Agenda:
Opening of the Meeting: Meeting called to order at 7:03pm

1. Fight song and role call
2. Social Justice Training
3. Open Forum
   a. Izzy Linser: Let’s make an actual mission statement!
   b. Kate Cullen: I want to make a transfer-student task force. Please let me know if you want to join.
   c. Nicole Updegrove: While the social justice training we had last week was not what EC had planned, I hope you all enjoyed considering the mission of the WSA, and I hope to bring a mission statement draft to GA for consideration in the future.
   d. Fred Ayres: Let me know about good places to get apparel!
4. Committee Reports
   a. Jason Shatz: What will be the cost for international students to stay over Winter Break? Are there other outlets?
   b. Kate Cullen: There are only 22 spots and the normal process will take place. I’m not aware of the precise figures, but it wouldn’t cost that much more.
   c. Nicole Updegrove: The amount of money left in the SBC account seems high for this time of year.
   d. Nicki Softness: Our weekly budgets are still on-par, it’s just that the large spring events haven’t requested funds yet.
   e. Jason Shatz: With the revival of the community housing model, could that possibly help assimilate first-generation students?
   f. Justin Gitlin: One of the main problems is that there is a bit of segregation and isolation with such housing options. It also wouldn’t help much to assimilate them with students of other backgrounds.
5. Endowment
   a. Nicole Updegrove: Please explain re-assumptions for new members.
   b. Nicole Brenner: Any unspent money in a student group’s account is taken back by the SBC.
c. Nicki Softness: Yes, at the end of the year, we take the unspent money back and that is the SBC’s surplus. This year we took about $17,000 for our endowment.
d. Justin Gitlin: You said $50,000 every year?
e. Andrew Trexler: Yes and most of that goes into the SBC budget, not the endowment.
f. Kate Cullen: How is the Wesleyan Endowment different from our endowment?
g. Andrew Trexler: It’s the endowment for our organization.
h. Glenn Cantave: Are there any less volatile options than Winslow? Do you change often?
i. Andrew Trexler: We first invested in Winslow for its green technology profile. It has had a generally positive return. We don’t change all that much, though we have divested from a local bank fund, but it had poor returns for two straight years and we dropped it.
j. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: Because we’re invested in Wesleyan Endowment, can we find out where exactly we’re invested?
k. Andrew Trexler: There is no possible way.
l. Kate Cullen: What is our share of the Wesleyan Endowment?
m. Andrew Trexler: It’s only about $80,000.
n. Glenn Cantave: Have we consulted any econ professors in terms of where we invest our money?
o. Andrew Trexler: There was some input at first, but now most of our investments are pretty stable.
p. Nicki Softness: We would do some consulting if there were wide fluctuations. Back in 2011, we did do a fair amount of consulting.
q. Rebecca Hutman: So is it the SBC’s responsibility to make sure this doesn’t tank?
r. Nicki Softness: Yes, generally. If anything like that happened, it wouldn’t be the SBC’s fault; inside, it’d be a larger problem based on the economy.
s. Nicole Updegrove: I move for a straw poll of those for and against removing the portion of the WSA Endowment that we have invested in the Wesleyan Endowment.
t. Andrew Trexler: Like it or not, we are invested in this university. We need to have some affiliation in the institution. We are not a separate body.
u. Scott Elias: Last semester, we voted that Wesleyan should divest from fossil fuels. This would be a significant move to align with those sustainability ideals and would send a message to the administration.
v. Straw Poll- 11 FOR, 9 AGAINST, 9 ABSTAIN
w. Justin Gitlin: Could we even really vote on such a change?
x. Andrew Trexler: The Endowment Committee could override the body, but I have faith it would not.
y. Sadasia McCutchen: The shift to being need-aware has had a huge effects on students here. Could we divert the money we invest into the Wes Endowment to the financial aid fund?
z. Andrew Trexler: We can discuss that moving forward.

