



49 UA Council Session 3 Meeting Minutes
 October 18, 2017, 7:30pm - 9:00pm in W20-400

Living Group	Representative	Present?
Baker	Makenzie Patarino	
Burton-Conner	Emma Desoto	
East Campus	Alexandra Stanton	x
MacGregor	Eleanor Wintersteen	x
Maseeh	Robert Bugilarelli	x
McCormick	Laura Bergemann	
New House	Emily Tang	x
Next House	Elizabeth Gaylord	
Random House	Ryuga Hatano	x
Simmons	Lily Dove (Jacqueline Liu)	x
Interfraternity Council	Robert Binkowski	x
Interfraternity Council	Sean Parks	
Interfraternity Council	Ato Kwapong	
Living Group Council	Emily Fleischman	x
Off Campus	Megan Kralj	
Panhellenic Association	Ayomide Fatunde	
Panhellenic Association	Leigh-Ana Rossitto	
Panhellenic Association	Meredith Loy	

Daniel
Trevor

Olivia Brode-Roger
Leah Flynn Gallant
Tania Llanas ASA Rep
Antares McCoy-Villaneda

Note: There was not quorum at this meeting. No votes were held.

Agenda

President's Questions	7:00 - 7:30
1. Roll Call	7:30
2. Approval of 49 UAC 2 Minutes	7:30 - 7:35
3. Q & A with Tessa McLain, Office of Student Citizenship	7:35 - 8:00
4. Discussion of OSC and COD Procedures	8:00 - 8:20
5. Student Funding Updates	8:20 - 8:30
6. Student Center Improvements	8:30 - 8:50
7. Closing Remarks and Open Discussion	8:50 - 9:00

Enclosures

- A. 49 UAC 2 Minutes

7:34pm Welcome :)

We will wait on approving the minutes because we don't have quorum, but Tessa McClain is here to talk about the Office of Student Conduct

7:35pm Tessa McClain, Office of Student Conduct (formally Citizenship)

- Vanderbilt University, and then USC for grad school, cats
- Want to humanize the student conduct process
- Went through student conduct process as an undergrad (struggling as a sophomore in college)

Conduct philosophy

- Conduct is first and foremost an opportunity for student support
- Can learn about a student and help them process whatever is happening
- Case should be heard before it is decided, give student full opportunity to tell their story
- Conduct should be educational
- College is a place to make mistakes and learn from those mistakes
- No student who comes through conduct process is a bad person, they've made a poor choice
- Believe in chance to rectify situation and reframe as a positive situation

Committee on Discipline

- Part of faculty governance structure to adjudicate cases of misconduct against students, both undergrad and grad, all types of misconduct
 - Personal misconduct: alcohol, drugs, assault, harassment, theft

- Academic misconduct: cheating, fake tests, committing fraud
- Anyone can refer a case, usually police, faculty, staff
- Members: Chair, appointed by Chair of the Faculty, 6 faculty appointed for 3 years, undergrad reps, grad reps, 6 Vice Chancellor representatives

Office of Student Conduct

- Changed name in by recommendation of external review
- Meet with students who allegedly violated policy, facilitate hearing or sanctioning when necessary, validate Chair's outcomes for lower level cases
- Collaborative initiatives, outreach, education about academic integrity / MIT expectations
- Corun student judicial groups (ex. IFC / Panhel Judicial Committee)

Quick Overview of COD Process

- Incident occurs
- Meet with students for initial meeting: student shares their perspective and is given an opportunity to learn about next steps, rights, etc
 - Students have 5 days to submit a written statement
- COD Chair, OSC staff, student member of COD does an initial review
 - Determines methods of resolution: administrative, sanction, or hearing
 - Administrative: case is considered low level, probation and under, decides findings (did student violate policy y/n, what are appropriate outcomes), assign status sanction and sometimes education sanction (essay, meeting, mentoring, etc)
 - Sanction panel and hearing: is serious enough that possible range of options is expansion or expulsion
 - Can choose an outcome if looking at the facts if confusing and needs more people to look at the case
 - Effectively the same: sanction panel the student is accepting responsibility, while hearing panel is if student didn't accept responsibility or there is some contentious facts
 - Opening statements, questions, closing statements, deliberates in closed session, then student meets with Tessa to review outcome of what is decided
- There are some tables with data from the last 3 years, will be emailed out

Changes to the office

- Have different philosophy than her predecessor
- Hoping to revise mission, goals
- Make incremental changes to process, think it is difficult for students to go through, is cumbersome and hard for students
- She can't change COD rules because COD owns them, but can gather data to show why they should consider changes
- Can change letters they send to students, all form letters in neutral tone, which is hard to interpret
- Diversity and inclusion initiatives, training on COD on power dynamics, implicit bias issues

- Move toward sanctioning that is rooted in compassion
- Want to hear feedback, questions about where the office is going

Questions

Allie: In the past 6-7 years the number of cases COD has heard quadrupled, mostly as a result of increase in personal misconduct cases. Why do you think that happened?

