

DormCon Meeting Minutes
February 27, 2014
Location: Senior Haus

Agenda

- 1) CPW Updates
- 2) CPW Funding Protocols
- 3) CPW Event Allocation (standardizing the future process)
- 4) i3 Updates
- 5) Funding Proposals
 - MIT Spring Picnic
 - Steer Roast
- 6) Retreat Action Items/Follow-Up
- 7) Security Updates
- 8) Constitution Amendment (regarding holding multiple offices)

Attendance

Dorm	Representative	Absent
Baker	Sean Corcoran	Proxy: Andrea Gutierrez
Burton-Conner	Victoria Stivanello	
East Campus	Jessica Parker	
MacGregor	Walter Menendez	
McCormick	Chloe Orphanides	
New House	Matthew Davis	
Next House	Ryan McDermott	
Random Hall	Gaurav Singh	
Senior Haus	Rodrigo Lopez Uricoechea	Proxy: Alina Kononov
Simmons Hall	Lars Johnson	
President	Eli Ross	
Vice President	Katherine Silvestre	
Secretary	Caitlin Heber	
Treasurer	Phoebe Whitwell	

Begin: 7:05
End: 8:45

1) CPW Updates [Allen Park, Antonio Moreno, and Yo Shavit]

- CPW event allocation happened earlier this week and is a continuing process. We are very close to finalizing them. Also, we got 10 more events from the administration and will finalize them by tonight. Deadline for events submission need to be submitted by tomorrow, February 28, at 5pm.
- Allen: There are a few random events floating around; if you want them, come and claim them. Campus wide event ideas: scavenger hunt (booklet handed out at the beginning of CPW) go to events or dorm tours to get puzzle pieces that direct you somewhere to get something. Apparently half of the prefrosh get in on Thursday at noon when there aren't many events. Therefore, we're planning on doing a campus wide picnic. It's not particularly a dorm event, whole of campus.
- Antonio: The picnic could introduce the scavenger hunt, and still be relaxed.
- Alina: Who's paying? Eli/Allen: Us, admissions, or someone else. It's unknown.
- Allen: Allocating events was difficult, we've ended up making executive decisions based on the shortened timeline.

2) CPW Funding Protocols [Phoebe]

- Eli: gave a summary of the two proposed funding options.
If you would like to see the proposed options, please email dormcon-secretary@mit.edu.
- Phoebe: These proposals are intended as a compromise between large and small dorms (large dorms give more money to DormCon, small dorms need funding).
- Matthew: Personally, I don't expect to get my five dollar tax back. Like federal taxes you don't expect the money to come back to you directly, but you get roads and other public works. DormCon tax goes toward building communities and spending on CPW is almost like campus wide tax. Both proposals are fair. We should look at how much of each dorm's total income is spent on CPW.
- Yo: Just to clarify, we're talking about two sums of money here? Phoebe: Yes, there is \$5,000 from admissions and \$5,000 from us. We're splitting the funding from admissions evenly, that's decided. Now we're debating over how to allocate our \$5,000.
- Matthew: Personally, I'd like to have DormCon money split evenly, because everyone pays different amounts for CPW, everyone pays different amount of taxes, everyone cares differently.
- Andrea: Phoebe's committee talking amount this for a month, let's move on and trust the committee.
Many conversations proceed at once, all arguing over the proposals.
- Gaurav: I still think this hurts small dorms.
- Eli: We can talk about this for a long time, but we need to take a vote on something. There seems like there is a lean toward proposal 2 – requesting a maximum budget from dorms sent to both Phoebe and CPW chairs; there won't be reimbursements until after CPW and receipts are collected. Dorms can get funding up to a certain cap, but they have to submit receipts for the amount they want reimbursed.

Vote approving proposal two passes 9 to 1.

3) CPW Event Allocation [Yo]