aa. Kate Cullen: Could invest in a local bank? It'd be a good move for Middletown-Wes relations.

bb. Andrew Trexler: We can discuss it further in the future. Keep in mind that a similar fund in the past tanked.

c. Rebecca Hutman: Have we even thought about giving away 1% to a student idea?

d. Andrew Trexler: We essentially already do that and more through the SBC.

e. Sadasia McCutchen: Prior to this discussion, I was unaware of such a fund. We should let students know about this and have them determine what use it should serve.

ff. Andrew Trexler: When the fund was originally created, we had many very long conversations regarding that topic both in GA and with the student body.

g. Colin O’Keefe: So if we vote to take money out of the Wes Endowment, would it make a difference?

hh. Andrew Trexler: It wouldn’t make a big difference, though they want this symbolic gesture to stay.

ii. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: From what I can tell, the Wesleyan Endowment is giving us the lowest return on this quarter. From a financial standpoint, should we divest?

jj. Andrew Trexler: There have been times when the Wes Endowment gave us the biggest returns.

kk. Nicole Brenner: It seems like the ideal behind our endowment is getting a bit lost. Are we really helping to decrease student costs?

ll. Andrew Trexler: Well actually, over time the money (in real dollars) that students have needed to pay for their activities fee has gone down.

mm. Chris Caines: Since we’re invested, could we find out what Wes is invested in?

nn. Matan Koplin-Green: It would be difficult to do so.

oo. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: It seems very odd to me that we would invest that is a bit of a bit mystery.

pp. Matan Koplin-Green: It’s all a matter of strategy; they can’t share that information with us.

qq. Justin Gitlin: I trust that the administration knows what they’re doing with their investments.

rr. Jason Shatz: I’d like to dispel the notion that being skeptical of the administration's investments is reason enough to divest entirely. We should maintain our relationship with the administration as we both have the students’
best interests at heart.

6. Appeals Process Reform
   
a. Nicole Updegrove: An administrator should be allowed to recuse himself or herself from the proceedings.

b. Kate Cullen: Michael Roth has stated that he no longer wants to be on this board. He’d rather a group that is more in-touch with the students should make these decisions.

c. Scott Elias: When addressing sexual assault, it’s not the best idea to have students that are not specially trained on these issues to be making such large decisions.

d. Jason Shatz: Does SART or WesWell have any specific input on these issues?

e. Kate Cullen: They haven’t, but that’s a great idea.

f. Andrew Trexler: It’s worth noting that in cases with sexual assault, there is no student involvement from the start. The prior body who approved the change felt that it would create too much awkwardness.

g. Glenn Softness: Are the victim and the accused victim in the same room for the initial testimony? At Northwestern, they have a group regarding sexual assault peer education program. Perhaps because the school is so small that we should have a third party come in to help.

h. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: I think that Wesleyan students shouldn’t serve in the deciding body in sexual assault cases.

i. Nicole Updegrove: Most appeals occur in the case of procedural error, not full reevaluation of the original student action and responsibility for violating the CNAC.

j. Kate Cullen: It’s also to lower sanctions.

k. Nicole Updegrove: We should get more input from students about how well they think the SJB process works.

l. Glenn Cantave: I don’t think it’s a good idea to have Wes students sitting on the board because students undergoing academic appeals may open up about different issues.

m. Nicki Softness: In the end, it’s up to the student to determine whether peer students are involved on the board.

n. Chris Caines: I think that having students involved validates the process. We might want to have a student sign off on the final decision of the case.

o. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: If we only had one compared to two students on the board, would that make a difference?

