



51 UA Council Session 6 Meeting Minutes
 December 4, 2019, 7:30pm - 9:00pm in W20-400

Living Group	Representative	Present?
Baker	Hannah Mahaffey	x
Burton-Conner	Alice Zhang	
East Campus	Adriana Jacobsen	x
MacGregor	Anthony Cheng	x
Maseeh	Kye Burchard	proxy
McCormick	Afeefah Khazi-Syed and Yara Komaiha	
New House	Lia Hsu-Rodriguez	x
Next House	Erick Eguia	x
Random Hall	Amanda Putnam	x
Simmons	Carlos Sendao	x
Interfraternity Council	Sam Ihns	x
Interfraternity Council	Ato Kwapong	x
Interfraternity Council	Daniel Gonzalez	
Interfraternity Council	David Poberejsky	x
Living Group Council	--	
Off Campus	--	
Panhellenic Association	Amanda Horne	x
Panhellenic Association	Vanessa Wong	
Panhellenic Association	Charlotte Folinus	x

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Roll Call + Introductions | 7:30 - 7:35 |
| 2. Presentation by Alumni Association | 7:40 - 8:00 |
| 3. Internal UA State of Affairs | 8:00 - 8:10 |
| 4. Mutual Selection | 8:10 - 9:00 |
| 5. Ad Hoc Process Committee Stakeholder Interviews | |

Enclosures

- A. Alumni Association and Internal Affairs Presentation

7:39 Start Meeting

Motion, seconded, all in favor. Passed.

7:40 Alumni Association Presentation

- Overview of the Alumni Association
- Mission
 - Build a stronger relationship between alumni and the Institute
- MIT Better World Campaign
 - “Engage and Inspire the global MIT community to make a better world.”
- Primary Goals
 - Delivery value to alumni/ae
 - Be world class
 - Create a strong volunteer pipeline; engage students early
 - Strengthen alumni/ae community
 - Strengthen the MITAA organization
- Strategies
 - Strengthening club/regional/affinity groups
 - Make MIT Tech Reunions inspiring
 - “Engagement First”; tailor philanthropy efforts around engagement
- 79% of MIT Alumni are engaged
- MITAA Stats
 - Staff of ~100
 - 18,043 Volunteered last year
 - 1200 Sponsored/supported events with >27K attendees
 - 55.5 K Infinite Connection Logins last year
- Many opportunities for student engagement
- Building Community
 - Advocacy for Alumni
 - Conveying concerns and ideas to senior leadership

8:00 State of the UA

- Will touch on the new initiatives next meeting
- Restructure of the committees
 - Bringing a structural and cultural change
 - More advocacy focused
- Code of Conduct <> Violations
 - No current clear reporting procedure, structurally and culturally
 - No framework for removal from the UA
 - Drafting a Code of Conduct now
 - Will be signed annually
- Diversity Audit
 - Internal Diversity Audit
 - Look at places for improvement

8:03 Mutual Selection

- Recording down for transitions notes on Mutual selection
- Baker (Hannah)
 - No mutual selection policy
 - Encouraged to change squatting policy
 - Didn't guarantee it
 - Now only guarantee only if the entire room wants to stay
 - Some issues of being peer pressured to squat
 - Expressed concern about this when the policy was; it happened
 - The issue with former area director pressuring Baker to implement certain policies

