

39 UAS 8
Meeting Minutes
March 10, 2008
8:00pm – 11:30pm(ish)
Senate Chambers (W20-400)

- I. Q&A w/Chancellor Clay (CC)
 - a. Process of deciding budget issues
 - i. Dean of Sloan school submitted recommendations in December
 - b. Corporation met last week
 - i. Further reduction in self-help level
 - ii. Relief on home equity
 - iii. MIT spends \$73 million/year on undergrad financial aid
 - iv. Review/announcement will start earlier than in past
 - v. Actual budget level set and approved by Corporation
 - vi. Calendar will probably be changed for next year, so that announcement will be closer to peers
 - vii. Usually don't send until admissions letter sent out
- II. CC Gives PowerPoint presentation about financial aid
 - a. Q: Harvard's protection of students pursued by RIAA. What is our policy?
 - b. CC: not sure what Harvard's policy
 - c. Comment: Harvard wait for legal subpoena until complying
 - d. CC: MIT does require subpoenas as well, in the past may have come w/improper subpoenas
 - i. If university and RIAA agree that MIT student is guilty, expulsion
- III. Overview: Pricing, Enrollment, and Admissions
 - a. Where we are now
 - b. Peers: Harvard, Stanford, Yale, Princeton
 - c. Now: tuition has increase 4.1%, tuition 4.2% ? (AY Year Review)
 - d. COFHE institutions (31) – we are not most expensive (ranked 23)
 - e. Proposal for next year (tuition increases 4.0%)
 - f. Overall increase in budget is 3.9% (tuition, activity, room, board, other expenses)
 - g. Financial aid rises w/tuition so no reason to go higher than 4.0% (e.g. 6.0%), going down to 2.0% would lose revenue (and have to make up next year)
 - h. Freshman class decline to 1040 because W1 not opening
 - i. Please w/overall composition of undergrad student body
 - j. Yield rate (% of admissions that accept) – have moved to 69% (all other peers except Harvard (around 82%) are within 2%)
 - k. Comparative information shown (SAT scores) – verbal 100 pts higher than years ago
 - l. Highest %age of low/middle income (less than \$60K) in our peer group
 - m. Each MIT student backed by is backed – in endowments
 - n. "poorest of rich schools" endowment: 7th in country

- o. Highest institutional scholarship per undergraduate
 - p. Highest percentage of undergrads receiving institutional scholarships (MIT 60% for some time, peers average is 47%)
- IV. The Shifting Financial Aid Environment
- a. Problem: not how well we've done, but how well we'll do
 - i. Definition of affordability, including parent/student contribution changing
 - ii. Congressional/political pressures changing
 - iii. May face serious challenges to sustaining quality of undergrad body (1/3 of admitted also admitted by ≥ 1 peers)
 - iv. Cross admits are top academic students, but likely to be interested in science than other discipline (v. Princeton, Yale, Stanford usually get student, v. Harvard usually not)
 - v. CC: what percentage of endowments spent each year? Ranged from 4.75-5.75% depending on state of economy and flow of \$
 - vi. About 50% women admitted, 45% usually accept – an area that could use improvement
 - b. What have peers done recently?
 - i. Reduced parental contributions significantly through changes, e.g. eliminating home equity in calculation in need (families have income + assets (includes home – expectation is that if you have a lot of equity, can be used to pay for child's education))
 - ii. Eliminated parental contributions below \$60K and offered free tuition for under \$100K
 - iii. Eliminated loan requirement for students from all income levels
 - iv. Provided increased aid to middle-class families (as high as \$200K, based on family circumstances)
 - v. Increased clarity & transparency, but there's still "fine print"
- V. Our Proposal for 2008-2009
- a. Our Commitment: Review
 - i. We have aggressively increased commitment to undergrad financial aid
 - ii. Shows graph of MIT's Commitment to Undergrad Fin Aid in Real Dollars
 - iii. (76 million comes from tuition)
 - iv. Endowed funds – comes from , strictly for fin aid from investing
 - 1. 41 \rightarrow 52 million in AY 2007 \rightarrow 2008
 - v. Not endowed \rightarrow spent from unrestricted resources of institution (like savings account)
 - vi. Want to close gap between endowed and unendowed
 - b. Recent MIT enhancements
 - i. 2002: Self help average \$23K in loans upon leaving MIT
 - 1. MIT lowered: Has gone from 7600 to 5600
 - ii. 2003: Lowered expected parent contribution by adopting common methodology
 - iii. 2004: reduced self help from 5600 to 5500

