Introduction

1. President’s Report (5 minutes)
   a. Follow Ups
      i. See attached President’s Report.
   b. End of Year Wrap-ups
      i. See attached President’s Report.
   c. Discussion Questions
      i. Why does mental health matter?
         1. Answer: If mental health is not a priority, people are unable to reach their maximum potential.
         2. Answer: At a place like Princeton where there is a tendency to push people to the limits of their ability, it is especially important to think about how we can help people cope with the demands of the environment.
         3. Answer: It is important to have conversations about failure, wellbeing, etc. because if we are ever to combat a culture of effortless perfection, it comes from people that are in positions of leadership.
      ii. What have we accomplished?
         1. Answers: Making progress on the Menstrual Products Task Force and discussing the financial possibility of it, the Carl A. Fields Center Block Party and increasing awareness of the Diversity & Equity Committee, and working on actualizing bringing electric scooters to campus!
         2. We will continue this discussion next week.

New Business

1. University Task Force on Eating Clubs Update: Caleb Visser and Hannah Paynter (20 minutes)
   a. Thank you to Hannah Paynter, President of the ICC, for presenting at today’s meeting!
   b. Caleb and Hannah have been on a University Task Force evaluating the relationship between the University and eating clubs. They are looking for feedback and dialogue on the University’s recommendation and next steps.
c. The Report’s Vision: “Princeton University and the eating clubs, working together, strive to provide all undergraduates with experiences that contribute to a campus social life that is vibrant, accessible and inclusive; help to create a sense of connectedness, belonging and community; and enhance the overall Princeton experience.”

d. There are nine guiding principles of the report: an independent, cohesive, transparent relationship, regular communication, diversity and inclusion, residential colleges and the clubs, social and dining alternatives, outreach, health, safety and well-being, commitment to open clubs, and fluidity between options.

e. Recommendations from the report were divided into four categories: (Notes for the discussion for each area are below.)

   i. Diversity, Inclusion and Community
   ii. Health, Safety and Well-Being
   iii. Communication
   iv. Eating Club Costs and Potential Partnerships

f. The report proposes the recommendations outlined in the presentation. There is a new committee with representatives from groups such as the Princeton Prospect Foundation, the ICC, the GICC, USG, etc. that has been charged with figuring out how these recommendations will be implemented.

g. When Hannah began as ICC Chair, it was the first year in which sign-in clubs were the smallest clubs out of all of the clubs on Prospect. Hannah was previously Cloister’s president. The ICC heard that many people wanted to bicker for the experience. This year, there will be no early sign-in. Previously, early sign-in was the Wednesday of Intersection.

h. This year, there will be Street Week. The website goes live on January 20th, and the pref window has also been changed. Before, you would rank the clubs you registered for in the beginning. Now, everyone will rank all 5 open clubs in addition to any clubs they bicker. By ranking all 5 for every person, the ICC hopes that people will think of them as option. Furthermore, all sophomores will receive an invitation on Friday morning.

i. The ICC is already working on many of the recommendations such as the diversity and inclusivity initiative. Demographics wise, only the University has access to demographic information for the eating club. The ICC is looking to work with the University to use that information to conduct more intentional recruiting.

