

**Community Time: Emily Miller**

- Title IX: prevents discrimination on basis of sex (federal funding)
- Sexual harassment and violence a huge issue on college campuses
- Unwelcome conduct: if person did not request/invite it and deemed undesirable or offensive
- Sexual harassment: unwelcome conduct in a sexual manner - quid pro quo (explicit or implicit), or when conduct creates a hostile environment
- Gender-based harassment: verbal or nonverbal aggressive interaction
- Question:
  - How can someone deem something hostile if they're unconscious? Is this a post-event determination? \*\*If incapacitated- conduct deemed unwelcome. People who come to seek help- no questions asked kind of implementation. Slightly subjective determination? Very hard question to answer.
  - In terms of education of the policy, how do you go about informing the greater student body? Goal is to get more comprehensive, mandatory training in this area.
  - Something can only be reopened if evidence comes up within a week? That is the window of repeal. If there is something coming in three weeks, and a heads-up is given, that will be taken into account. Initial stage of formal investigation - complaint filed and initial review. Someone meets with the person who filed the complaint to see if this is a violation of the policy - if so, go through with investigation and if not, administratively closed. Have a window of a week to tweak account.
  - On average how long does it take to adjudicate a case? Can students appeal? Appeal is allowed. Quite a range of time for these cases.
  - What can federal government do about sexual assault in a timely manner? Welcoming for process to be audited so gov. can bring constructive criticism.
  - Title IX workshops? Trainings every year - orientations for tutors and proctors.
  - Are there cases of sexual assault/harassment that would at some point go to police or non-Harvard? Do non-Harvard people get involved? Decision of person who filed the complaint. Always make HUPD available to students who want to explore this option.

- The word 'consent' does not show up in Harvard's policy - why we're not/difference if we were. Our unwelcome conduct standard does capture what affirmative consent gets at. Conduct needs to be requested or invited definition fits that prong. Difference would be a cultural one.

➤ [emilymiller@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:emilymiller@fas.harvard.edu)

### **Community Time: Chinese and Canadian delegates**

- All China Students federation, established in 1990. Came to Harvard to learn from American friends! Hope to learn more about the experience of other students.
- Largest ILS conference we've ever had!
- What do the Chinese students feel they are advocating for most (i.e. here, sexual assault is a hot topic)
  - In China, men the victims of sexual assault for the first time. Equality for both men and women more of a priority.
- Academic integrity? Cultural norm being set on our campus- is this spirit also as heavily embedded or is it more of a background?
  - Student union tell people not to cheat- if you cheat won't get any scholarship, etc
- Any suggestions for UC, as a student government?
  - They don't know enough yet to tell!

### **Prez/VP Updates:**

- Read the agenda
- Aligned on many ideas with Dean Smith
- HUDS brain break - we're moving forward! Perhaps a few houses, one in each neighborhood
- All of Exec board except Berkeley and Eduardo will be up for reelection.

### **Committee Updates:**

- Let Scott or Anna know if you want to add something to the survey/fill out Meriton's form
- FCC: Working on referendum
- Rules: Need to think about reaching out for pro/con statements.
- Read the agenda

### **Secretary Update:**

### 34F-20 Fall Grants Pack 7

- Only three groups showed up for interviews- weird
- Won't give funding for future events if they don't submit CPF in time (Completed Project Form)
- Outside funding deducted from funding you get from UC
- **Con:** TEDx tickets very expensive- nearly \$100 except for students (money put into event to subsidize students, \$25) - where does that money go? All to TEDx company. Very similar to Harvard Thinks Big.
- Point of information: TEDx Harvard group wanted money to pay for cameras to film student groups during intermissions. For videography and food. 1500 for video, 600 for food (by policy).
- Point of information: regular policy guidelines not used for large venues
- **Pro:** According to Wikipedia, TED and TEDx nonprofit (but we don't fund nonprofits making surpluses)
- **Con:** Poor planning on the part of the organizers, but not good that we're talking about whether or not to fund \$2100 after the fact - puts us in a tough space.

Amendment: "Be it further resolved that the Treasurer be empowered to enquire as to the profitability of grant 11 and disperse funding only following approval by the Executive Board following a report from the Treasurer. **Being considered by hand vote**

- Want the ability to look into this.
- Better to come back next week through the entire UC body?
- Don't typically have the power to audit people - want the grant to be contingent on that power
- Doesn't this put the blame/fault on the student group?
  - More a seeking information before acting
- What happens if we choose not to fund this student group when the event has already happened?
- Profitability of student group? Yes
- What standards will the Executive Board be applying toward investigation and will the UC Gen hear a detailed explanation at a future meeting?
  - Not really an "investigation" - right or wrong implied meaning.  
Hopefully the body treats Exec
- **Amendment Con:** Will the full UC be able to review this decision before funding is given out? Exec will send out an email and you will know. Also Exec meetings are open.

- Point of Information: Can we adjust money through the 150% rule to decrease the amount of money
- **Amendment Pro:** Love the idea of Exec deciding this - hope Exec holds this up to the same scrutiny, whether it be future grant or retroactive grant. This went before rules to get endorsement, failed endorsement.
- **Amendment Con:** We fund a lot of events that have to pay speakers to come, and those speakers are making money. -> Don't fund speakers and standards applied to the group, not the speakers.
- **Amendment Pro:** Put money toward events, not speakers. Ultimately, just looking for information. Not a witchhunt.

**Amendment passes by a hand vote.**

**This passes 39-1-6.**

Exec voted to allot \$150 for the alumni event.

Member expelled from the UC - Gary Castellanos Reyes

### **Allotment of Money for DJ**

- Poker chip method most interactive, best method after much thought
- Help out with staffing this event!
- Need crowd manager -> Brett
- HUID only

**Passed by unanimous consent**

### **Question/Comments**

- Will a meeting with Khurana/Smith be rescheduled?
- Student-faculty meetings very important - one of them is the student organizational fc where they decide if student organizations should be funded if they have parent organizations -> \*\*clarification, actually under SRC
- As of 5 pm today: 673, 280, 114 for the referenda (sexual assault policy, final clubs, and breakfast in that order)