November 15th, 2015
UC Gen Minutes

Community Time: Professor Sean Kelly
- ➢ Gen Ed program: first class in fall of 2009
- ➢ Very hard courses to teach (for professors and teaching fellows alike)
- ➢ Four stakeholders: students, faculty, teaching fellows, and administrators who finance and run
- ➢ Four town halls for students last fall - about 150 students
- ➢ 450 pages of narrative response on Q Guide
- ➢ Presented paper to faculty committee, met over the summer and proposed ideas to fix the program
- ➢ Major problems
  - ○ Program too big from perspective of the students - hampered freedom to explore all kinds of courses (although heard other side as well)
  - ○ Lacks identity- why do some courses count and why do others not? Implemented in funny way
- ➢ Propose only four Gen Ed courses instead of 8, but have those courses be special (not back of the book) and then have four others be back of the book/distribution requirement-y
- ➢ What is the Gen Ed course supposed to be doing? Discussion has evolved over the years - what is the faculty supposed to be teaching Harvard students to do?

Questions:
- ➢ Isn't this still an 8 course requirement? Yes but slightly different - shaping identity, these are two different principles at stake
- ➢ Are the front of the book courses going to be just humanities? Not necessarily - think combination of SPU and SLS into one
- ➢ Will this require the creation of new courses? Want current really good GEs to stick around. Broaden categories.
- ➢ How will public service learning fit in? Could imagine courses with a strong public service component fit into GE system
- ➢ Are they going to be modifying which current courses fit into requirements (ie Social Studies 10) -> faculty need to propose
- ➢ Once courses are approved, approved for perpetuity
- ➢ Take about 1 GE per semester - what about students who graduate in fewer than 8 semesters and therefore don't have to take 8 GEs currently - will this happen in the new program as well?

➢ To what extent are the concerns you're seeing now similar to those brought up in the past at each juncture? Things naturally change generation by generation but hopefully this proposal will separate these two distinct problems

Prez/VP Updates
➢ Read the agenda

Committee Updates
➢ Same

Fall Grants Pack 8: Wintersession
➢ Results of investigation with TEDx? No response from them yet
Passed by unanimous consent

Thanksgiving Shuttles
➢ People like it!! Costs $1500
➢ Mail-merge, pubbing, staffing
➢ If you're a UC member and take it you would be volunteering to staff this especially
➢ Q: How did you choose the times? Based off last year's time
➢ Q: Partner for H-Y? Different. In this case, we're doing the work.
➢ Q: Maximum carrying capacity per time? 52 people.
Passed by hand vote

An Act to Fund Freshman Yard Town Hall Meetings
➢ Oct 27th - heard from a lot of people, a lot of great ideas. Want to continue this informal dialogue.
➢ $400 - one town hall in each yard - smaller and more intimate (heard more demand)
➢ Q: Best idea? Guy who said he had 10 years of CS experience and willing to help improve Omni/Ventfull apps and expand outreach
➢ Q: What was the prize? Felipe's gift card for $25
➢ Q: They have to keep coming up front with legislation to spend money? Yes
Passed by unanimous consent

New Business: Initiatives to Stop Sexual Assault on Campus Act
➢ Secretarial error: Nick Whittaker should also be there as a sponsor.
Considered as new business

- ➢ Deadline when we have to give the administration our proposal - this is why these programs are relatively general
- ➢ Q: No mention of specific policy changes that in theory we could be seeking. Is there a reason for that? Adopted specific branch of policies under Title IX and affirmative consent or a different branch of policies would cause internal investigation procedures to shift. This was done with the current procedure in mind.
- ➢ Q: "Deliberations"? Will occur this week at Fi Com.
- ➢ Q: Basically, FiCom will be empowered to make this decision.
- ➢ Q: Will these changes be reported to UC Gen? Definitely
- ➢ Q:Will everyone be able to vote? Only primary and secondary members.
    - ○ Procedurally, either only FiCom votes or whole UC votes
- ➢ Con: Opposition because there is something that is not included: We can't pretend that putting an active bystander in a final club is going to make huge changes. 15% happen in final clubs - then people go elsewhere. Happens because women are put in vulnerable positions. Demand final clubs go co-ed and otherwise we are ignoring the issue.
- ➢ Pro: What right now is insufficient with freshman training? Doesn't include prevention techniques or real practical tips.
- ➢ Con: How does financial incentive work with organizations that aren't recognized by the administration and therefore don't receive funding from the UC? These three recommendations are in no way comprehensive - students from Cornell have a much higher bystander intervention rate but it does have limitations

