknowledging that the Monday, November 12, 2012 community forum on “Diversity University: In Theory and Practice” attracted hundreds of attendees, and that many other interested parties were unable to attend,

Recognizing that such days can be disruptive to the academic calendar if not planned for in advance,

Noting that a current proposal for the new five-year academic calendar includes a week with only one day of class, which could lead to lower than desirable class attendance both for students and faculty,

1. Recommends the institutionalization of a day without classes for community building events in the academic calendar, such that the week containing Fall Break would have classes on Monday and Tuesday and no classes Wednesday through Sunday, allowing for a day for community building on a selected Tuesday during the semester and a day off from classes on the Monday of Labor Day weekend;

2. Calls upon the University to determine the form and content of such a day in consultation with students and other community members on a yearly basis;

3. Resolves to remain actively seized of the matter.

Introduced 18 November 2012 / Adopted 18 November 2012
Resolution 6.34 (2012)

Sponsors: Zachary Malter ‘13, Samuel Ebb ’13, Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Andrew Trexler ‘14, Mari Jarris ‘14

The Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA)

Recognizing that academic regulations discourage the holding of events during reading week,

Recognizing that Spring Fling is a campus-wide event with high levels of student participation, bringing the campus together,

Highlighting the large portion of the Student Activities Fee directed towards funding Spring Fling, and thus the impetus to make the event accessible to the entire student body,

Acknowledging that if Spring Fling is scheduled during reading week, students who attend will have less time to study,

Bearing in mind that during the anecdotal portion of the 2012 EPC Survey, faculty wrote that students have “no time to prepare for final papers and exams,” and that “the students really need at least 4 days of reading period, especially for advanced courses that require long final assignments”,

Very aware of student demand for a longer reading period,

Observing that students have had difficulty managing their work with 4 days of reading period and 4 days of finals,

Noting that no additional time is provided for packing and moving out at the end of semesters, forcing students to take time from reading period and finals,

Concerned with ensuring that students maintain healthful sleep habits and positive mental and physical health during reading and finals period, and

Therefore, be it resolved that

1. Urges the Educational Policy Committee to maintain the current policy of having a day for Spring Fling, four days for reading period, and four days for final exams.

Introduced 18 November 2012 / Adopted 18 November 2012
Resolution 7.34 (2012)

Sponsors: Andrew Trexler ’14 (Principal), Sam Ebb ’13, Lydia Rex ’14, Jason Shatz ’14

Understanding that WesFest 2013 has been rescheduled from a Thursday, Friday, and Saturday to a Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday,

Understanding that the administration would prefer to avoid exposing prospective students to a dangerous drinking and substance abuse environment, and that the new schedule would seem to accommodate that preference,

Acknowledging the tragically high numbers of students and prospective students that are transported to the hospital during the course of every WesFest in recent memory,

Understanding the desire for classes and academic programming during WesFest,

Understanding that classes do not occur on Saturdays,

Observing the plentitude and particular value of lectures, panels, and other highly academic events that are regularly scheduled during and contribute greatly to WesFest, and the continued opportunities for the same,

Noting that students are almost invariably most academically strained on nights prior to classes, including Wednesday and Thursday evenings,

Noting that professors and staff that might otherwise participate in WesFest events are similarly constrained on these days,

Noting that a good WesFest requires the combined efforts, collaborations, and enthusiasms of the entire campus community, and that this is maximized on days where there are fewer mundane, day-to-day tasks to be accomplished,

Noting that students and other community members would feel torn between academic work and a desire to participate in and contribute to WesFest, and that both interests would likely suffer,

Noting that student groups enjoy putting on events and programs during WesFest, and are much less capable of doing so on weekdays,

Observing that these events and programs are vital to the charm of WesFest,

Observing the existing difficulty of finding sufficient hosts for prospective students and that this new schedule would exacerbate that difficulty,

Positing the possibility that some students (though certainly not all or even most) may still seek to engage in dangerous behaviors despite pressing academics, and that this affords prospective students a poor impression of Wesleyan on additional levels, poses problems for the academic well-being of said students, present and future, and thereby potentially provides great harm to our educational mission,
Noting that the often vital initiative of hosts to take prospective students to campus events and show prospective students the charms of Wesleyan requires a relatively free schedule,

Noting that, for prospective students, it is incredibly dull to watch the host do hir homework,

Observing that Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday are all three weekdays,

Observing that prospective students also have other pressing activities and needs such as school that could prevent them from participating in WesFest on weekdays,

Observing also that the parents and guardians of prospective students similarly have pressing obligations such as work that would prevent them from participating in or transporting prospective students to WesFest on weekdays,

Concerned that these constraints are more strongly felt by prospective students whose families depend more heavily paycheck-to-paycheck income for vitality or are otherwise less privileged,

Observing that this year’s shift away from a fully need-blind model for domestic first-year students may, in the administration’s own words, have an observable and significant impact on matriculation rates for and diversity of the Class of 2017,

Observing that the alteration of the WesFest 2013 schedule may also have an observable and significant impact on matriculation rates for and diversity of the Class of 2017,

Believing strongly that the matriculation and diversity data for the Class of 2017 is paramount to understanding the viability of our new financial aid model and its effects on class diversity, regardless of disagreements about the merits and viability of this new policy before the accumulation of this data, and that this new policy should therefore be the sole major variable in the comparison to previous years,

Acknowledging that matriculation and diversity data is also vital to evaluating any major experimentation with WesFest,

Urging that these two experiments and evaluations, if they must be conducted at all, absolutely must not be allowed to interfere with each other by running concurrently,

Acknowledging the near certainty that the new financial aid model will be maintained for the 2012-2013 Budget and the Class of 2017,

Positing, therefore, that in this context 2013 is the worst possible year to experiment with the schedule of WesFest, and that 2014 and subsequent years are similarly but decreasingly poor choices,

Acknowledging the grave realities of Wesleyan and broader drinking and substance abuse culture and many admirable efforts of the Wesleyan community to combat this culture,

Lauding in particular the efforts of Wesleyan’s National College Health Improvement Project (NCHIP) team and those of many student groups in combating this culture,
Positing that ongoing efforts and other yet-untried avenues provide great opportunities to further combat this culture and eliminate dangerous behavior during WesFest and throughout the year,

