



49 UA Council Session 5 Meeting Minutes
 November 15, 2017, 7:30pm - 9:00pm in W20-400

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

Olivia Brode-Roger, Tanya Llanas

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Roll Call | 7:35 |
| 2. Approval of 49 UAC 4 Minutes | 7:35 - 7:40 |
| 3. Process Proposal for Conference & Travel Grants | 7:40 - 7:50 |
| 4. Discussion on Confidentiality Policy for Institute Committees | 7:50 - 8:00 |
| 5. Discussion on SAC Recommendations from Senior House Closure Report | 8:00 - 8:30 |
| 6. Discussion on Diversity-focused Academic Requirement | 8:30 - 8:50 |
| 7. Closing Remarks and Open Discussion | 8:50 - 9:00 |

Enclosures

- A. 49 UAC 4 Minutes
- B. Confidentiality Policy for Institute Committees

7:35pm Attendance. We have quorum!

7:36pm Approving minutes. 14 in favor. 0 opposed.

7:36pm Conference & Travel Grants Proposal by Jon Coden, UA Treasurer

This is something we've been working on and students have been asking about for a while, Jon has been working with the GSC, Finboard to make up these guidelines. First three pages is guidelines, then last page is the application. Two types of conferences is academic growth or professional growth for passion for something developed outside the classroom. There's a tool called Concur, there's an MIT Concur GSC uses for their grants, reached out to SAO to see if we could use that as well. Trying to set up system with Colin Codner so students don't have to front. Student groups use Concur for travel reimbursements.

Guidelines

Three main guidelines:

- 1. Quality of conference: evaluation for quality by established reference
- 2. Academic / professional growth: personal statement, resume
- 3. Funding necessity: budget explanation to know minimum subsidy students would need

Not covering food to save costs, cap grants at \$1,000/student/academic year. Dates are super flexible. Currently chosen because midpoint of funding cycles, since we would use Finboard as the funding body.

Ayo: I'm concerned about the reference from professor. I find it's hard for students to get references from faculty in general.

- It would be on the quality of the conference, not of the student.

Rhat: Why can't you go to all the departments and ask for a list of legit conferences?

- Or maybe encourage it if it's a niche field or conference isn't well known.

Olivia: We aren't going to be inundated with applications, could just reach out to student asking for legitimacy.

- Iterative process

Ayo: Adding a question to ask if the student applied for department funding?

- It's in the application already.

Rob: Application deadlines, September has 30 days.

- Oops

Mo: Hypothetically if a conference happened on November 20th they could apply for funding up to November 15th.

- Wouldn't expect to get funding until 2 weeks after results. Should adjust timeline accordingly. We can also have these be rolling dates.

Laura: If there's a conference on October 1st, the student would have to front f.

- They could apply in August. The dates are the funding cycles, so you can apply for that in August.

Sarah: if everyone can take the time between now and the next Council meeting to look at this more thoroughly, will come back at the next meeting, then will vote next meeting.

7:51pm Discussion on Confidentiality Policy for Institute Committees by Mo Eltahir

Big part of my job is to staff institute and advisory committees. Students deal with lots of interesting decisions high level administrators consider. As a result students on these committees run into lots of very sensitive information. Up to this point there's been no defined procedure or policy with what students can and can't share. This was a project started by predecessor, Kyle Archer. This is our first pass at trying to draft a policy that will set a more standard procedure for standing committees for faculty (CAP, CoCP, COC, COD, FPC, Library, CSL, CUAFA, CUP).

If undergraduate representatives on one of these committees wants to share information, they must seek permission from the chair of the committee or committee staff. The information must be in a written document.

Levels

0: may be freely distributed

1: distributed only to relevant parties

2: relevant and position of leadership

3: relevant, position of leadership of relevant group

4: cannot be shared with any undergrad

Emma: What stops with other students sharing that information?

- Nothing, but this should stop students having that information in the first place they shouldn't.

Olivia: What happens if The Tech gets their hands on it?

- The Tech will publish it because freedom of press. If you don't want The Tech to publish something, don't send it to us. *Note that Olivia does not speak for The Tech and these statements do not necessarily reflect the official policy or opinion of The Tech Executive Board.* We will meet to clarify these policies and norms.

Ayo: clarifying different levels of leadership between dorm presidents and say UA / Dormcon.

- What was meant was people who presided over a higher level, reword to higher level leadership for level 3

Allie: Speaking from experience, middle levels don't really work, maybe with tiny bit of grey area between Dormcon P/VP and UA P/VP. Having experienced this, it should be very very clear. It's never clear and it's hard because people want to make exceptions for you, people want to forward it. If the damage is done there's no way to go about fixing that.

Ayo: Restructure the document

Rob: What are the rules for committees this would be applied for?

