



Agenda Items

1. Summer Session Application Fee
2. Water Bottle Refill Stations
3. YCC Biannual Donation Drive
4. YCC Proposals
5. Reminders & Announcements

Attendance

BK	Diksha Brahmhatt	X	Joseph English	X
BK	Ethan Young	E	Madeline Bauer	X
BR	Mollie Johnson	X	Amour Alexandre	X
BR	Shannon Flores	X	Daniel Tovbin	X
CC	Michael Yuan	E	Sammy Bensinger	X
CC	Luis Patiño	U	Josh Hochman	X
DC	Joseph Cornett	X	Megan Ruan	X
DC	Daniel Hamidi	X	Joel Bervell	E
ES	Sydney Wade	X	Maya Sweedler	E
ES	Joseph Tomchak	X	Phan Nguyen	E
JE	Benjamin Held	E		
JE	Larry Fulton	E		
MC	Kevin Sullivan	X		
MC	Carter Henschien	X		
PC	Lauren Sapienza	X		
PC	Sofia Braunstein	X		
SY	Christopher Bowman	X		
SY	Avery Thompson	X		
SM	Katherine Oh	X		
SM	Peter Huang	X		
TD	Joshua McGilvray	X		
TD	Nicholas Zevallos	E		
TC	Shah Kahn	X		
TC	Devyn Rigsby	E		

Minutes

Please note that the minutes reflect the conversation held during the Council of Representatives meeting, but may not contain every comment and are not intended to reflect exact quotations. Comments in italics are notes to give context to the minutes. The layout of the minutes is the Presentation of the Issue, Presentation of the Discussion, and Recording of the Vote. Unless otherwise noted, the Presentation of the Issue is done by the person whose name is next to the heading for that issue. Comments by representatives or other attendees are preceded by their name (e.g. Jane: comment).

Summer Session Application Fee

Presentation by Jaclyn Price, BK '19:

- Current: \$75 fee
- Suggestions:
 - Get rid of or lower application fee
 - Introduce a fee waiver if fee is burdensome, similar to waiver for Yale College application
 - For abroad programs, introduce \$200 deposit only after student accepts admission

Discussion:

- Josh: Can we have a more intensive application?
- Daniel: Is this Yale the only school that has this?
- Jaclyn: Yes.
- Carter: What would the fee waiver option look like?
- Jaclyn: Check box on the application.
- Adam: Is it possible to base the fee waiver on financial aid?
- Jaclyn: Yes. We can propose a waived fee for the highest need students and we are looking into the viability.
- Lauren: Consider a sliding scale for the fee.

Water Bottle Refill Stations

Presentation by Jenny Xiao, PC '19:

- Current locations: PWG, Dunham Laboratory, some residential college gyms
- ~1400 students use reusable water bottles
- Suggestions
 - Prioritize college residential facilities (gyms and libraries)
 - Classroom buildings and other libraries

Discussion:

- Carter: What would the cost be, short-term and long-term? \$800 on Amazon.
- Diksha: Who would fund this? Libraries and Facilities are very receptive.
- Kate: Brita filters in the Law school? Perhaps more expensive.

YCC Biannual Donation Drive

Presentation by Joseph Cornett, DC '17:

- Take place after spring break
- Precedents:
 - Sustainability Corps provides laundry-room bins for donations
 - Declutter, Destress, Donate - residential college donating competition
- Proposal:
 - Bring together many organizations, increase student involvement
 - Volunteer opportunities
 - Student sign-up to deliver what has been donated to donees
 - Do this the week after Spring Break - fresh mindset, low stress
 - Advertise during end of Spring Break

Discussion:

- Andrew: Will there be a representative from Dwight Hall? Yes. Rep from Goodwill.
- Maddie: What does this require on the part of YCC? Campus-wide email; individual organizations will do more intensive outreach
- Sydney: Where will donation bins be? Depends on layout of each college, but common rooms
- Peter: Make this a competition between colleges? Need prizes.
- Maddie: Who's supplying manpower? Dwight Hall.
- Kate: How much publicity will YCC do? Nice to have the YCC stamp to increase range of awareness

