

DORMCON MINUTES - APRIL 14, 2011

Attendance:

Dorm	Representative	Absent
Baker	Brian Luque	
Burton-Conner	Alex Penn	
East Campus	James Douberley	
MacGregor	Mariya Samoylova	
McCormick	Krithika Shanmugasundaram	
New House	TyShaun Wynter	
Next House	Alec Lai	
Random Hall	Rebecca Cox	
Senior Haus	Paula Countouris	
Simmons Hall	Zach Hynes	
Phoenix Group	Virginia Nicholson	
President	Christina Johnson	
Vice President	Meagan Roth	
Secretary	Alicia Singham Goodwin	
Treasurer	Leonid Grinberg	

Topics Discussed:

1. CPW and i3 Censorship

- CPW: In the future, in the comment box under advertised CPW events, it would be good to put a description if the event title is controversial or provocative (ex. clubbing baby seals = pinatas). There was also a discussion about how the events were registered, and maybe next year there will be CPW appointments with each of the dorms's CPW chairs instead of the big CPW meeting, so that they can discuss the events being registered beforehand and sort out any potential problems. There should also be more communication between dorms if there are any time changes for mutually-run events to prevent confusion.
- *Adam Keyes from Housing came to answer questions about i3 censorship*
- Paula: I don't think that there was a problem with the process as much as with the rules. There are a few things I would hope to see changed about the i3 video rules. 1) To be able to show any mural in the dorm, and 2) to be able to openly show sexual expression and acceptance. Showing animals (or humans) copulating might not be acceptable, but shirts that say "i jerk off" just show the sexual acceptance of the people living in the dorm.
- Adam: I agree with what you're saying. A lot of the things are very contextual. For example, in Bexley if you're offended by a mural you can paint over it. You're saying that those parts of the videos show acceptance, where that kind of acceptance is learned while you're living in the dorm, but when just put in the video, those clips can be interpreted any way, whereas once you live in the dorm, there is the opportunity to have discussions about the potentially offensive things. You're both giving people the opportunity to get "turned on" by a dorm's culture, but also you're giving them the opportunity to be offended and close out the dorm as a choice even if it may be right for them.
- James: Maybe we are trying to scare away people.

- Virginia: I'd like to clear up some of the ambiguity in the rules. I know that it varies case by case, but it might be easier for us if we knew more concretely what wouldn't be allowed before we started.
- Clarification: The censorship decisions are made first by housemasters, and then by people in the housing office, not by the i3 coordinator.
- Paula: Maybe it would be nice to have meetings where the i3 producer sits with the person who is censoring their video so that they could have discussions about the content.
- Adam: I think that in the future, Bexley should be given the option not to submit at all. The problem was that we ran out of time. What I wrote to Bexley is that I'm happy to sit with them and have meetings and start early so that we can come to a good compromise instead of having to submit something that they're not happy with.
- Bexley i3 Coordinators: What are the guidelines going to be for next year?
- Adam: We can plan how to redo the guidelines and I'm happy to meet with you (DormCon) and oversee that process in the future. Also, I'm happy to meet individually more often and earlier in the process with different i3 creators.
- Bexley: It might make sense to make the deadline earlier. It would have been better for us if we had submitted our video early, because then there would have been more time for discussion about what parts to cut and change before the absolute deadline.
- Adam: That's a good suggestion. In the future they might also move away from sending stuff out in the mail and having the whole i3 process be online, so that absolute deadline could be later in the year.
- Bexley: We have questions about specific material that was deleted from our video. There were 10 or 12 things that were cut from the videos, a lot of which weren't murals. What we were really looking for is an understanding of what you find offensive. We want to know what are the extents of what you're going to give, and what are you going to definitely say no to in future years.
- Adam: Suicide is never going in the video (there was a silent scene that appeared to have a student hanging themselves, and with no explanation, it seemed to be insinuating suicide). Also, I don't know if you're ever going to get a picture of the "fuck" wall in the video. However, there might be some sort of framing of that wall or of the "I jerk off" t-shirts that is explanatory that could probably fly. Anything that looks like a real gun or weapon won't be put in.

2. Funding Requests

- Baker Piano Drop
 - Baker had about \$700 left over from the DormCon funding for CPW, so they are asking for \$600 from DormCon to help fund this year's Piano Drop.
 - It will be prominently advertised during the MIT 150 Celebration, and is a long-standing MIT tradition.
 - *This funding request was white balloted.*
- Burton-Conner overspent for their CPW "Sugar High" party by \$40, and is asking for DormCon to cover the extra expenses.
- *This funding request was white balloted.*

