CSL Minutes October 10, 2014

1. Introductions and List of Members
   a. Members present: Helen Marrow, Phil Starks, Consuelo Cruz, Anne Poncet-Montange, Andrew Ramsburg, Mickey Toogood, Mary Pat McMahon, Bruce Reitman, Linda Jiang, Ece Kocak
   b. Minutes taker: Linda Jiang
2. Student Co-Chair Decision
   a. Students will discuss among themselves independently and let the committee know who is interested in being a co-chair
3. Faculty Chair
   a. Helen Marrow was voted unanimously by the committee to act as chair for the fall
   b. Spring chair will be decided on a later date
4. Su McGlone presentation of Fraternity hearing
   a. Questions we will essentially be asking and considering: Is the fraternity in question not just implicated by, but also responsible for, the acts of individuals in the fraternity? If an event is held by individual fraternity members, but perceived to be a fraternity (group) event, does it indeed qualify as a fraternity(group) event? Does it matter that the event is held on or off the organization’s premises? Is there a culture in the organization that allowed the act to happen, or otherwise contributed to a breach of the Code of Conduct or to putting members of the community in danger/harm? Did the organization take sufficient responsibility both before and after the incident to protect members of the community from danger/harm?
   b. Things to consider for the process of the inquiry:
      i. CSL will be creating expectations and precedence for how to address future sorority and fraternity issues that reach the committee. AS&E faculty voted to reengage with fraternities/sororities for the first time in 17 years in 2013-14, so this is the first original case coming before us in some time.
   c. Concerns:
      i. Need some information on the organization’s recent case history to make a decision about the culture and responsibility of the organization, but also want to stay unbiased during the hearing
         1. We proposed a hybrid model of receiving a recent history in a sealed envelope that we can open during the hearing after arguments have been made.
      ii. This is an inquiry hearing, with no official complainant: So no current way to include counter arguments (who/what is the counterargument if there is no official complainant). They sound like they are there... we want them explicit during the hearing.
         1. Should the case be brought up as a complainant or kept as an inquiry?
iii. Cultural context vs. individual context (how do we really know or can we really tell that the individuals’ actions were indeed influenced by the culture/structure of the fraternity, or something else?)

iv. How many representatives of the fraternity will be allowed to speak?
   1. How many will we be allowed to question? (we are allowed to decide on a case by case basis, so today for this case we decided all/any)

v. How have other schools dealt with similar events? How has Tufts sanctioned other fraternities or sororities for various offenses in the recent past?
   1. We will receive us some history of both prior to the review. We will also receive other case info closer to the hearing date.

d. Another meeting will be organized (October 31) before the hearing to decide the process of the hearing (November 7) and answer any further questions/discussion

5. Identity Harassment
   a. EEOC came to us to ask for our support in moving forward with administration
   b. Their concerns
      i. The OEO language currently does not represent diversity on campus
      ii. Specific concerns about wording “intentional and unintentional”
      iii. What constitutes as an offense – is the wording too broad? Will faculty come under fire for teaching (freedom of expression be limited)? Is the wording also too delimited on other hand (eg, microaggressions)?
      iv. What role can CSL play downstream in adjudicating such cases (whether original cases brought against groups, or appeals brought against individuals)? Is it helpful to be able to frame the CSL as having this jurisdiction should complicated cases arise?
   c. (Confidential) examples of reported incidents of bias will be sent out by email to CSL members from Mickey Toogood, to show evidence that there is student demand for new language
   d. Members decided that they would like to have some voice in the review of the current language. 1-2 representatives will be selected to work with EEOC on a subcommittee (Phil Starks and Consuelo Cruz have agreed.)
   e. Overall, members agreed to put support behind EEOC to move forward

6. Report from Phil Starks’ attending the Executive Committee’s re: the process to include faculty input into the Provost’s proposal
   a. Phil reports that at this time it doesn’t look like there is any impact on CSL
   b. Kevin Dunn willing to return to speak to us anytime about the impact

7. Wendell Phillips Award questions
   a. Advertising is going very well among students and faculty
   b. Helen Marrow will email around potential new and old award questions, for an email vote prior to October 27, since we have run out of time in our meeting today

8. Adjournment