Suggesting, in particular, that more WesFest events be scheduled in the late evening hours, as very successfully exemplified by particular efforts of the Wesleyan Student Assembly and the NCHIP team to provide fun and healthful late night alternatives to college drinking culture,

Concerned deeply about the ostensibly complete lack of involvement in or input on this decision to change the schedule of WesFest 2013 by the elected representatives of the students,

Concerned similarly about the ostensibly complete lack of transparency regarding the same,

Acknowledging that some student staff were consulted in this decision, in absence of the proper inclusion of elected student representatives,

Noting that these student staff also unanimously opposed the selected change,

Observing the extreme urgency afforded by the need to plan events for WesFest 2013 and distribute materials thereof to prospective students and to the Wesleyan community,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Wesleyan Student Assembly

1. Demands the immediate reversal of the scheduling change of WesFest 2013 to return to a Thursday, Friday, Saturday schedule,

2. Demands a commitment on the part of the administration to amply involve the Assembly and the Wesleyan community generally in any similar decision regarding WesFest in the future, with ample transparency after, during, and well before any such decision is made,

3. Requests written justification as to why this decision was made and why this decision was made without consulting with students or their elected representatives,

4. Resolves to remain actively seized of the matter.

Introduced 18 November 2012 / [ Adopted/Rejected ] [ Date ]
Resolution 8.34 (2013)

Sponsors: Andrew Trexler ’14 (Principal), Syed Ali ’13, Jacob Blumenthal ’13, Gabriela De Golia ’13, Zach Malter ’13, Mansoor Alam ’15

Recognizing the significant and vocal outcry against the proposed development and the proposed zoning text change by residents of neighboring areas,

Recognizing the significant and vocal opposition to the proposed development by the Wesleyan Faculty, many members of which are also residents of the City of Middletown,

Recognizing the significant and vocal opposition to the proposed development amongst the College Body, manifested in numerous polls, discussions, meetings of the General Assembly of the Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA), and a community forum with Centerplan developers and members of the Wesleyan community which occurred on 27th November 2012 (at which “of the 150 or more attendees, not one spoke up in favor of the development”),

Concerned by the current lack of pedestrian safety on Washington Street and the possibility of increased traffic volume in the areas adjacent to campus due to new commercial development,

Concerned by potential damage to Middletown’s unique urban aesthetic currently enjoyed by students and residents posed by the proposed development due to potential demolition of historic buildings,

Noting the high likelihood that the proposed zoning text change may lead to further commercial development along Washington Street, thereby significantly altering the residential environment enjoyed by many Wesleyan students,

Concerned by the possibility of negative effects on Middletown businesses, cafés, and restaurants by the installation of national chains,

Concerned in particular by the potential affects that such a development and zone text change will have on Wesleyan students’ relationship to Middletown by inciting them to support national—as opposed to local—businesses, and by potentially deterring them from exploring the historic downtown neighborhood that is Middletown’s Main Street, developments that will garner concerns similar to those mentioned above,

Acknowledging the role of the WSA as the “legislative and deliberative organization of the College Body” responsible for “serving as a forum for … promotion of [Wesleyan] University policies consistent with student interests” and “transacting other business on behalf of the College Body,”

Commending Wesleyan University’s decision not to collaborate with Centerplan through the association of its bookstore, deciding instead to retain the bookstore’s current location on Broad Street,

Finding a mandate to present the opinion of the College Body on this issue to the Middletown Planning and Zoning Commission, upon whose cooperation the proponents of the proposed
development and the proposed zone text change depend to proceed in full capacity,

Therefore be it resolved, the Wesleyan Student Assembly

1. **Urges** the Middletown Planning and Zoning Commission to deny any zone text change that would allow for MX zones along Washington Street to be used for retail, upper story professional office space, restaurants, or upper story residential purposes;

2. **Resolves** to remain actively seized of matters regarding the proposed development and zone text change.

*Introduced 3rd February 2013 / Adopted 10th February 2013, amended 24th February 2013*

*Presented at the Public Hearing of the Middletown Planning and Zoning Commission of 27th February 2013*

[1] “Proposed development” being hereafter defined as the development project proposed by Centerplan Company, LLC on the North side of Washington Street, between Pearl and High Streets.

[2] “Proposed zone change” being hereafter defined as the zone text change proposed by LLC Acquisitions on 8th January 2013 to allow for a special exception for mixed use development in MX zones, which would allow for retail, upper story professional office, restaurants and upper story residential.

[3] A Sense of the Faculty Resolution, adopted at the Faculty Meeting of 4th December 2012

[4] “College Body” is defined as “every student recognized by [Wesleyan] University as an enrolled, degree-seeking undergraduate.” WSA Constitution, II

[5] Including and especially a survey sent to the whole College Body; 62 percent of respondents indicated “No” to the question “The Wesleyan Student Assembly is interested in your opinion about the proposed development on Washington Street area between Pearl and High Streets. Are you in favor of this development?”

[6] http://wesleying.org/2012/11/28/bookstore-relocation-forum-follow-up-photos-video-statements-and-more/concerned by the likelihood that the proposed zone text change will open the door to future
Resolution (2013): Terminating the Chalking Moratorium

Sponsor: Scott Elias ’14, Jesse Ross-Silverman ’13, Chloe Murtagh ’15, Mari Jarris ’14, Ellen Paik ’16, Nicole Updegrove ‘14, Andrew Trexler ‘14

The Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA),

Reaffirming the WSA’s role as the representative student legislative and deliberative body of Wesleyan University,

Guided by the fervent desire of many students for a more inclusive campus culture, student participation in policymaking, and improving areas in which we, as a community, have fallen short,

Taking into consideration that a primary purpose of chalking is to express a message to the community in a quick, concise, cheap, and environmentally friendly manner,

Emphasizing that chalking as a mode of expression can compliment the Wesleyan educational mission and enhance the quality of student life,

Deeply convinced that “community standards” and regulations, especially when they do not obstruct the educational mission or impair community life, ought to honor community sentiment,

Noting the 44-8 faculty vote on October 3rd 2002 asking former President Bennet to overturn the Chalking moratorium,

Deeply convinced that the Wesleyan community at large opposes the current chalking moratorium,

Acknowledging that the University administration initiated the chalking moratorium after it began facing growing concerns regarding obscene, discriminatory, and threatening chalking on campus,