p. Nicole Updegrove: I don’t think there is much bias based on which students are on the board. On the Academic Review Committee, I haven’t seen much bias in terms of gender, major, etc.
q. Andrew Trexler: I am wary of trying to make the appeal process extremely anonymous; just reading a transcript is not a good way to gauge a case. I suggest that a member of the WSA should perhaps serve on the board at times.
r. Ellen Paik: I see the merit in not having a student on the board, but then again many facets of our school’s support system (e.g. 8-8 calling) relies on anonymity. This is again a tough decision.
s. Kate Cullen: I want a straw poll on points 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.
t. Straw Poll: 3.1 5 FOR, 3.2 18 FOR, 3.3 2 FOR, 4 ABSTAIN
u. Andrew Trexler: How many of you would feel comfortable serving on the sexual assault case review board?
v. Kate Cullen: Some members on the board would know the names of the students involved.
w. Nicole Updegrove: Along the same lines, on Academic Review Committee, the decisions made affects students for the rest of their lives. It’s not an easy decision to put on students. To be a student on the sexual assault appeals committee would require making even farther reaching decisions, and I’m not sure many students are in a place to cope with that.
x. Martin Malabanan: For the other appeals boards, will the identity be known? Any students on the boards have to be there, right?
y. Kate Cullen: Yes for the identity issue. And no, members can recuse themselves. Any members on the board are willing to be there.
z. Glenn Cantave: The amount of power given to these students is something we should question, given the small size of the Wesleyan community. I don’t feel comfortable with it, personally.
aa. Izzy Linser: We should care about the students on the board, but we should still keep in mind the students going through the appeal.
b. Andrew Trexler: It’s my opinion that the process shouldn’t include students because it’s a power that students just shouldn’t have.
cc. Justin Gitlin: I don’t care about the comfort of the student serving on the board. We owe it to have that student perspective on the board; the administrators need to have a check on their power. We should make this a complete and holistic discussion.
dd. Nicole Brenner: As for the comfort of the student making the appeal, we should allow them to choose whether or not they want students to serve on the board.
ee. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: With the sexual assault cases, how much power does the appeals board actually have? What is the scope?
ff. Kate Cullen: It’s not to overturn a decision-- it’s just to remedy any procedural errors.
gg. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: Given this new scope-- that cases might be retried-- we should definitely have students on the board. They shouldn’t have the power to convict.

hh. Chris Caines: There are others members on campus who make really big decisions. It’s not a matter of whether or not we can handle.

ii. Ellen Paik: It only makes sense to have a student on the board if it’s requested. I just want to know why it’s only the sexual assault cases are the only one with that option.

jj. Kate Cullen: It all depends on how the original cases is heard. The other cases align with how the original case was conducted.

kk. Nicole Updegrove: I strongly recommend that WSA members be used as the students members on the board and not SJB members. SJB members are influenced considerably by the administrators they work with.

ll. Nicki Softness: I would like this form be part of the official WSA recommendation-- we should add that peer advisors should be available to student members of the board.

mm. Kate Cullen: As for the students that could serve on the SJB cases, which ones could serve?

nn. Jenna Starr: At the start of the semester, we should ask students if they’d want to be involved. Go to the WSA, for instance.

oo. Andrew Trexler: Faculty advisors are already really busy, so I think it’s best if faculty selected by the Service Committee serve instead.

pp. Izzy Linser: Maybe the best thing here is to have student request that certain faculty members not serve.

7. USLAC/ Progressive Independence Model
   a. Sadasia McCutchen: I propose a straw poll on an entirely reduction of janitorial services, the same model, or a happy medium of only having services a few times a week.
   b. Straw Poll: Keep 0, Modification 18, Abstain 10

8. New Business and Announcements
   a. Jenna Starr: A lot of people come to me if we could put more outlets in Pi Cafe?
   b. Justin Gitlin: I’ll make a point of it.
   c. Ellen Paik: And on the first floor of Sci Li!
   d. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: Rebecca and I will be revisiting our conversation on withdrawal policy soon.
   e. Key Session: We are having a dodgeball tournament soon. Email me or Lizzie to help out.
   f. Scott Elias: The financial aid committee is meeting on Wednesday. We need creative ideas.
   g. Bruno Machiavelli: Is Admissions committee going to be a thing?
Meeting Adjourned: 10:02pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Fred Ayres ‘17