- Culture of reporting is slowly changing nationally, student population is more open to reporting, greater societal trends
- More outreach in past 3 years to faculty, students, so people know that COD exists
- Do not think there is an increase in cases
- High turnover in OSC, probably had 6 different Deans of OSC in past ~10 years, affects visibility, impact data tracking and reporting

Rhat: How does this process deal with students who willfully break the rules if they are trying to contest?

- We don't have a protest policy, so if you protest in a way that doesn't violate policy, it won't be reported, but if it breaks the policy then it will go to the OSC
- Is something to be considered during the process, possibly through a written statement

Daniel: Who is the listening tour to?

- Tentatively to IFC, Panhel, Dormcon, LGC, GSC
- But an open to other groups, residence halls
- Doing this tour all this semester to gather feedback on what students think about this process

Daniel: About initial notice letter to students, from talking to them they don't know what the meeting is about, so spreading some information about how this is included in the process would be useful, also the fact that students are allowed an advisor. Balance between not scaring students and not creating the false sense that OSC is here to help students because they are obligated to report.

- Have people create a flowchart about process

Jon: How aware of the COD members are to the student struggles? Understanding day-to-day life, good weeks / bad weeks, social life, balancing that with work? Or preconceived notion that MIT students are cookie cutter, etc?

- We have students on the COD for that reason--to speak for the student experience
- Faculty and staff are integrated into the community
- As part of training, we have a student panel to talk about life at MIT
- But can always be repeated because life at MIT 3 years ago is different than life at MIT now

Allie: COD and OSC both operate under DSL, do you think there are advantages for OSC to be a neutral body?

- Actually COD is with faculty governance, has slightly more power than OSC, OSC supports COD
- Is something she's thought about, for example Title IX reports to Chancellor's office, not DSL, perceived as neutral
- Moving out of DSL is a possibility
- Benefits to under DSL: closest to referring students to different resources on campus

Thank you Tessa! Please feel free to email her at tmclain@mit.edu with any feedback or to meet one-on-one.

8:08pm OSC and COD Discussion

Time to have a broader conversation about OSC and COD procedures, keeping in mind that on the COD side, these rules are governed by the faculty and are difficult to change

What is the role of the faculty chair on COD? For all low level cases, which are majority of cases, they are decided by Chair, no one else gets to weigh in

- Binky: Is there an appeals process?
 - Yes, but it is to the Chancellor, and Cindy can choose to recuse herself and pass it along to Suzy or Ian
- Philosophy of discipline could shift a lot with changing of one person since one person has so much power
- Is this a worthy thing to continue discussion on to adjust the model?
 - Binky: I think this is slightly scary
 - Lily: One person made the decision if probation or under, which is majority of cases
- Mo: More troubling than one person making the decision is the person who chooses the Chair of COD, which is chosen by Chair of the Faculty, isn't necessarily concerned about concerns of students, also Committee on Nominations for Faculty doesn't have any students
 - Have professors on COD who seem to relish the power dynamics, which is not a good situation for students
 - Leah: I've been on the COD for 7 years, have seen the faculty dynamics, has gotten better and now Tessa has more power, but also depends on Chair being more in tune with students
- The Chair of the COD also play a large role in cases that go to sanctioning or panel
- Jon: Faculty being open to students, is a fine line with student representatives
- Allie: I have a lot of problems with the relationship between DSL and OSC, because large number of violations deal with DSL things like security violations, housing, etc
 - Makes me uncomfortable with office that is initiating those proceedings is the same office
 - Much more prefer structurally if it was a separate issue
 - Tessa's boss Judy Robinson is in DSL
 - Third largest party that brings the case is staff, and probably DSL staff, so there is a problem when a case is brought to their subordinates

Is there bias within the review process? Tessa talked about how they've done unconscious bias training for COD members, but Tessa is concerned there is bias in reporting structure, especially since there is high proportion of URM students in academic integrity cases. How can we address those issues and ensure there isn't unconscious bias?

- Daniel: So much of OSC - COD process is one person, not a lot of regulations on the philosophy, so it's great that Tessa's philosophy is about helping students

- But predecessor who didn't have that philosophy had a negative relationship with DSL and students, which led to negative perception of DSL, dangerous for student-admin interaction
- More formal process during each step could go a long way, once you get to full COD hearing there is a large committee, but most cases come down to 1 or 2 people in a room
- Olivia: In our legal system we have 1 or 2 people who always have a side's interests at heart. It seems like we don't have a student advocate who students can talk to who will always have their best interests at heart.
 - Sarah: we do have student advocates, but they are likely S^3 deans who might need to report things
 - But if the moment you get a letter having someone to be there for them and say what each step of the process means, someone the student can trust, would go a long way
 - Eleanor: Isn't there an advisor?
 - Yes, but they don't reach out to you directly
 - Maybe have a group of people who knew about the process who students could pick as an advisor
- Eleanor: Since most reporting is done by faculty and staff, would be nice for them to have training?
 - Allie: This is a problem that is more system and needs to be addressed at a higher level
 - Sarah: But given that we know there is this bias, should whoever is making this decision take into account someone's background when talking about sanctioning?
 - Ex: if someone is suspended it's not just about where they are living, it's also about paying the loans, getting health insurance, paying rent, etc
 - Do we think about that in the sanctioning process? How do we support students when they are facing suspension?
 - Allie: It is asking people to change the punishment based on things unrelated to what occurred. There is support for people who go on leave for medical reasons, should also be support for people who go on leave for policy reasons.
 - Emily: If one student commits misconduct that would have them suspended but have relationship with their parents, etc, should be different than someone who is worse off financially, is already a different punishment based on external factors
 - Allie: I don't know if you can address that before making punishment decision. Probably the most fair thing is MIT extending financial support, helping them find a job, etc.