3. Discussion and vote on CIPR Proposal

- Rachel (chair of CIPR Committee): The summary goes through the motivation (weaknesses of our current system: confusing to navigate, redundancy, fractured structure), current structure, and proposed structure (the major change is the creation of a UA council of 20 representatives instead of senators) There would be two additional committees formed, the committee on dormitory affairs and the dormitory funding committee, which would take

over some of the jobs that DormCon does currently. One of the biggest concerns that people addressed was communication with administrators and faculty. I know a lot of people spoke to housemasters, ResLife, DSL finance, Student Activities, Campus Activities, as well as Dean Colombo and Chancellor Grimson. We've also spoken to someone in Dean Hasting's office and a large number of faculty members, some Sloan professors who work on issues like this professionally, and someone from the Corporation Joint Advisory Committee. Support from these people for the proposal as a whole was good, and a lot of people said that it should be up to us to decide what we want out of this. Some people said that we should push forward more quickly, and others suggested that we take more time. Online there is a new draft of the implementation plan, which pretty much pushes a lot of the dates back by 10 days. Things to talk about now are 1) when the DormCon constitution will no longer be in effect, 2) when the last meeting of DormCon will be (because you need to decide on what will happen with the DormCon money that is left over)

- **Vrajesh:** From previous discussions, some good concerns were brought up that have inspired some potential changes. Before you vote on the proposal, you also need to decide whether you want to accept the following three changes as part of the proposal you're voting on: 1) members of the UA council would have the ability to appoint a long term proxy who would vote in their place and attend meetings until the end of their term in office. The rationale for this was that when you were elected, you didn't have this type of time commitment in mind or you weren't elected to have an external role for your dorm, so you could appoint someone else during this transition time to fill your spot. 2) there would be a flexible period after the new structure we put in place where there would be a lower threshold (potentially 2/3) for making constitutional amendments, because once we start working under the new system, there might be some problems that we only learn about as we're working that we couldn't have foreseen. 3) when is DormCon's last meeting? Possibilities range from immediate to December when most of your terms end. The ideas that I had were maybe at the end of this semester, or after REX is over.
- **Leonid:** If we did keep DormCon meeting through REX, should senate meet then? I think there is a huge advantage to having the council start meeting sooner rather than later.
- **Krithika:** On the proxy issue, I don't think it can be arbitrarily chosen by the president, so we'd have to have a system in place to elect proxies or something.
- **James:** On the issue of timing for DormCon, it would be good for us to continue meeting for a while, but it might not be necessary because the two committees would exist that would be a little bit redundant.
- **Virginia:** I think that this proposal needs to be pushed through as quickly as possible. One of the strong points is that it is very flexible and open to change, so the idea that we need more time now is redundant with proposing the "flexible" amendment time.
- **Zach:** Christina, what have you heard from administrators?
- **Christina:** I talked to Dean Humphrey's, and he said that it would be a good idea for us to talk to more people about it and not move as quickly. Meagan and I talked to the housemasters and a lot of them agreed that it was moving to quickly. Chancellor Grimson very much urged us to slow down and clarify the problem we're addressing. He offered to have us make another committee that would continue exploring the problem.
- **Virginia:** I was with Chancellor Grimson and Dean Hastings and Dean Colombo last night at a meeting, and a lot of the students there said that they don't think their senators represented them well, and that they wanted to see changes soon. Let's make this decision now that we have the power, because it seems like the administrators keep telling us different things.

- Jonte: I also met with the Chancellor, and he was very intentional in meeting with me, Vrajesh, and the presidents of IFC, DormCon, Panhel, and he said that he couldn't take a position on the proposal itself, but he suggested we take some time in figuring out what problems we're addressing.
- James: I wanted to address the questions about timelines. I think what we're hearing from the administrators is that they are looking at taking another semester, and having a plan that wouldn't take effect until after we all left office, after RBA things had been decided, after REX stuff had been decided, and I don't think we should let that happen.
- Krithika: I agree that the threshold for amendments should be lower like Vrajesh said.
- Paula: I definitely agree with the momentum things that a lot of people have mentioned. We're all going to get tired of meetings like this.
- Decision on proxy issue: everyone agreed that that was a good addition.
- Decision on flexible amendment period: everyone agreed, that that was also a good addition, and should last until the end of fall semester.
- Decision on when DormCon's last meeting would be: at the end of this semester.

Vote:

Dorm	Total Votes	Votes "Yes"	Votes "No"
Baker	322	322	0
Burton-Conner	362	1	361
East Campus	377	376	1
MacGregor	338	68	271
McCormick	246	123	123
New House	304	304	0
Next House	351	175	175
Random Hall	93	93	0
Senior Haus	144	144	0
Simmons Hall	332	0	332
Phoenix Group	50	50	0
Total	2919	1656	1262

DormCon voted 56.7% in favor of the proposal, which is not enough to accept the proposal given the necessary 3/4 vote.

4. DormCon Elections

- Elections for positions like President, Vice President, Secretary, Dining Chair, etc. will take place at our next meeting on April 28th at Next House (expect an e-mail soon).
- Any dorm resident (except for Bexley residents) can run for any position in DormCon.

5. Rush/REX Proposal

- At our next meeting we will discuss asking for a Rush/REX agreement with the IFC.
- This would likely entail agreeing not to bad-mouth greek life during REX, and having IFC members agree not to recruit until Rush officially starts.