YCC Proposals

Recommendation-Specific Voting

- Especially important for complex projects with many aspects
- Council tends to pass proposals in their entirety, perhaps too much of the time
- We already do this sometimes, but could make this a universal policy/default for every project
- Carter: Case by case is working, could decrease efficiency, not every project needs such delineation
- Diksha: Case by case might make more sense. If one recommendation garners a lot of discussion/disagreement, it could be parsed out and voted on separately.
- Joshua: Make it the specific power of the council member to separate voting by recommendation

Task Force Leadership

- Require that a current YCC member (representative or e-board) lead/participate in each task force
- Useful for the functioning of the task force, knowledge/familiarity of YCC policies, survey timelines, advocacy procedures
- Why are some TFDs this semester not on YCC? This semester, people who were most qualified to lead task forces were not on council
- Is the position of Task Force Director (Joel) officially part of the YCC constitution? Ambiguous.
- Kate: Require all task force leaders to be a part of YCC and attend meetings

- Kevin: Every task force should have a YCC liaison, but don't necessarily exclude rest of student body from leading a TF
- Peter: Can e-board send out a document on TF past and present? Joel can present

Flexibility in Policy Directorship Jurisdictions

- Omit the line in the constitution that says it is the Academics Director who must liaison with CIPE/Career Services
- This could expand to other realms
- Currently there are some areas that are unclear as to why one PD should be
- Maddie: there is some value in having a specific person responsible/continuous contact person
- Kate: Create a position specifically to liaison with administration
- Joe: TFs take care of this, having a specific rep responsible would be inefficient
- Joseph: state in the constitution that each admin contact will be liaised with by *one* PD, but not specify which ones
- David: This role belongs under University Services, just because a PD doesn't have the expertise to liaise with someone doesn't mean the responsibility should go away
- Maddie: At the beginning of the year VP and PDs sit down and assign "floating" bodies to primary liaisons

2/3 Approval Vote

- There have been no more than 5 "nay" votes on any projects.
- Often, projects have been passed even though many dissenting comments have been made
- Create two types of votes for projects
- If VP deems the project will require the approval of admin, then require a supermajority vote of $\frac{2}{3}$
- If project is YCC internal, then simple majority will be sufficient
- Problem: groupthink
- A way to constrain the number of projects that will be passed, and make the vetting process more intensive
- Discussion:
- Carter: This wouldn't increase the number of "nay" votes.
- Josh: But by drawing attention to this problem, we can get people to think more openly about voting "nay"
- David: This will encourage people to say what they think, break down part of the high psychological barrier against saying "nay." If your "nay" vote carries more significance because the threshold is higher, then people will be more likely to speak out.
- Joshua: Different approach could be to invoke money. Make the costs of projects more salient so that council votes more realistically/weights the costs
- Jackson: It would also make our arguments stronger to the faculty. $\frac{2}{3}$ is stronger support than simple majority
- Daniel: Hesitant to support. What if one year council is very contentious? Would this lead to an inefficiency? Also concerned about the presidential veto. It hasn't been revoked recently, but $\frac{3}{4}$ is a high bar as a check on presidential power.

- Josh: Number of projects that are contentious enough to make this inefficient is small. Not opposed to a $\frac{3}{4}$ threshold instead of $\frac{2}{3}$, just think it should be higher than $\frac{1}{2}$. The $\frac{3}{4}$ margin for presidential veto is not much higher than $\frac{2}{3}$ for a council of 24.
- Carter: How would this affect quorum?
- Sammy: Does not affect this. Quorum doesn't change.

Electronic Voting

- Groupthink - it is difficult to say no in front of a group/peer who has worked hard. Makes voting anonymous.
- Allows reps more time, esp. if a report is involved (more time to read), pressure to commit to a decision and vote right away
- Quorum - avoids the problem of vote pileup
- Daniel: not fair to allow people who missed meeting to vote. Stricter attendance, lower quorum?
- Kate: Voting should be in person, we should have stricter attendance requirements.
- Andrew: If YCC doesn't have quorum, videotape meetings and let people watch them before they vote.
- Josh: Favor electronic voting that is done during council. People who are not present at meetings should not be allowed to vote, but online voting does solve the problem of anonymity and groupthink
- Sammy: Clicker voting. (Notetaker's note: People loved this)
- Maddie: favors clicker over using phones. Would be a distraction
- Diksha: With electronic voting in the room, it takes the pressure off voting in front of everyone. People would not take the time to sit through a video of a missed meeting.
- Kevin: From the perspective of a person who is low in the alphabet, his vote has definitely been swayed by the votes of others.