Sarah: Also want to talk to Tessa for **data about sanctioning to see what is the norm for certain things**. On the one hand it is important to take a holistic view, but it is also useful to know for certain violations this is what has happened in the past. Useful for fairness.

- Some students need to take classes during their time off, which will not count for credit, but is another financial burden

We still don't have quorum. Oops. We can still talk about things though!

8:30pm Student Life Fee Update

Anticipating a significant drop in career fair money to lower barrier to entry to increase diversity of companies, so total student life money is lower.

- \$100,000 to support low income students: half to grad students to grants, \$50k to a fund for students who want to go to ticketed events to get free tickets
 - Freshmen, sophomore, junior classes get \$60,000
- Less money to senior class (slated \$225,000) for events and activities, don't know definitely the amount, will be gradually implemented, more similar to 2013-2014 funding level
- SWE will have a funding reduction (\$25,000) because they have a large amount of money in reserves and get corporate sponsorships
- UA (\$365,000) doesn't get money from CF, will continue to be the case, GSC will have a similar budget going forward
- GSC wanted more money than what the undergrads get, compromise is UA would advocate for MIT to pay for GSC orientation, which will happen

Philosophy of transparency and accountability

- Groups that are getting large pools of money will have to publicly post budgets, present budgets to someone at MIT to check that they are reasonable

Binky: Who made the decision to have the ticketed events fund?

- Sarah, Alexa, Jon, GSC, Senior Class, SWE, Suzy, Peter Cummings collectively agreed that ticketed events fund is a good thing to spend money on
- Suzy believes it will limit the burden because senior class' budget is getting reduced

Allie: When will this go into effect?

- Next fall. Some things are being phased in, but in the spring we will all present budget to Suzy, who will present to provost, who will make a decision over the summer
- Jon: How budgets work is budget request get passed up the chain, how student organization funding worked would be just money showing up, but want to shift toward a budget request model where you ask for more money

Alie: How does Senior Class feel about this?

- Probably not good, but they were given the opportunity to present a budget to justify that spending
- GSC and Senior Class have similar budgets and GSC has a 12 page line by line budget, you need to justify how you are spending that much money

Jon: Main thing was presenting budgets to get money, and not tying Career Fair to student funding and moving it toward a more stable funding source

- Career Fair working group happening under Ian Waitz
- The decision to change the fair structure was made by the Career Fair directors

Rhat: given this shift in funding and budget principles, should we be proactive in making things under the UA follow them?

- All of the student groups (including Class Councils) who are receiving this money will have to be transparent and accountable in justifying their spending
- Mo: This has escalated beyond this room and is now an issue Suzy Nelson is taking up

Lily: How do other schools deal with Class Council money?

- Jon: Ex. Princeton has a senior tax, but other schools have a much larger student life pool of money
- Sarah: There is a chart Sophia shared about how our peer institution get money, most schools there is a fee for each year, every student pays that to go toward DSL, Class Council, etc
- MIT is unique in that we have one Student Life Fee which includes Mental Health and Daper, which is another conversation
- It is feasible that if Senior Class wanted more money, they could push to get a senior class fee, but unsure if that is something students want
- Unique in receiving funding from Career Fair, but something similar to visiting committee working with GECD, they way we do funding for CF is unethical and not in line with how other schools do CF

8:47pm Talking about changes to the stud

- It's not getting renovated but we can have micro-renovations! Like paint!

8:48pm General Updates

- Please encourage people to take Cost of Living Survey emailed out by Stu Schmill, affects financial aid calculations, gives MIT data about financial burdens
- Food insecurity working group happening because of CASE survey, will use information from that survey
- There is a now a system for students to go to S^3 dean and can get a meal swipe through Tech Cash
- Also will be rolling out a system for students to donate unused guest swipes to program
- Meeting with Committee on Education Chairs to go over advising notes from Council and Cabinet + Operations Meeting, working to create a best principles guide to present to Ian on November 1st, will have version of that to go over at next Council meeting

8:50pm Open discussion

- Think about how to make the Stud better with small amount of money (like paint or furniture)
- Free slushies!
- ASA is looking at renovations on first floor
- Water on the first floor

8:52pm Adjourned