- Yo: As you may have heard, event allocations happened, and there were a number of unhappy people. We distributed events by looking at numbers from previous years, then catered a little bit and attempted to scale equally. Basically, dorms have different standards for the events they believe they were supposed to submit to DormCon. For example, Random came up with 60 events they could feasibly run but proposed 37; Burton-Conner came up with 55 events they could feasibly run and submitted all 55. As a result, Burton-Conner got a lot of events and Random got less than they've had in the past, and people were unhappy. Basically, we need a plan to prevent this happening in the future.
- Victoria: I felt you guys did a good job; however, our events were tangible events. Surprisingly, we had a large amount of enthusiasm – much more than previous years. My CPW chairs were offended that you asked them to give away events.
- Ryan: Next House could've done the same thing. We also have a large amount of enthusiasm and a large number of events we could run, but we didn't and we got shorted by this.
- Yo: We're not accusing anyone. What happened, happened. Now we need to get everyone on the same page. I think it doesn't make sense to have DormCon REX Chairs do the allocations single handedly. If this continues to be the case, we need a system. The presidents are the best group to work together because you all continuously work together. We all care!
- Ryan: Numbers, such as the previous year's data, are important and the amount of money dorms spend is worth taking into consideration. We should equally distribute culture and events.
- Katherine: Different dorms have different numbers of events (some put on a small number of big events, others have a lot of small events).
- Ryan: Admissions does not look at number of hours, just number of events.
- Katherine: My CPW was in 2010, and I remember a LOT of events.
- Yo: The reason for cap is that admissions saw a 60% increase in number of events over a five year period. Even though we have the cap, prefrosh still think there's too much going on.
- Matthew: The main issue with event allocation is that it always occurs after dorms planned their events. Hopefully, we can ask before events are planned, then maybe go to admissions to ask for larger cap.
- Allen: One suggestion – the number of events for each dorm be based on the past two years, take the max of the two years and next year's number be that max plus one or two. This stops the total number of events from ballooning.
- Eli: Simmons used to be awful; in 2010 it was full of unfriendly, mean people. Then we moved in and decided to make the dorm way better. The next CPW we doubled the number of events, and this would prevent a dorm from doing this.
- Allen: Other idea – currently we ask for event titles and funding estimates, which is small amount of data to work with. So instead, we ask for extreme descriptions, line items, etc. which would make it super difficult to fake events. We could also merge these two ideas to get to a nice middle ground.

- Yo: I like the sentiment, but these ideas are not as structured as I would like. This year's problem was that we passed people's lower bounds. In the future we should put everyone in a room together.
- Victoria: I agree with that idea; the REX chairs should go.
- Yo: I'm afraid of the REX chairs being put together because they are all passionate about CPW/REX and will never have to work together again. The presidents are more willing to negotiate and have to work together over time.
- Lars: As we discussed at retreat (and possibly last meeting), DormCon's REX Chairs should be elected in the fall. Just wanted to reiterate this point.
- Gaurav: CPW is about selling MIT, the goal shouldn't be equality. By this, I mean that the distribution doesn't need to be completely equal. We should try to have large variety of interesting events; prefrash should always have an event they want to go to.
- Matthew: Yo, this goes back to your original point. You, the REX/CPW Chairs, are better at distributing events. Dorms can't set their opinions aside or act objectively to allocate fairly. I think the best solution is to vote on event allocations before dorm events are planned.

4) i3 Updates [Adrianna Rodriguez]

- Met with housing people on Tuesday. The meeting was good; they had a discussion about what people want to do. This year it's going to be a lot more work. i3 Chairs will need to produce one stereotypical i3 video and another video exactly four minutes in length touring the dorm. Additionally, they have to work with the web design people to update dorm descriptions on the housing website. Web page content is still being worked out, but there may be small bios on GRTs, House Masters and dorm government.
- Alina: Why? They had virtual tours last year.
- Adrianna: I didn't know about the tours last year, so I didn't ask. However, this should be a onetime thing for years to come.
- Jess: This seems like a really great step toward not needing REX.
- Adrianna: I asked them about that, and of course they were hesitant. Frankly, they didn't have an answer. Additionally, we should keep in mind that the parents end about watching i3 videos more than the prefrash. Primarily, the i3 is an introduction of campus to families.
- Ryan: Yes, this has the potential to ruin REX, and we should be wary about changing REX. However, I don't think this is a bad thing.
- Adrianna: To reiterate, i3 stands for interactive introduction to the institute. The point of the video is welcome freshman and get them these materials. I will be meeting with people next week and then a meeting with all the i3 reps will occur. Because of all that's happening, getting multiple people to do i3 stuff for your dorm is good is a good idea.
- Ben: I'm worried about going to i3 chairs with these projects and them being overwhelmed. Adrianna: April 4th is the i3 video "deadline", and given the flexibility of that "deadline," we can get the other video pushed back too.
- Victoria: What exactly is the timeline for this other video? Could we push this back to the end of the semester? Adrianna: Yes, my earlier point still stands,

deadlines can be pushed back. Additionally, housing is insisting on Bexley video and we're working toward this.