Noting the persistence of non-intimidating, non-hostile, non-offensive chalking despite the moratorium’s implementation and despite the opportunities provided by the present legality of chalking on public streets and sidewalks,

Noting further that the messages that have been chalked in recent years, despite the moratorium, have been largely around political issues on campus, and has not been generally considered intimidating, hostile, or offensive,

Recognizing that the enforcement of the chalking moratorium curtails positive student activism and political speech,

Noting that if the moratorium on chalking on sidewalks is lifted and a person perceives the chalk as intimidating, offensive, or in any way contributing towards a hostile work environment they reserve the right to notify the Director of Affirmative Action, Public Safety, and/or Physical Plant to remove the chalk, consistent with our community standards regarding other forms of
communication as outlined in the guidelines for posters, banners, announcements, and other forms of communication in the Student Handbook,

Deeply convinced that the aforementioned means of addressing individual cases of controversial chalking within a consistent communication policy addresses current administrative concerns while providing the benefits of chalking as a means of public expression and will contribute to a culture of community members respecting each other,

Concerned by the argument that Wesleyan’s past chalking controversy necessarily entails future incidents that have been largely absent for over a decade,

Taking into consideration Eric Stephen’s March 29, 2013 Wesleyan Argus article, “Chalk is Talk: Is Wesleyan’s Chalking Ban Illegal?” which argues that the chalking policy, as it exists now, is overbroad in a way that would likely not hold up to judicial scrutiny and, as a result, should no longer be enforced,

Concerned that the Chalking moratorium brushes oppressions and micro-aggressions that occur at Wesleyan under the rug and is thus inconsistent and antithetical to our university’s institutional goal of advancing social justice,

Believing that an end to the moratorium would allow for increased and direct community dialogue to resolve underlying issues, prejudices, and biases in the event of problematic chalking,

Emphasizing that an indiscriminate Chalking Moratorium forces an unnecessary exorbitant cost and an imprudent use of Wesleyan resources in a time of sacrifices and budget constraints,

Guided by the belief that the concerns of chalking do not justify the costs of the ban,

Reaffirming the Wesleyan Student Assembly’s support for the free exchange of ideas on campus, including the right for individuals to express their views in the form of chalk,

Reaffirming the Wesleyan Student Assembly’s commitment to fiscal responsibility in the allocation of Wesleyan resources and identifying cost-savings measures that will make Wesleyan more affordable,

Acknowledging that a trial period lifting the chalking moratorium on sidewalks is both reasonable and consistent with the prevailing rational consensus, and will provide further evidence that the benefits of chalking outweigh the costs,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Wesleyan Student Assembly:

1. Calls for the termination of the moratorium on chalking on sidewalks, thereby removing the chalking provision from Regulation 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct, ceasing the practice of preemptively erasing/washing away chalk and allowing chalk to be subject to the same communications policy/regulations as other media;

2. Recommends the use of technology to facilitate the reporting process and to ensure
that negative dialogue is documented in the Campus Climate Log;

3. Decides to remain actively seized of the matter.

Adopted on April 28th: 25 in favor, 2 against, 0 abstentions.

According to the FY12 Budget breakdown the cost was $12,037 in 2012, which was a little more than a third of the University’s unfunded vandalism and damage fees. If constant, the cost of the moratorium amounts to $48,148 over the cost of four years, $96,296 over 8 years and $120,370 over the course of a decade.
MEMOS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From: The Student Budget Sustainability Task Force

To: The Wesleyan Student Body President Michael Roth
Vice President for Finance & Administration John Meerts University Vice Presidents

Date: Monday, December 10th, 2012

Subject: Memorandum to the Community

Part 1: Mission

The Student Budget Sustainability Task Force’s stated mission is to use all available information to evaluate the suitability of the recent move to a capped financial aid budget and need-aware admissions policy. During that process, the Task Force seeks to identify cost savings, new revenues, or budget cuts that will ameliorate the University’s financial situation and enable Wesleyan to increase its financial aid budget, raise our discount rate, restore need blind, and provide an education of the most desirable caliber and accessibility.

The Task Force’s work is based on certain assumptions. First, eliminating need blind is not a necessity—it is a choice—and that in order to justify it, evidence must be compiled to demonstrate that it is the least bad choice of the given options. Second, need aware admissions is morally undesirable since it deviates from our stated common values of admitting students regardless of need (as established in Wesleyan 2020), and the University should do what it can to minimize its negative consequences by maximizing affordability and reinstating need blind admissions at a future date. Ultimately, the Task Force will produce, in addition to this set of initial items for consideration, a second document with concrete and actionable recommendations to the University that optimize Wesleyan’s potential to fulfill its mission.

Part 2: Process So Far

The Student Budget Sustainability Task Force was proposed over the summer by WSA President Zachary Malter ‘13 in light of the Administration and the Board of Trustee’s decision to eliminate need-blind admissions. After President Roth agreed to support the task force and its work, the WSA appointed members to the Task Force. They are: Kevin Arritt ‘13, Nate Campagne ‘15, Alex Japko ‘14, Chi Le ‘13, Michelle Li ‘16, Michael Linden ‘15, Zachary Malter ‘13, Lina Mamut ‘13, Jesse Ross-Silverman ‘13, Andrew Trexler ‘14, Rachel Warren ‘14.

The Task Force began its work by familiarizing itself with the university budget through meetings with Associate Vice President of Finance Nate Peters and members of the Budget Priorities Committee. We analyzed budget documents and conducted research on relevant peer institutions, gaining a thorough understanding of the issues at hand. After educating ourselves, the Task Force met with every top university administrator, including but not limited to all the University Vice Presidents and President Roth, to gain insight about departmental budgets, with an eye for places where inessential spending could be shifted to support the financial aid budget. We also asked critical questions about how university practices such as admissions, financial aid,
and fundraising would be affected by the policy shift towards need aware admissions. Last, we conducted outreach to the student body via an all-student survey and two open student fora. This memorandum represents our work up until this point and puts forward various items that we are considering in order to increase affordability. While these items are not formal recommendations, they are meant to spark conversation and debate in advance of our final recommendations.

Part 3: Items for Consideration

Note: The following items are still under consideration, subject to continuing research and review. These are preliminary recommendations only, some of which may form part of the our final report and recommendations in Spring 2013.