j. The ICC is trying to put together an Activities Fair Mixer on January 20th with a little table set up for every club. The idea would be to combat stereotypes about clubs.
k. There is also a SHARE Best Practices matrix established in 2015; ICC is using this as a guideline. There is full membership training in the fall for example. Every club has a SHARE liaison, too.
l. The ICC started an Instagram last spring. On that Instagram, you can find what ICC has been working on this year. There was Sophomore Week back in November where ICC tabled in late meal. There was an open house that had great turnout, too. The ICC also just launched the Princeton Eats Tumblr! where students can ask anonymous questions (inspired by Real Talk Princeton).
m. Questions
i. There is a concern about blending diversity and inclusion. How might we think about inclusivity outside of this blend as well?
   1. The open clubs offer this experience. Hannah has been working with all of the selective club presidents to ensure they have open events that are sent to residential college listervs.
   2. The idea is for the system itself to be inclusive. The idea is for everyone to have the opportunity to participate in a club if they would like to. The system should be comfortable and welcoming.
ii. Request for Feedback: Meal exchange has been going well especially since it is now electronic. One thing that it does lack is a system for independents to meal exchange. It would be great to brainstorm ways we can build infrastructure for this to be possible!
   1. All upperclassmen have two swipes per week. Perhaps that could be used as a medium for independent students to meal exchange.
iii. Is the proportion of students in bicker clubs higher because more people are bickering or because more people are going independent?
   1. Two possibilities: The bicker clubs have been increasing their caps. More students are also going independent or joining a co-op.
iv. Class size is increasing in the near future. Have you guys had conversations about that?
   1. One of the concerns from the GICC is that as the University increases the class size, if the number of low-income students increases, the clubs will not be support all of the students who need financial aid. As such, the University is incentivizing going into a co-op because of how much cheaper they are. The recommendation to lower the cost of an eating club is difficult is because of taxes, maintenance of the buildings, staff salaries, etc.
n. The full slide deck for the presentation can be found here: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1GTTXoy9sSzZNagjDulgqiWnokXFF9wfrw?EwRMKOkUM/edit#slide=id.g4c62fcd272_0_90.

o. If you have more questions, please let either Caleb or Hannah know! Their e-mails are cvisser@princeton.edu and hannah.paynter@princeton.edu.

2. Mental Health Week Funding Request: Casey Kemper and Josh Gardner (30 minutes)
   a. Mental Health Week is a week of programming that leads up to Me Too monologues with the intention of spreading awareness about mental health and advertising the Me Too monologues.
   b. The funding request is for stickers, posters, programming, etc. Items include TMAYD stickers, the Mental Health Forum on Thursdays, etc. Another event that will be held is Open Mic Night. On Monday, the 18th, MHI will also hold the In Their Shoes event. They will have therapy dogs and outreach counselors.
   c. Suggestion: Maybe Sabrina Benaim can speak in conjunction with the panel. This would save money and create more engagement.
   d. Feedback: Richardson tends to be more than $1,000 to rent.
   e. Feedback: Another Senate member is affiliated with a group that paid closer to $5,000 for Richardson.
   f. Feedback: In Projects Board, generally, posters are not printed because USG offers poster printing for free.
   g. Feedback: Generally, boba can be bought for 5$ each. The $600 is probably closer to $500 set aside for boba.
   h. Question: Are we voting on this with only one payment of $1,000?
      i. We could potentially table it as Josh has to discuss with his co-chair.
      ii. Suggestion: We should vote on the budget as is, and if there is an adjustment, we can vote on the adjustment.
      iii. Last year, Mental Health Week cost approximately $9,000.
   j. Voting:
      i. Yes: 19 (All voting members present.)
      ii. No: 1 (Rachel Hazan)
      iii. Abstain: 0

3. Attendance Review: Rachel Yee and Nate Lambert (5 minutes)
   a. Discussed in Executive Session.
   b. Voting to Enter Executive Session:
      i. Yes: 19
      ii. Abstain: 0
      iii. No: 0

4. Spring Retreat Funding Request: Brad Spicher (10 minutes)
a. Brad, Chitra and Zarnab have been working with the Chauncy Center to generate a contract. The details of the payment are in the meeting packet.

b. The reason they are asking for funding right now as opposed to within the new administration (who the retreat is for) is because the Chauncy Center requires the contract to be signed by the end of January at the latest.

c. Voting: (APPROVED)
   i. Yes: 19
   ii. No: 0
   iii. Abstain: 0

5. Announcement: Ben and Olivia
   a. For the last few months, Ben and Olivia have been sitting on the Academic Reconciliations Committee! The report is confidential, but the content is not. Feel free to reach out to Olivia and Ben if you are interested!