Empowering Representatives

- Establish council-only meetings and a Speaker of the Council
- No official business done, but creating a collaborative effort
- Kevin loves separation of power
- Elect a representative as Speaker, could appoint a Secretary
- Report back to E-board on what was discussed
- Adam: From an associate rep perspective, doesn't seem like they should be excluded
- Kevin: associates would not be excluded, unless Speaker decided there was probable reason
- Joe: Loves the idea of council-only meetings, but dislikes idea of Speaker of council. VP is already elected by the student body for this job. Possible to hold council-only meetings without further official separation of leadership
- Daniel: Speaker role would only be to run the council-only meetings
- Maddie: Would it be just as effective to have VP present in a passive capacity, merely to facilitate?
- Kevin: No, that would not detract at all.
- Joseph: Important to have someone not on e-board running these meetings. E-board has a lot of behind the scenes power, and we could run into a situation in which having e-board present would deter people from speaking freely
- Joe: Do a random number generator to decide moderator.

- Peter: Don't do this over brunch. Does think there should be a single "speaker", not VP, perhaps elected by the council. Does understand the point about excessive hierarchy, but having a single speaker would provide consistency
- Joshua: Thinks it would be cool to have the council-only meetings/ speaker fill a more oppositional role. Will increase "nays"
- Sammy: Strongly support having a rep be the speaker, for efficiency's sake. Something to be said for having a skilled moderator. All for having more opportunities for leadership, and this would not necessarily create excess hierarchy
- Adam: Uncomfortable because if one person is consistently leading meetings outside of official council meetings, it might change the dynamic at actual council meetings.
- Diksha: Look at this like a "moderator" rather than "speaker." If there is something that's been on a rep's mind, could put this on the agenda via the moderator.
- Maddie: Fear of this becoming an entirely different council. Moderator gives it a more appropriate feel.
- Doesn't have to be a formal meeting between moderator and e-board
- David: What specifically will be talked about at these meetings?
 - Necessary to have a meeting every month?
- Rayan: would this be creating a separation between e-board and council?
- Mollie: Most projects we take are generally not that controversial, and they are also proposed *by* members of the council. Seems like such a meeting would be superfluous. Same quasi-barrier would exist. Might be better served by really encouraging people to speak their minds. Would be "bloating"
- Lauren: No "freaky" power dynamic unless we artificially create one.

Director of Communications Job Description

- Add sponsorship liaison responsibility to the job description

Community Service in the YCC Mission

- YCC and affiliated bodies have unique breadth and should take advantage to make Yale a more community-bonding experience
- Edit preamble to include a line along the lines of "support community service"
- Look at Article 3 Section 14, add that Student Life Director would be liaison to community service groups
- Dwight Hall would like to have an official relationship with YCC
- Three ways:
- SL Director
- Events component - at least 1 comm. service event per year that unites student body
- Also reflect in FCC and SoCo manuals
- Discussion:
- Joseph: This is very outside the realm of YCC. Appreciates that comm. service is important and we should all be involved, but does not need to be the mission of YCC.
- This is not committing to any central core aspect, but should just reflect a consideration to the importance of comm. service.
- Maddie: completely supports, but worried about precedent. YCC president does meet regularly with Dwight Hall. Maybe this means we just need to be more open and enthusiastic about inviting comm. service organizations to meetings. We are strictly a

neutral and policy-oriented body. We are neutral on political issues, and by nature comm. services can often have political leanings.

- Adam: Agrees with the spirit of proposal, and SL component is good. But including in the mission is perhaps not in the spirit of a “mission statement”. We are a broad and neutral organization, and prioritizing a specific action in the mission statement is counter.
- Peter: don’t necessarily have to accept everything that comes our way, but vet it through SL director.