1. Waitlist-only need-aware model

While we consider any review of students’ finances during the admissions process to be less than optimal, applying the need-aware policy only to the wait-list could be more fair and transparent, while still allowing the University to prevent uncontrolled growth of its financial aid budget.

The major substantive difference in impact on the financial aid budget from applying need-sensitivity only to the waitlist is reduced “flexibility” in admitting a student body under a capped financial aid budget. However, according to the figures released through Wesleyan’s common data sets, the number of students admitted from the waiting list prior to the Class of 2015 was similar to the estimated number of applicants to be impacted by the proposed need-aware policy. A waitlist-only need-aware policy could allow for similar levels of financial responsibility and, by shifting the consideration of financial need to only less-optimal applicants, would be more responsible to Wesleyan’s core values.

This model offers another major advantage: the aggregate need of the admitted students (before the waitlist is used) is determinable, being that of the matriculating students, before waitlist decisions are made. As such, we can accurately be as generous with financial aid as we can afford, rather than attempting to rely on estimations and data model. Admission would need to be cautious to ensure that Wesleyan does not under-admit in fear of running over budget. The models currently being developed for the current need-aware policy could be useful in this regard.

2. Hire more student workers to replace staff

We recommend that the University replace some permanent staff positions with student workers. Hiring more student workers would not only reduce the expenses of having full time staff, but also open up opportunities for students looking for work.

For example, contractors on call are paid a minimum of two hours worth of work, resulting in wasted expenditures as they oftentimes do not work for two hours or more. We propose an initiative to eliminate contracted work for grounds and facilities maintenance by encouraging students to take up these responsibilities. One model for this would be to require some amount of labor for all students on campus, compensated on a sliding scale. This would also encourage students to take ownership of the school and become more involved within the Wesleyan
community. Currently, there is a group of students outside the task force working on proposals that have a similar thrust, and we will include their input in our final recommendations.

3. Promote greater independence in residential policies

We recommend that students are given more responsibility in maintaining their living environment, such as a standard in program houses or dormitory halls whereby the house or hall residents themselves do upkeep in public spaces; seniors can also be given responsibility for minor maintenance of their woodframes, such as opportunities to paint their own houses. Such a standard could be incentivized for students to participate by dedicating savings from not hiring custodial staff directly to the financial aid budget or the endowment for scholarships. This model could increase awareness of our financial situation and its relation to financial aid, build a stronger sense of community within residences, encourage positive group dynamics, and demonstrate that students are actively contributing to the solution of Wesleyan’s financial problems. We recommend a pilot program to test the suitability of this model.

We are also reviewing a redefinition the traditional role of RAs at Wesleyan, both in terms of responsibilities and compensation. We feel that forcing the RA’s to regulate student behavior through disciplinary actions is both unnecessary and inconsistent with the community-building values that Wesleyan promotes. A better model for the role of the RA would be one that focuses on providing practical advice, community leadership, and both curricular and social support, consistent with many of our peer schools. Given these redefined responsibilities, we also believe that RA compensation (which comes in the form of a stipend), could be reduced, and the money saved by this cut could be redirected towards financial aid.

4. Sell graduate and faculty housing units

Wesleyan currently owns a portfolio of 160 housing units that it rents out to faculty, staff, and graduate students. This housing option is seen as a draw for faculty, staff, and grad students deciding whether or not to come to Wesleyan, although concrete evidence that this weighs particularly heavily in that decision is not readily available. Because Wesleyan rents these properties at rates below the cost to maintain them, the University loses money each year by owning these properties (the annual loss has recently risen to around $500,000). Wesleyan could raise rent so that Wesleyan takes in more revenue from these holdings; alternatively, the University could sell these units off (total estimated value = $14 million) and have an external contractor rent the houses to faculty/staff/grad students.

5. Encourage teachers to take on research/scholarship based classes as a 5th credit

Transitioning from a 2-2 teaching model to a mandatory 3-2 teaching model would save the University significantly; however, we feel that this could undermine Wesleyan’s academic mission and its particular dedication to employing professors that are both exceptional teachers and exceptional scholars. Nevertheless, we recall that our 2-2 teaching model has an asterisk, noting that professors should be willing to work with students in research and independent scholarship as a sort of limited “fifth” course load, and recommend that Academic Affairs more energetically encourage this commitment amongst the faculty. We also recommend that when appropriate Academic Affairs encourage professors to teach a full fifth class (based on their
research/independent scholarship or otherwise) for an additional stipend, which would reduce the number of visiting professors we’d have to hire while still not preventing our professors from engaging in scholarship. In these settings, faculty are able to continue their research, and perform that research with free assistance, but students are also able to participate and learn actively from Wesleyan’s great minds and get credit for their work. These courses would build upon the small class initiative to offer more courses taught by tenure-track faculty, but do so in such a way that saves the university money. Expanding these opportunities would allow the University to reduce its visiting professor payroll while still presenting excellent opportunities for both faculty and students.

6. Restructure administration

We recommend that Wesleyan consider restructuring the upper administration. In researching many of our peer schools, we found an array of different structures for the upper administration, several of which Wesleyan should consider for efficiency. Particularly, we encourage exploration of three possibilities. First, none of the schools we researched had a Director of Strategic Initiatives as a singular position; many schools had a merged Vice President for Strategic Initiatives and Diversity. Second, several peer schools had a class dean specifically for freshmen plus two or three floating class deans for sophomores and upperclassmen. Third, course relief for divisional deans could be reduced.

The rapid growth of administrative personnel in higher education over the past two decades is a well-documented phenomenon. While Wesleyan has made significant cuts in recent years through attrition and other means, Wesleyan has not been exempt from this rapid growth and the University should continue to seek to innovate and lead higher education to greater administrative efficiency.

7. Explore co-curricular spending reductions

Students have provided significant feedback that ResLife and UCAB programs are poorly attended, expensive, and otherwise inefficient. Excessive programming is wasteful and creates information clutter that dilutes the experience of other events and the Wesleyan experience generally. We recommend making cuts to the ResLife and UCAB programming budgets. A cut in the programming requirement for program houses as well may allow for the elimination of some Head Resident positions in ResLife due to the reduced paperwork, ultimately resulting in cost savings.