- Jess: I'm concerned about parents seeing these videos and saying "Maseeh's so nice, you can't live in East Campus."
- Lars: that is a legitimate concern, but it's nice that the video will be student produced. Adrianna: Yes! Student produced is so much better than last year's virtual tour that housing consulted no one on.

5) Funding Proposals

a) MIT Spring Picnic [Chloe, Ryan, and Victoria]

- Yay food! This event happened last year; it was cool and very well attended. This year the picnic will be Saturday, April 26th from 1-4pm on McCormick's front lawn (or inside McCormick if it rains). There will be lots of food, games, and places to eat (picnic blankets).
- Alina: Are you reusing anything from last year? Chloe: Yes, picnic blankets from last year. However we didn't have enough last year, so we're getting more this year. The tent we're buying this year will cover the food from the sun, because the food is outside for a long time.

Vote passes unanimously for \$1,708.95.

b) Steer Roast [Alina Kononov]

- Festivities commence at 5pm on Friday, May 2nd, with the traditional pit lighting ceremony and continue throughout the evening with mud wrestling and live music. The main attraction of Saturday is a huge feast at 2pm where students, alumni, and professors come together to enjoy a delicious meal and some entertainment. Additionally, every hall and suite in Senior House will be completely transformed into an art exhibit to showcase artwork made by students. The courtyard will be open to everyone; each person in Senior Haus is allowed four guests at a time in order to know roughly how many people are in the dorm and safely accounted for by a residents. There's no reason why anyone who wants to come couldn't come. We're asking for \$5,924.
- Ryan: Where do costs come from? Alina: The numbers are based off 50 years of experience. The rounded numbers on the proposal are numbers we shoot for.
- Eli: Based on our newly passed funding policies, we can't allocate more than half our event budget in one meeting. Therefore, since we have already approved the MIT Spring Picnic, we need to amend the funding down to \$5,791.05.

Vote passes unanimously for \$5,791.05.

6) Retreat Action Items/Follow-Up [Eli]

- You should all now have the notes from our retreat. Exec will figure out action items and then ask for the presidents' feedback.

7) Security Updates [Eli]

- Dean Humphries promised an update by Monday.

8) Constitution Amendment [Matthew]

- Article V Section 1 Current Text:

“All Full and Associate Members of DormCon shall be eligible to serve as officers of DormCon. DormCon officers shall represent the views and interests of the entire set of DormCon-represented dormitories above those of the particular dormitory in which the officer resides. There shall be one and only one MIT undergraduate serving in each of the DormCon offices, unless otherwise noted in this Constitution. No officer of DormCon may simultaneously hold a position as a Principal Officer of the Undergraduate Association, or as an officer of the Inter-Fraternity Council, the Panhellenic Association, or the Living Group Council.”

- Article V Section 1 Proposed Changes:

“All Full and Associate Members of DormCon shall be eligible to serve as officers of DormCon. DormCon officers shall represent the views and interests of the entire set of DormCon-represented dormitories above those of the particular dormitory in which the officer resides. There shall be one and only one MIT undergraduate serving in each of the DormCon offices, unless otherwise noted in this Constitution. ~~No officer~~ **The President and Executive Vice President** of DormCon may **not** simultaneously hold a position as a Principal Officer of the Undergraduate Association, or as an officer of the Inter-Fraternity Council, the Panhellenic Association, or the Living Group Council.”

- Ben Horkley: An additional amendment could be that no one can hold the equivalent office.
- Andrea: I’m worried about a person in the future who can’t uphold all their positions, maybe Matt can handle this, but it is a lot for one person to handle.
- Matthew: Yes, this is so person dependent. I would hope that members of each body would have the foresight to decide whether or not the person could fulfill the duties. Currently, I’m concerned with being in conflict with the constitution.
- Eli: Just a reminder, dorm presidents have the right to remove DormCon Exec officer from office.
- Alina: Is UA constitution like ours? Ben: No.
- Gaurav: No officer of DormCon...strike out principal officer of the UA, move below, because other living groups you shouldn’t have simultaneous positions.
- Final Wording along the lines of:

“No officer of DormCon may simultaneously hold a position an officer of the Inter-Fraternity Council, the Panhellenic Association, or the Living Group Council. The President, Vice President, Treasurer, and Secretary of DormCon may not simultaneously hold a position as a Principal Officer of the Undergraduate Association.”

Vote approving passes 9 for and 1 abstain.