

ASC

Date: 10.27.04

Attending: Marcel, Liz, Michelle, Carlos, Scott, Lauren, Michael, Coryn, Meelena, Jimmy (partially), Elliot (minutes author)

1. GSC reps: Elliot, Lauren, Casey(to be confirmed)
2. Budget
 - a. distributed by Marcel
 - b. cash flow sheet set-up to track reimbursement
 - i. process: give to Marcel, 1 week turn-around
 - c. \$193.99 spent goes to "\$193.99" since we cant spend ASC \$ on "restrictive" events (need to be community-wide with architectural content – ie: "debate" events were no good according to Rebecca)
 - d. money allocated such that pending funds bracketed until rec'd
 - e. events are being scrutinized w/r/t expenditure vs. attendance (institute wide)
 - f. Friday noon talks: should asc buy food/drink?
 - i. joe dahmen (FNT-TA) estimated budget: \$120 per talk, 4 remaining
 - ii. vote in favor of funding food: 9/1 (for/against)
 - iii. conclusion:
 1. asc to fund fall FNT @ \$120/event
 2. asc to notify dept that as a result of this, asc will not be able to fund certain other events (tbd) such that it is made clear there is no "extra" money.
 3. food to be reception after? and leveraged for asc awareness
 4. \$ could come from student guest speaker fund allocation?
3. events scheduling:
 - a. election party: "Architecture Fall Social" 11/2 – Jimmy in charge, needs to pick-up the ball.
 - b. lectures:
 - i. student list given to anne/stan
 - ii. Fernandez to run it next semester ilo stan
 - c. town hall meeting
 - i. introduction
 - ii. agenda as per email
 - iii. elliot to moderate discussion
4. Dept. Head (luis report)
 - a. breakfast was useful (more so than lecture)
 - b. committee today: candidates will be shuffled around less since the current visitation format is exhausting
 - c. committee will not deliberate until all candidates have come
 - d. student feedback process:
 - i. luis-organized breakfasts with cadre of students and candidate

- ii. discussion amongst breakfast attendees after the candidates have all come
 - iii. public presentation to students by breakfast cadre to structure open discussion
 - iv. email feedback to luis welcomed at any time
 - e. candidates:
 - i. mark angelil
 - ii. ming fung
 - iii. stefano boeri
 - iv. yung ho chang
 - v. mark burry
 - vi. two others that cannot be disclosed
- 5. Student Advisors to president – interviews today/tomorrow – soon to be named.
- 6. Non-resident tuition Issue:
 - a. non-res students req'd to pay 15% tuition
 - b. 39 of 110 institute-wide in architecture (11 w/ dept of Architecture)
 - c. Non-resident not the same as to ABD (all but dissertation)
 - d. Talking to Ike Colbert et al.
 - e. Faculty generally in favor of waiving but Stan seems unable to change the (institute wide) requirement - will be discussed tomorrow in ASC meeting with Stan
 - f. Will take the issue to GSC (Lauren is a rep.)
- 7. Computation group
 - a. 11 students (13 really but 1 recently defended dissertation, other is non-res.)
 - b. facilities
 - i. secluded within N51 but a lot of space and privacy
 - ii. some are resistant (most have finished their coursework so don't care as much if secluded)
 - iii. facilities bad (leakage, lead paint, asbestos tiles recently removed, etc...)
 - c. 5 faculty are all spread out
 - d. whole dept is missing out (as well as comp. group)
 - e. problem is larger: VAP, Ugrad – department is fragmented and that needs to go public (immediate solution would be nice but it's a long-term concern.
- 8. Meeting with Stan
 - a. "common room" also requested by SMArchS – should be prioritized w/r/t computation group space, though 3-309 likely wouldn't solve the latter problem and could help by giving people coming from N-51 a place to be.
 - b. add to list:
 - i. thesis scheduling
 - 1. celebrating
 - 2. production resources (how to maximize?)

- a. should ask for second laser cutter (second one, according to c. dewart not workable) – desktop models for 6
 - ii. course 4 book
 1. made one for accreditation should be annual
 2. marlene and karl
 3. thresholds is 2000 books for \$10,000 (stan's figure \$40,000 seems high)
 4. could be self-supporting if it cost something (\$10-15) but then its less of a publicity tool – for example open house visitor likely wont pay for the books to see the work
 5. note that the “archiving”/ocw system here greatly simplifies the process since the work is already documented
 - a. at uva, a book was published every year (9”x12” with approx 100 pages). It cost \$15 and got money from soliciting donations. Professors picked 2 or 3 projects per student and the book was put together each summer by 2 to 3 students.
9. adjourn (9:00pm)