

DormCon Minutes 10/12/17

Dorm	Attendance
Baker	x
Burton-Conner (proxy)	x
East Campus	x
MacGregor	x
Maseeh	x
McCormick	--
New	--
Next	x
Random	x
Simmons	x

PROXIES:

BC - Katie Fisher

Meeting started at approximately: 7:39pm

Officer Updates

Event Reg Policy

- Not much happened at the meeting; mostly just catching up
- Next step: get more contact
- Get it up by spring
- Is there any way to move up the timeline to test it at the end of the semester?
 - It depends on atlas
 - Could also test it during IAP

REX Chairs' Update

- Feedback from Jen and Julie
 - Have more food options - halal, kosher
 - Could have a marker in the booklet?
 - Having accountability plans in place sooner so that early return numbers are higher
- Having freshmen check-in events

- 6/10 dorms already have peer mentorship program, so funding for freshmen check-in events would be for other 4 dorms
- Also could have events for other class years - is there interest?
 - Doesn't hurt
- Part of bigger discussion about in dorm programming
 - Don't want checklist programming: want more thoughtful programming
 - If too many events, attendance goes down
 - Lower barrier by having right in entrance
 - Ideas for more programming?
 - More non-course 6 career programming
 - MISTI
 - Also good for meeting more people
 - Don't want to have too many events with people not in the dorm
 - Maybe flip the programming to be globalized so people can have more global programming

Creating In-House Rooming Guidelines

- Problem: keeping freshmen information private
 - Want to have some guiding principles
 - Example: distributing freshmen information through email
 - Institutions have obligations to keep educational records private, including surveys filled out: because rooming survey is semi-required, information needs to be kept private
- Dorm rooming process
 - Macgregor
 - Allows squatting
 - Freshmen split into 10 groups
 - Freshmen visits each entry/HOH for 15 minutes
 - Entries rank freshmen on 1-6, 6 being freshman really doesn't fit
 - If problems, rush person for each entry
 - Information goes into an algorithm
 - Maseeh
 - Freshmen can stay in their old room if they want (squatting)
 - Or can join new lottery (usually <15 people)
 - Random
 - No freshmen get to squat
 - Get on a list then get to choose
 - Difficult because cat floors and gender floors
 - Baker
 - Kinda similar to Maseeh
 - Not random, try to make good fit
 - Freshmen fill out survey whether they want to move or not, but usually people that want to stay can stay

- Form: where they want to move
 - Minimize number of rooms but maximize happiness
 - Simmons
 - No guaranteed squatting
 - Go visit all the sections
 - Fill out long form
 - Then assigned to rooms by rooming chairs
 - Next
 - No squats
 - Wing rush - visit all the wings
 - Get a lottery number, then freshmen pick rooms based on their lottery pick
 - Awkward at the end if say, one triple and two males one female, then need to backtrack
 - Try not to get to that point
 - BC
 - No squatting
 - Freshmen organize all the forms (stapling)
 - Freshmen rank floors
 - Floors submit 5 freshmen that they want
 - Then try to match
 - EC
 - Mutual selection
 - Hall rush: visit all 10 halls
 - Freshmen fill out forms
 - Get together with prez, RAC, rep from each hall
 - Room freshmen based on principles/rules
 - Done manually
 - Use algorithm to quantify happiness
- Squatting: good or bad? :/
 - Some freshmen really like their section
 - But also might not know where they really want to live
 - Don't think it's fair that FYREs don't have the same opportunity
- Anything with upperclassmen choice = mutual selection
 - Line that mutual selection is not good though - ie if freshmen prefs never get taken into account
- Macgregor: in mutual selection, some freshmen are really popular among some entries and some are not
 - In algorithm, rank freshmen prefs higher than upperclassmen prefs
 - Most people get their top 1-3 choices
 - Concern: entries have different personalities
- Needs to be more clear about how to get SDS form for singles for medical reasons
 - Don't want students to be in the position of having to choose

- Tough when not even singles: what to do if none of them have the validation?
 - Idea behind number 7 is to avoid having to make RACs choose
- Please make sure that housing is clear about single gender bathrooms/suites
 - Macgregor: for single bathroom suite, bathrooms are still shared
 - That's a Jen thing
- Another principle is transparency
 - Reason people get upset is that they don't know
 - Actually disagree, (EC) tell freshmen that it's a mutual selection but they preferences are priority, 99% will get top 3 choice
 - Emphasizing the mutual selection may make them feel more pressured
 - Don't want to overwhelm them with detailed information on the steps
 - Simmons: don't want to release number of rooms per section because don't want freshmen to game rooms
 - Goals are good, but steps are a little difficult
 - Next: extremely transparent, true that it leads to people gaming the system; especially true this year because space is tight
 - Freshmen trying to get biggest room or loopholes, not trying to meet upperclassmen or find the best place for them
 - Being extremely transparent directs focus to the wrong place
- Motivations for 5
 - Idea is that information needs to be protected
 - For example, if there's a floor mailing list, information about freshmen shouldn't go beyond RAC or rooming committee; information should not be sent to a floor or dorm mailing list
- Is 4 and 5 the same?
 - Unclear what "sensitive" means
 - Reason they're different is that "or rooming committee" wasn't there
- ** At least one person on the committee needs to be FERPA trained
- Next house only has one rooming chair...
- Maseeh has a rooming committee, only uses summer form to match roommates and room and floor is random after that
- Macgregor: do gender ratios differ on Institute levels? Not a lot of girls
 - Continuously have a problem
 - No policy to preserve some gender ratio within suites/floors/etc.
- Something on the form: include interested in/want gender inclusive housing
 - One reason to recommend own housing form: get to be more in-depth with those questions
- For 4 and 5: only worried about sensitive information

Straw Poll: Security Tap Access for Every Undergrad?

- What's the purpose?
 - Back in like 2013 or something, none of the dorms had security
- Is it possible to be dorm by dorm access?

- Probably
- Maybe get upsides without downsides: more express guest list
- Feelings
 - Yes: Next, BC (tentative), EC
 - No: Macg, Maseeh, Random
 - Not sure: Baker, Simmons (but kinda no)
- Would be nice to not have people waiting outside though
- Dorms are growing increasingly antagonistic
- How often would you need/want to get into a dorm without reasonable probability of being on a guest list
 - Having security discourages going to other dorms
- Dorms are safe zones
 - In extreme situation, no lists
 - This policy would make it easier for people to tailgate in
 - There are people that residents don't want them to be in their dorm
 - Less confident in people, making more stringent policies are better
 - Response: some dorms that are open completely to all students
 - Never heard of situation of such discomfort; if that were something to happen, then it would be addressed
- Possible issue: people from other dorms just coming in to use facilities
- Maybe having open access hours at only specific hours?
- Why did this change?
 - Risk management in general
 - Bombings? Stabbing? Baker?
- For context: at Harvard, can access any undergrad dorm

House Team Feedback

- Official going to be sent out at 11/9 meeting GBM, presidents should be here
- House specific questions will be sent to HOH (maybe RLAD)

Discussion