We are reviewing the attendance Center for the Arts events to evaluate demand and the optimal level of programming. We are also researching a cross-school comparison of the same. We tentatively suggest the reduction of the subsidy for CFA programs by either reducing the number of programs or by increasing the ticket fee for students and other constituencies. Increased outreach to the Middletown community to increase awareness about our programs and to attract viewers who will pay full admission might also reduce our CFA programming cost.

8. Decrease rate of salary increase for staff and faculty making over $100,000

Faculty and staff salaries constitute a significant portion of Wesleyan’s budget. Decreasing the
rate of increase would help curb spending over time. That being said, there is very little room to do this, as salary increases must be kept in line with cost-of-living increases. Being known as a school who gives raises at a significantly lower rate than peer institutions may make it more difficult to get the best staff and faculty. That being said, for faculty and staff making over 100k, it may be possible to reduce the rate of salary increase without compromising the quality of personnel we attract or our rate of retention for staff or faculty. Our highest paid faculty, who would be less susceptible to cost-of-living increases, could afford to endure a decrease in the rate their salary increases, and such a proposal seems worth considering to help increase our financial aid budget.

9. Reduce athletics budget

Fifty-four percent of students responding to the Student Budget Priorities Survey favored reducing the athletic budget. While we recognize that support for athletics draw alumni donations, we recommend that more research be conducted on cost-effective ways to streamline the athletic budget.

In particular, we recommend further encouraging varsity teams to engage in more fundraising for their endeavors, turning some varsity teams into club sports teams, and reducing the money allocated to each team by a set percentage.

10. Put moratorium on building projects

Buildings are expensive (especially new buildings but also comprehensive renovations such as those recently occurred at 41 Wyllys and the Butterfields). While funding for some projects may be covered entirely by gifts, others would require substantial borrowing, increasing Wesleyan’s debt levels or otherwise damaging our endowment and overall financial outlook. Furthermore, gifts that fund building projects could be dedicated more directly to stabilizing Wesleyan’s financial situation and funding scholarships that directly support our academic and social mission. We recommend that building projects focus only on major maintenance until we are able to both admit without sensitivity to need and meet full need of all those admitted, and do so.

11. Permanently end increases of student body

Given the University’s current financial situation, we do not consider the expansion of the student body to be an acceptable solution to the University’s budgetary model. While under other circumstances an expansion may be acceptable or even desirable, our budget is already stretched quite thin on a per-student basis and we see little benefit to the admittance of more students. Under a need-blind policy, the admittance of a marginal student nets the University only $28,000 in additional revenue on average after financial. If the University were to admit more students under a need-aware policy, it may be able to gain more since the students admitted would be full-pay students. However, this would exemplify one of the worse outcomes of a need-aware policy: since these extra “seats” would be only open to those who could pay full tuition and fees, such an expansion would be the equivalent to selling seats.

The expansion of the student body in recent history has only worsened problems with access to courses and class-appropriate housing. Furthermore, the over-enrollment of the Class of 2015 appears to have exacerbated the financial stress of the University because of the requisite growth
of the financial budget, which has exaggerated the purported unsustainability of a need-blind policy. Based on our discussions with students, the student body would be deeply concerned about the effects of expanding the size of the undergraduate classes. In the long term, admitting a larger student body undercuts our endowment per-student and therefore dilutes the long term fiscal sustainability of the University. Ultimately, class size will increase such that hiring new faculty and capital projects are required, mitigating any financial gains from increased class size. We therefore implore the University to not consider this as a viable option in determining the path to financial sustainability.

12. Explore innovative fundraising methods including encouraging faculty fundraising

At many other colleges and universities, faculty are either able to fundraise for their own needs or work actively with the fundraising department (University Relations in our case) to fundraise for the University, bringing a more personal connection to the University to alumni on the road. We feel that faculty and students are kept out of the fundraising process in such a way that damages Wesleyan’s overall fundraising capacity, and we would like to see these two constituencies more actively involved. While the Red and Black Calling Society is composed entirely of students, possibilities for more innovative and personal connecting with alumni, particularly that which more amply highlights the superb and pioneering work that faculty and students are performing here at Wesleyan every semester. We also encourage University Relations to actively work with faculty and students to seek out other new and unexplored fundraising methods that may be able to reach individuals otherwise disinclined to donate to Wesleyan.

13. Aggressively pursue new revenues

We recommend that the University make a more proactive effort to creatively identify projects and initiatives that maximize revenue for the University, thus allowing more money for financial aid. In particular Wesleyan could do better at profiting from its facilities during summers and breaks. Although we do have a summer session and are about to introduce a second, it is relatively short and includes few core classes, particularly in math and science. The program could also be better publicized for non-Wesleyan students and high school students. Furthermore a pre-college program taught by graduate students and junior faculty, similar to Brown’s, might be a good source of revenue as well as an important recruiting tool. A program of that sort is being adopted for online classes, and we highly encourage other opportunities to use online learning to generate revenue from outside constituencies. Much of the University’s facilities also remain unused during the summer and other breaks, and we feel the university could do more to increase facilities rental and maximize usage. Last, the university should look into ways of working with faculty to generate revenue through research. Large research projects such as the Wesleyan Media Project could be capitalized upon to raise money for financial aid and while at the same time increasing the profile of Wesleyan’s faculty.

Part 4: Desired Process for Future Financial Decisions

All future financial decisions of a comparable or otherwise significant magnitude should be considered carefully over the course of an academic year. All constituencies (students, faculty, alumni, staff, etc.) should be actively consulted from the beginning of the process. These
constituencies should be actively engaged at the identification of a problem, at the exploration of
the problem, at the cultivation of possible solutions, at the weighing of possible solutions, at the
decision on a particular solution, at the implementation of said solution, and the evaluation in the
aftermath of the same. The administration has a duty to achieve consensus, if not unity, of these
broad constituencies at all stages of the process in resolving issues of this significance to
Wesleyan’s long-term health, core values, and mission.

We believe the University has not met this obligation in the past, as evidence by the plethora of
activism and discussion this semester that was mostly absent last year. This perceived lack of
engagement has led to unfortunate tensions between the administration and the student body that
have negatively impacted our community's ability to move forward to find solutions that are
viewed as legitimate by the whole community.

Wesleyan has a many-decade history of decisions that were not carefully considered in the long-
term, were rushed, and did not engage the thousands of brilliant minds available to it for their
opinions and consideration. The time is long past that we had the wealth and the freedom from
care to do so.