- When a faculty appoints a standing committee it will be here for a longer amount of time. With conversations with faculty governance administrator it makes sense to have it apply to these committees because others either have their own or are temporary it doesn't make sense.

Emily F: Why is the default the student needs to ask for permission rather than it being not-confidential to begin with?

- Would be better for something to be presented with a level during a committee so students wouldn't have to ask. I considered having everything start at level 0 and then move up.
- We made this for undergrad representatives, but phrased it so undergrads share with their constituents, who are mostly other undergrads.

Olivia: I'm afraid of situation where committee members see something of grave importance, then needs to talk to Sarah, because now they need to go through the chair of the committee.

- There is a certain assumption of benevolence of the faculty chair. I'm not sure if faculty on the whole are likely to go for it unless we put the faculty chair who traditionally has lots of power, try to weasel that power away from them would be a major point of pushback.

Olivia: If you pass something that gives them power, you're never going to get that back. There's an effect here about the long term. We want to avoid over-specifying because we might create constraints. There doesn't seem to be a nice classification we can do. I don't feel like we need 5 levels. Would be more excited if it was the chair and staff deciding who to share this with.

Allie: I think this should be "this is fine in public" meaning if The Tech gets a hold of it it's fine, a level of complete confidentiality, and a level where we get together to determine what students to share this with.

Sarah: Please let us know about any other suggestions, keeping in mind our biggest constraint is getting this pass the faculty. We'll bring this back to you at the next meeting or the following one.

Mo: Thank you so much for the feedback. I appreciate it.

8:19pm SAC Recommendations from Senior House Closure Report

Allie has been working to compile all the facts that are accessible with what happened with Senior House from the turnaround, review process, and closure to get a sense of what happened, what

worked well and what didn't work well on the administrative side and on the side of students and student leaders. From that document we came up with a set of recommendations for how to handle similar situations, focused on how to prevent disciplinary actions in dormitories. The FSILGs have a pretty defined system for what happens when a living group violates the rules but that isn't spelled out for dorms, dorms don't have the same check system that the fraternity system has, for example. This will also have to be okay-ed by DormCon.

Maintenance of healthy communities

DormCon does have a JudComm, used to be must more robust, dissolved with OSC consumed its responsibilities in ~2005, so it's mostly internal right now. Trying to stay away from visiting committee language, but every two years each dorms would be visited by a group of other dorm presidents, JudComm, because it's much easier to hear that from students than from an administrator. Serves as a preventative measure before a problem escalates to have other students say this is questionable and you should fix this.

- Eleanor: are you creating a list for things to review? I think the president of that dorm can volunteer things to look at, ex. EC's rooming process. It takes a certain amount of buy-in. I see it as a conversation between this dorm and students from another dorm, like a reality check.
- Ayo: Is there still drama between dorms? Wanted safeguards against that.

MIT administration implementing support services such as S^3 and Mental Health and Counselling in dorms. This is probably going to happen, and came out of what was put in place in Senior House during the turnaround. I don't know what's the best system but we're not the ones deciding. Wellcomm has been working with Karen Singleton about the mental health liaisons, working with FSILGs about mental health training. Currently EC has office hours 4-ish times a week at convenient times, in our RLAD's office.

Loosely organized group of dorm alumni. Something some dorms have a loosely organized group of advisors (ex. 10 people who graduated in the last 25 years) who come by twice a year to hear what's going on. When something bad happens, in house team know who to go toward.

- Eleanor: I think we have 0 alumni in MacGregor, so I think this would be hard to do. We could have the last 5 presidents.
- Emma: In Burton-Conner people feel really attached to their floor so it might be complicated setting that up.

Disciplinary interventions in living groups

Allegations should be submitted in writing by the Chancellor to relevant student leaders. Members of the community should freely consult with executive board of their associated student government.

Investigation should be led by a committee with at least Dean of OSC, chair of judicial board of governing body, rights of students should be made public, should be aligned with COD student rights. There are COD cases and non-COD cases.

Committee should prepare a report with a summary of findings and set of recommendations. People should be able to state dissent. The report will be presented to the living group. In particular, Chair or President of living group should be consulted before recommendations are finalized.

If committee recommends an individual to be removed from living group or the living group to be dissolved it should go through the COD if it was not unanimous and the person should make an appeal to the COD. Will clarify about who can appeal. Power to reverse dissolution should be at COD.

Steering committee to guide implementation, should include VPDSL, president of living group, and representative from executive board of associated governing body (ex. Dormcon, Panhel, etc), and have tangible milestones. This comes from backlash with Pilot 2021 and dissolution.

- Ayo: concerns about dorm president transition if a person graduates. If a president of a living group was graduating they could appoint someone else. Dissolution needs something a little more strong.
- Should add something where ideally students would select the other students, but these are guiding principles out of UA SAC.

8:58pm Adjourned.