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

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

• 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

• 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