**Part 5: Next Steps**

The Task Force will gather feedback on this memorandum and meet with administrators and
other relevant parties to further explore the items for consideration—their viability, desirability,
and impact on the budget. We ask that the relevant administrators read and provide a response to
this document in a timely manner. After considering their and other feedback, we will determine
which items will be formally endorsed and constitute our final recommendations. We will also
entertain new ideas and conduct further research to ensure the final recommendations are as well
informed as possible.
Recommendations from the Committee for Inclusion and Diversity to the Campus Community

1. The Office of Diversity and Institutional Partnerships needs to be expanded in order to be able to address a higher number of students in a more substantial way.

Rationale: The institutional space on campus designated with addressing issues of full membership and inclusion on campus has a staff of three people, two of which are part-time. We as a committee see any progress that the administration can make as limited while this Office remains in its current form. We call on the administration to make Renee Johnson-Thornton full time as Dean for Diversity and Student Engagement (while the position of Mellon-Mays Associate Coordinator is also empowered by a new full-time staff member) and to make Patricia Stephenson-Gordon the full time Affirmative Action Officer. In addition, we also call for the creation of a position specifically designated to address LGBTQ issues on campus.

2. President Roth, his cabinet, Public Safety and the faculty should go through social justice training, preferably in tandem with students and staff.

Rationale: In the midst of all of our recommendations, we assert that there is only so much work that can be done if the people that we are calling on to make these changes don’t understand their own social location. In order for us to truly believe that the administration can do the community-based work to help move our campus forward, they must commit as individuals to do the internal work necessary to understand how institutional discrimination manifests not only on campus but in their lives. This begins with President Roth, who as the leader of this institution will set the tone for the rest of the faculty and staff (particularly because he holds positions as both). Public Safety has come under scrutiny not only for the incidents that have occurred on campus but the fact that there seems to be a lack of understanding as to why there is so much discontent with the way that they do their work. This is where social justice training can be of assistance. Finally, faculty members are looked at as leaders and role models on campus and yet many of them have been called out for making comments that have made students feel excluded and oppressed. Taking the pledge as a faculty community to go through social justice training will be a powerful tool in moving all of us forward together.

3. There should be an expansion and promotion of the Campus Climate Log so that people feel more empowered to post there when a bias incident occurs

Rationale: The fact that there is a tool on campus designed to report incidents of hate speech and bias should engender a safer space. However, the Log is underutilized in its current form. More resources should be given to promote and explain the true purpose of the Log in order for people to understand its functionality on campus.

4. Publish the Wesleyan Public Safety Guidelines • Rationale: While there are national guidelines for Public Safety available, the institutional framework that is used for Wesleyan officers is not made widely available to the campus community. How can we know how to make Public Safety better and more attuned to the unique needs of our campus if we don’t even know how they operate? We call on President Roth, Vice President Meerts and David Meyer to take the steps to make the operating procedures
of Public Safety more transparent

5. Orientation should have a more consistent focus on social justice • Rationale: Orientation is one of the few times when there is an active acculturation to the campus community. All incoming students should have an understanding of implicit biases, institutional discrimination, and the like in order to understand how their walk in the world in relation to others on campus will manifest itself during their time at Wesleyan. We acknowledge that this is the first year that Elisa Cardona and SALD has planned orientation and that there has been already been a dialogue about integrating social justice into orientation but we place this recommendation here to assert the fact that this should not be a one-year experiment but something that is institutionalized every year for our incoming freshmen.

6. Just like there has been an increased focus on writing skills during this academic year, social justice should be an integrated part of many First Year Initiative courses and other courses throughout the curriculum.

Rationale: In the same vein as the topic above, classes that identify themselves as relating to topics around social justice will provide an academic background for many students who may be interested in gaining this knowledge but didn’t know that a course offered this kind of skill set. We are not calling for the shifting of course content, but rather for Academic Affairs to allow faculty to distinguish that they will have a focus on topics centered on social justice.

7. There should be a space for any member of the Wesleyan community to get social justice training when they would like (this may take the form of more institutional support for the WesDEFs)

Rationale: As we continue to explore the ways in which prejudice and discrimination affects our campus, we are aware of the fact that it is much more difficult to do this when you don’t understand our own social location. Therefore, we ask that there be greater number of opportunities for social justice training on campus so that students, faculty, and staff that want to do that active interrogation of the self will be given an opportunity to do so. We affirm the powerful work that the Wesleyan Diversity Education Facilitators (WesDEFs) do on campus and state that this increased training may come out of expansion of that program.

8. There should be a day set aside for talking about community issues and building every year and perhaps every semester

Rationale: The idea of a day set aside for the development and cultivation of the community is not a new one and there has already been a motion set aside by the Educational Policy Committee to form this day. However, the day is currently set aside for the day before Fall Break when it may be inconvenient for many students to participate, without respect to their level of commitment to social justice. We call on the administration to fully buy in to make this an annual tradition that fully commits our campus to honest and frank dialogue about our strengths and our weaknesses in making every member of our community have a fully actualized sense of full membership

9. Cluster hires related around thematic initiatives designed to increase faculty diversity
Rationale: One of the most powerful ways to cull a sense of community is to have leaders on campus come from a broad spectrum of backgrounds. Thematic initiatives are pushes around subject matter like race and ethnicity, environmental studies, class and privilege, etc. that are more likely to attract a more diverse applicant pool in our faculty membership for multiple departments. This requires a commitment to diversity on the part of our academic departments and we call on them to affirm and invest in that commitment.

10. More institutional support for the African-American Studies Program and the African Studies Cluster. In addition, the plausibility of Asian-American Studies should be explored

Rationale: Drawing from the previous point, the understanding of our own social location oftentimes comes from our academic backgrounds and particularly the deeper understanding of people from oppressed racial classes. Two great avenues for understanding this location are in the African-American Studies Program and African Studies Cluster. However, they are significantly underfunded and understaffed and this not only affects the students that do significant coursework in these fields but also negatively affects the students that take courses that cross-list with them, such as students in Anthropology, Sociology, History, English, Music, and many more. We affirm that more support should be given to these programs. In addition, the idea of a deeper understanding of the Asian-American diaspora is one that has not been explored enough on campus and one that has manifested in a dearth of Asian-American activism. We also affirm that the plausibility of this type of study on an institutional level should be addressed.