- Advice:
 - stand your ground
 - Reach out to house masters to deal with Area directors
- New House (Leah)
 - According to Admin New House had a mutual selection
 - The process at its core didn't change too much
 - Had internal issues with housing chair
 - Culture house vs number house process
 - Culture House:
 - Miscommunication; DSL went back on what was told they were allowed to do; told Area director but not students
 - Half of the first years that didn't get into their cultural houses were 'ghosted'
 - Area directors were not allowed to reach out to them to tell them they didn't get a spot
 - Number House:
 - Communication coming from admin instead of housing chairs
 - Advice:
 - Clear lines of communications between Area Director, DSL, President, and Rooming Chairs
 - Take a lot of notes in the meetings to correct/avoiding miscommunication; send to them at the end
 - Mahi: CC Rooming chairs have concerns
 - Lots of granular decisions being made by senior leadership, not individual houses
 - DSL told them that they could have an accepted, waitlist, and rejected list
 - CC and German House:
 - They sent DSL a weight list that was ranked
 - DSL chose for them
 - For CC; DSL chose someone that wasn't even on the waitlist
- EC
 - Early conversation was frustrating
 - 'Mutual Selection' was unclear
 - Admin think of it as more of a Greek life thing
 - EC sees it as more of a matching process
 - Value of the process wasn't clear on the student or Admin side
 - Advice:
 - Prioritize getting on the same page with the language around mutual selection
 - Soliciting feedback from students about what is actually valued about mutual selection, and how can that be preserved in other ways
- ...
 - Advice:
 - Clarify your definitions with administration
- Simmons
 - No mutual selection
 - Squatting
 - Showing survey data from upperclassman students
 - The most stressful situation is the forced triple situation
 - Showed that people are going to squat in singles and doubles
 - Presented to Suzy and Cindy
 - How can you programmatically create something to take into the data?
 - This year Chancellor has a UROP
 - Are going to survey the current freshman class
 - Squatting currently is something available to students, upon inquiry, just not on for

- Masseh
 - No mutual selection
 - Squatting
 - Point process
 - How can they best change the algorithm to award points for transfers in?
- MacGregor
 - Nothing really changed
 - Algorithm is very straightforward
 - Used to be an upperclassman input side
 - Most seemed to like who they got this year; partially function of BC
 - No specific person feedback from upperclassman
 - They generated 10 options for each entry; rank choice version
 - Optimal solution:
 - 3 entries that were most popular had the most variability
 - 2 entries had very little variability in their choices
 - Feel like it didn't really make too much of a difference
 - Students didn't seem less/more stressed
 - Most people wanted to move rooms
 - Cultures across entries are very different
 - Charlotte:
 - Low variability in options
 - Instead of the old system where you would select groups of people
 - Because of the options, it ended up with having the choices being the same as ranking individual students in the situation
 - Upperclassmen buy lost; entry culture is now very dead
- New House (Leah)
 - Has traditionally felt like a safe space for underrepresented minorities
 - This was the first year where the full class of New House freshman that didn't see what 'old New House' was
 - Very large change in demographics in numbered houses
 - 50-60% -> 10% underrepresented minorities
 - Culture in especially numbered houses suffered
 - "Near Gentrification"
 - Not sure how to talk to DSL about this
 - EC:
 - had a similar situation
 - Self-segregation
 - Spaces where you feel comfortable/normalization is important
 - Charlotte:
 - Fundamental disagreement about how living groups should look like
- Mahi: Disconnect between opinions on multicultural life between Admissions and DSL/Chancellor's Office
 - Admissions was not notified about mutual selection changes
 - IFC: possibly connect with OFY to better connect Admissions and DSL
 - PanHel: Student Advisory Committee for DSL
 - Mahi: Technically this is CSL
- New House:
 - Minority students are ranking new house, but they're just not getting lotteries in
- Charlotte: reach out to other institutions
- Mahi:
 - Don't have a successful model for how to change their mind
- MIT Corporation:

- Utilize recent grad representatives, DSL VC, CJAC
 - Getting opinions and an advocate in Corp is difficult/unclear
- EC: If DSL had come to IFC and PanHel and said that students can choose whatever ILGs they would like to go?
 - National organizations of IFC and PanHel to fall back on
 - Greek life has similar processes in place at peer institutions
 - More overtly values-based
- MacGregor:
 - Frustrating to deal with admin

Ad Hoc Process Committee Stakeholder Interviews

- Will send a form for feedback on the fundraising process