Motion to amend: Mandate that members of all-male final clubs open their organizations to students of all genders: **Considered by a hand vote, 14/42**
- ➢ Final clubs make up a huge percentage of this problem. This is something that needs to be addressed. We are tired of making a lot of motions and pretending we are addressing the problem.
- ➢ Q: Is there anything else you wanted to say? Yes, we can make these environments a lot less toxic by letting women into these final clubs. We should be past discrimination based on gender, race. The way you reduce sexual assault is by having all spaces friendly to people of all genders.
- ➢ Q: Have you had any women approach you about this? Daniel has talked to people in Winthrop about this and hears a lot of different viewpoints that aren't necessarily divided down gender lines.
- ➢ Q: Chicken and egg problem? Why not just a correlational relationship, not causation? Hard to determine, but a lot of anecdotal evidence suggests sexual assault happens because these are places unwelcoming to people of

all genders. Other problems such as the fact that freshmen women are given preference.

➢ Q: These are very practical, implementable solutions in this legislation. Why should this controversial legislation piece be included- is the sexual assault taskforce the place? This is practical and the administration is already making this mandatory.

➢ Con: Not practical or actionable. Legislation we were presented with had concrete proposals we could implement this week - this seems counterproductive. Also this won't be able to accomplish that - we need to keep pushing administration

➢ Pro: Not giving us 100% mandate on anything - these are just recommendations. One argument that we have yet to hear is that male final clubs garner so much recognition- have spaces where they can welcome whomever they would like - female final clubs do not have their own spaces! Give women their own space!

➢ Con: Forcing clubs to go co-ed is not a step forward- forcing people to accept members they don't want is not beneficial. Not feasible nor the appropriate way to do this.

➢ Pro: Legislation is just a bunch of recommendations - just one more way to voice our opinions that all genders should be included in a social space. Saw Hasty Puddings Theatrical Club and some final clubs go co-ed : big news.

➢ Con: These are specific and actionable items, have had meetings for weeks. This is not actionable. This is not the right place to have this kind of approach. This is already happening at Faust-level.

➢ Pro: This isn't about attacking final clubs - it's on the values we hold as representatives of the students, as members of the UC. It is an expression of values that should be universal on this campus. Totally something can be done and other legislation pieces are good but insufficient.

➢ Con: Better to instead introduce an amendment that might call out the final clubs for their contribution ; this is not the one thing that solves the issue. -> Response from DL: This is a much more actionable item than just saying " Final clubs are a problem." This is not finger-pointing.

➢ Pro: These prongs have all been taken to administrations - advocacy plus significant groundwork. Would this be validating administration? Is this our role - to validate administration? Our role to give administration feedback with the student voice.

FAILED, 12-24-5

Amendment: 4) Address the role and engage in dialogue with off-campus student groups, known as final clubs…

a. Initiate closed-door talks surrounding the issue
b. Recognize that these "final clubs" have an effect on sexual assault on campus.

➢ Stop skirting around the issue. Need to talk about them.
➢ Q: What is the ideal conversation? Entire proposal is vague. Trying to keep in this realm of vagueness, so that administration will listen. Somebody needs to recognize that these things exist and somebody needs to talk to them about the role.
➢ Q: How will this play into current conversations? Maybe initiate isn't the right word. Just want to continue conversations. The three prongs don't include these organizations.
➢ Con: Toothless- things you're asking for have already been happening. Especially disingenuous of us to approve this amendment when we've downvoted the previous amendment which was much more actionable.
➢ Pro: Haven't had a conversation between final clubs and us. This is just a start and it states that this needs to happen. Also other prongs are already happening.
➢ Con: Distracting from the main point: we need to do something. What real action does this amendment have? Also why are we singling out final clubs - this is just "off-campus organizations" in survey, keep it as that
➢ Pro: Definitely adds to this piece of legislation; we need to recognize this issue for what it is. Also UC should tell the administration when they're doing something right.
➢ Con: We don't disagree with the spirit; we disagree with whether this is the time or place - these prongs are all things that we are introducing for the first time.
➢ Pro: Some of these other proposals are toothless; being toothless isn't necessarily a bad thing. Also administration is already doing a lot of this stuff!

PASSED, 22-7-10

Legislation passed by hand vote