11. Implement either an orientation program or ongoing workshops (facilitators can be trained) about making the judicial system at Wes more transparent/accessible to students

Rationale: As a committee, we find it necessary to state that many students find themselves in untenable situations with both Public Safety and the Student Judicial Board that preclude them from having a fully realized sense of confidence and safety if they do end up needing to go through these processes. While we do acknowledge the work of process advisors (it should be noted that three of us identify as process advisors), we call on the administration to provide a place where students can be proactive about learning their way through the student judicial process.

As stated above, we are open and encouraging of refinements and additions to these recommendations. We will try to be as transparent as possible in outlining what the follow-up to these recommendations are and we will continue to have this dialogue both internally as a committee, with the WSA, with President Roth and the administration, and with the larger campus community. Have a Happy Holiday and we look forward to continuing this work in the Spring semester.

Respectfully, The Committee for Inclusion and Diversity

Christian Hosam ’15 (chair), Kelsey Henry ’15, Alton Wang ’16, Jalen Alexander ’14, Carey Gilchrist ’13, Aissa Gueye ’15, Mike Greenwald ’16, Prince Carter ’14, Kate Cullen ’16 (SAC Liaison)
Recommendations for ResLife Policy Changes

In response to student commentary about their freshmen experiences, we (Kate Cullen ‘16 and Nicole Updegrove ‘14) have spent much of the 2012-2013 academic year looking critically at the University’s policies and expectations surrounding student staff positions. We have looked at models used by our peer institutions, spoken with students from every freshman hall on campus, worked with Area Coordinators, consulted the University’s general counsel, met with every Head Resident at least twice, and reached out to all of the student staff on campus. After conversations with some amazing student staff, our goals shifted towards reexamining policies to improve the student staff experience.

We firmly believe that the role of the student staff is crucial to the residential experience and will continue to defend the preservation of these jobs and their salaries. Our proposal simply reflects input we have heard from student staff and residents about how the system could be improved.

Primary problems we have identified:

- Many staff feel that the job they are required to perform is not what they signed up for the previous spring.
- First-year staff members face a steep learning curve, particularly during the first weeks, which affects residents in real time.
- There is huge variation in the time commitments, passions, and interests of staff members and students on campus, as well as great variation in Wesleyan’s housing experiences, making coherent policy setting difficult. However, when different policies are applied in different areas or halls on-campus, residents often feel that their experiences have been unfair.
- Student staff feel that programming requirements are overly bureaucratic; often, it is a stretch to fit programs to all of the requirements.
- House Managers often find that their residents love programming with the house—but not always for programs that fulfill ResLife requirements.
- There is very little accountability for determining what programs are successful and effective at building community.
- Residents in many halls don’t attend their Resident Advisors’ programs, which makes RAs’ efforts to build community much more difficult.
- Staff members struggle with enforcing community standards among their peers, who often don’t understand how or why their behavior negatively affects the community.
- Students often resent their Resident Advisors for enforcing policy, without understanding what a crucial (and mandatory) aspect of the job enforcement is.
- Student ratings of ResLife staff don’t reflect how well community has grown among residents as a result of student staff’s work.
Training
1) In advertising open positions in the spring, make more clear the specifics of the job (particularly by advertising job descriptions themselves).
   a) Rationale:
      i) Advertisements for ResLife staff positions tend to be vague and don’t address crucial aspects of the position (“ResLife wants YOU!…to join our team. Apply to be a resident advisor (RA) and develop great leadership skills while shaping the residential experience for other students at Wes.”)
      ii) Many new staff are unaware of many job requirements (like duty, amount of paperwork required, and the sheer time commitment of the job) until they arrive for training; some staff express that they are not as good a fit for the job as they had expected.
      iii) With advertisements and information sessions that more directly pertain to the actual job (e.g., addressing community-building, learning to plan effective events, maintaining community standards, ongoing professional development), applicants will better fit the real expectations of the task at hand.
      iv) With greater understanding of the time (and emotional) commitments involved in these positions, staff can better plan their other commitments for the coming year.
   2) As a prerequisite to the application process for new staff members, require applicants to shadow a current staff member for an hour of duty (including a round of patrols) in two different areas. (Ensure that applicants sign confidentiality agreements in advance.)
      a) Rationale:
         i) Spending an hour with a current staff member would foster honest conversations about the ResLife staff experience before the application process, helping applicants to make informed decisions.
         ii) A shadowing process can help RAs hit the ground running in the fall with a greater understanding of how to maintain community standards in their hall.
         iii) This requirement would give applicants a better sense of the requirements and implications of being an RA, and could weed out applicants who are unwilling to perform those duties.
         iv) In their applications, students will be able to speak to first-hand experience, thus making their application more representative of their candidacy as an RA.
   3) Maintain current practices of post-application duty shadowing.
      a) Rationale: See above (2aii).
   4) Better prepare students in training for confronting specific situations (in addition to Behind Closed Doors) - including providing the groundwork for language needed in conversations about community standards.
      a) Rationale:
i) Enforcement is one of the hardest aspects of the RA’s job. With better preparation, the first few weeks will run much more smoothly both for residents and staff.

ii) The language needed to explain to the impact that residents’ behavior has on the community is not always intuitive. With better support from ResLife for these conversations between RAs and residents, residents will more quickly learn to behave in ways that support a productive and positive community, ultimately lightening the burden carried by RAs later in the year.

5) Better prepare students in training for having difficult conversations (e.g., confrontations, discussions about social justice, etc.) with peer staff members and supervisors.
   a) Rationale:
      i) During training, ResLife never discusses how to deal with a fellow staff member who has partaken in actions not in accordance with their job, how to have difficult conversations with other staff members when it comes to differences of opinion, feeling triggered and hurt by someone's words, action, etc, or any other staff problem troubleshooting. Situations on the job are challenging and training must involve strategies for dealing with conflict within the workplace.

6) In the first two weeks of fall, have HRs and ACs incentivize new RAs to meet and collaborate with returned staff members who volunteer to help out. If new staff are feeling overwhelmed by duty, temporarily partner them with a returning staff member.
   a) Rationale:
      i) Recognizing that to some extent this already occurs, further encouragement of mentorship can only be beneficial. Many staff expressed being uncertain or overwhelmed during their first weeks; mentorship from an older staff member can help mitigate the process.

7) Reform the spring training process to address where programming efficacy and planning, resident evaluations, community development, biggest issues from the fall, institutional concerns, celebration of accomplished year-long goals and recommitment to remaining ones, with minimal repetition of components of fall training.
   a) Rationale:
      i) Many student staff felt that spring training was redundant and unhelpful.
      ii) With greater attention in spring training to generating insight about the fall, the spring will be a new time for growth among student staff and residential communities.

**Programming**

1) For CAs and RAs, have a minimum number of programs that occur in-hall; said minimum number should be set by the AC to reflect that area, its community, and its communal spaces.
   a) Rationales:
Especially in mixed-class housing, many residents report feeling disconnected from their neighbors and hallmates; in-hall events can most effectively build those connections.

Too often, out-of-hall events don’t get good attendance because residents are unwilling to leave their dorms or aren’t aware that they are happening.

Hall events are accessible and easy to plan while also productive towards developing the immediate community where residents live.

If RAs co-program with one another or with student groups, the program ought to include an aspect that is hall-specific. (Example: before the Block Party, have single-hall cooking events to prepare food, potluck-style.)

Rationale:

We understand that programming is already moving in this direction and strongly support the initiative. Co-programming can bring together different communities in productive new ways. However, all programs should still explicitly build community among those specific residents.

In staff’s programming evaluation forms, attendance reports should consist of the number of residents who attended, out of the total number of residents (e.g., 7 / 31). Head Residents and Area Coordinators should track attendance throughout the year and address progress with obtaining student commitment in their weekly meetings.

Rationale:

Programs can be very effective at community-building and individual development regardless of attendance and should get credit regardless of attendance. Still, many programs receive low attendance either overall or among residents of the hall or house; reports should explicitly address the number of residents who attended.

By tracking attendance, attaining student engagement for programs can be a central part of mentorship from the HR and AC.

Remove the "learning outcome" objectives from programming for RAs and HMs (but maintain the objectives for hall meetings and one-on-ones with residents).

Rationales:

Many residents report the learning outcome requirements for programming to seem ineffective and inorganic, as well as limiting of other potentially popular and community-oriented programs.

Many staff members report that their programs rarely fit the requirements, and they must stretch the truth about programs to fulfil the requirements.

Learning outcomes are more effectively demonstrated through more personal events such as a hall meeting or informal talk between an RA and a resident.

Given that learning outcomes are the only requirements for Community Advisor programs this year, they should remain in place for CAs.

Interactions with Residents
1) Require that RAs hold “open door hours” once per week from 8 p.m. to 10 p.m. while on duty so residents know that the RA is accessible to talk.

   a) **Rationales:**
      i) Open door hours will make being on duty more dynamic and community development-focused, without taking additional time out of RAs busy schedules.
      ii) Open door hours will encourage stronger one-on-one relationships between RAs and residents.
      iii) Open door hours will dispel the stigma some students hold of RAs only being on duty to write up residents for violating the Honor Code.
      iv) Having these hours happen while already on duty and required to be present in the building lessens the additional strain placed on RAs while making clear to residents that their RA is there for them.

2) For HMs and RAs, require within the first month of each semester a 15-minute conversation with each resident within the first month of each semester. (If specific upperclassman residents are particularly evasive, allowances can be made, but every freshman should be involved).

   a) **Rationales:**
      i) Many students report that they rarely see their RAs; many RAs report that their are students they rarely see on the hall. An additional mechanism of engagement can begin those mentorship connections early.
      ii) Students are more likely to engage with programs and with the community if they have already built the beginnings of a relationship with their RA or HM.
      iii) One-on-one conversations are most effective for determining how a resident is doing, what resources they might need, and what is happening in the house or hall.
      iv) By allowing a month for these conversations to occur, the burden placed on staff by adding this requirement is lessened.

3) Make monthly “blurbs” about residents a standard requirement across all dorm areas.

   a) **Rationale:**
      i) Student staff fairly consistently report positive experiences with their increased degree of interaction with residents due to the blurb requirement. We feel that this requirement could benefit students in all residential areas.

4) Add into the hiring process a question about how the applicant would conduct these conversations.

   a) **Rationale:**
      i) Adding this question to the hiring process would better identify applicants who will make good mentors to residents.
Assessment

1) In evaluations, have residents assess their hall/house and the sense of community within it, in addition to assessing their RA.

a) Rationales:
   i) Much of the paperwork that staff must complete attempts to evaluate how successful they have been in building community on their halls. However, programming reports, residents’ RA assessments, and weekly conversations are insufficient for and ineffective in assessing actual progress in community-building.
   ii) Students who are afraid to be honest about assessing individuals can be more honest in assessing their halls; students who want to report a bad experience in a hall can do so without blaming the entire experience on a staff member.
   iii) This form of assessment adds no additional paperwork to the already heavily-burdened staff.

2) Incentivize better turnout for student staff evaluations. To that end, incentivize RAs to get at least half of their residents to fill out the evaluations. For HMs, make clear to residents that filling out this evaluation is one part of house engagement, which is one element of determining the status and viability of the program house.

Other Recommendations

1) Have Maureen and Fran lead a large session during Orientation (accompanied by ACs) to explain to freshmen the role of RAs.

a) Rationale:
   i) With more realistic expectations about the role of RAs from the start, students will (a) know for what resources they can and should turn to their RAs, (b) understand from the start the role that RAs play in enforcement, and (c) understand the fact that RAs are contractually bound to perform certain roles.
Leonard Prize Memo
May 28, 2013

To Dean David Phillips

I would like to propose revised terms for the Leonard Prize:

"Awarded annually by the faculty to one of three undergraduates nominated by WSA to help an individual complete a worthwhile project that will enhance the campus community. By completing this project, this student will be exemplifying the highest standards of character through giving back to improve campus life. The winner will be selected on the basis of project proposals solicited by the WSA. The prize money will go directly to the most meaningful and viable project, and the money will be allocated through the WSA office consistent with SBC financial processes to ensure maximum efficiency. Members of the WSA General Assembly will be ineligible to receive the prize.”

I believe these terms meet the current stated goal of the prize, to award exemplary character in campus life, while also guaranteeing, in the spirit of community, that the money goes on to benefit the entire student body.

Sincerely,
Zachary Malter