- iv. 2007 MIT's Pell Grant Matching Program
- v. 2008: reduced self-help from \$5500 to \$5250, guaranteed UROP for upper class MIT scholarship recipients
- c. Impact of peer aid changes on MIT admissions since AY 2002
 - i. MIT's held own w/cross admits, increased admissions yield, remained strong on quality, selectivity, done well/improved attractiveness to targeted group: women, minorities, academic stars, etc.
- d. Fin aid plan for AY 2008-2009
 - i. Families earning < \$75 K w/typical assets pay no tuition
 - 1. Tuition ~\$30K, additional ~15K in room/board, other areas
 - ii. Students from families earning < \$75 K (average \$15K now in loans leaving MIT)
 - iii. Eliminate home equity in determining need for families < \$100K w/typical assets
 - iv. Reduce student self-help from \$5250 to \$4750 for all families

VI. Q&A

- a. Q: With decreased costs, who is paying for these?
- b. CC: no decreasing aid for anyone, need for each person depends on circumstances
- c. Q: How many students does this affect?
- d. 850 out of 4300 (~22%) (Martin says headline says ~30%)
- e. Q: plans in dealing w/dorm renovations
- f. CC: tuition does not deal w/dorm renovations, on list for renovation b/c can't give specific date
- g. Q: what does tuition pay for, what contributes to increase in tuition?
- h. CC: tuitions covers cost about ½ of education, other from endowments, etc.
 - i. Dorms don't entirely pay for themselves, rents partially for
 - ii. Faculty salaries, library (gen operations of institute except for research and Lincoln Labs)
- i. Q: Will students currently at MIT be seeing the effect of this
- j. CC: hopefully students will be able to borrow less, maybe more UROPS for pay that are international and richer, less pressure on families
- k. Q: where is extra \$ coming from? What projects delayed b/c of this?
- l. CC: extra coming from endowment; fin aid budget is going up 10%, would have been less if hadn't made this change, extra \$ to do a few special projects
- m. CC: analysis of need will stay similar, may still need to work during school year or summer
- n. Q: how to measure quality of students?
- o. CC: have tables in all classes, reach targets in admissions pools, how close is yield to profile of those admitted, comparison to peer institutions
 - i. Have cancellation stipend: to find out where people who say no go and why
- p. Q: what changes in criteria in admission process?
- q. CC: admissions office more selective, have received more applicants
 - i. ½ of those who apply are well qualified 1300-1400 admissions, another 1500 students could be admitted w/o compromising quality

- r. Q: Princeton has started new project to encourage students to take year off and help others w/help of Princeton
- s. CC: hasn't been discussed by administration, not sure how he feels about it, no strong view, doubts administrations have strong policy
- t. Q: what does "typical assets" mean
- u. CC: assets typically available to support student in college (e.g. different owning 5 houses/condos and 10 trucks owned by small business);
 - i. What about assets not easily available to sell
- v. Q: recent decisions of administration – contrary decisions between top 4 administrators and other administrators; multi-tier system
 - i. Frustration w/not getting "why"
- w. CC: illustration w/W1 case
 - i. After decision made to build new building, Larry convened committee in Fall 06 (10 people – 4 students)
 - ii. Issued report in Jan 07 w/recommendation that W1 totally renovated, include dining facility, including what else it should include
 - iii. Didn't think resources were present to do complete renovation
 - iv. Jan 07-Nov 07 nothing much happened b/c no \$, not sure what was feasible and what would cost (2 engineering studies in between)
 - 1. December 07 decision of full renovation, acceptance of committee's report
 - 2. Rooms for ~420
 - 3. No consultation w/students between 1/07 – 11/07 b/c not doing anything, no decisions being made
 - 4. Didn't think any controversy of scope b/c report had stated
 - 5. W1 and Dining was not to imply dining anywhere else on campus
 - 6. Larry appointed committee to look at dining system w/in relation to each other
 - 7. Founders group will take over what W1 will mean, come from all over campus, will consult w/dining group
- x. Q: Dining decision made before students brought into discussion, frustration
- y. CC: Every dorm built over the years, dining was in them (except New House)
- z. Q: decisions were made for students w/o students
- aa. Q: Blue Ribbon Committee not presented that way, Blue Ribbon Committee formed b/c of dining issues, not W1
- bb. CC: Blue Ribbon formed b/c dining on campus is not where we want it to be
- cc. Q: Susan Hockfield presented
 - i. We have failed external (world) and internal (students) communications as a response to fin aid, dining
 - ii. What are the plans to improve communicate
- dd. CC:
 - i. meeting w/UA/GSC leadership,

- ii. prohibited by law to call other institutions regarding fin aid, but report to each other what they've done in the past
- iii. communication w/public: sense that universities not living up to expectations (but MIT 92% graduate)
- iv. public doesn't know what goes on in universities
- v. higher education in general has communication problem
- ee. Q: W1 Founders Group has control of direction of dining at W1, what is range of their influence on proceedings
- ff. CC: include how extensive dining will be (e.g. # of meals),
- gg. Q: students come to MIT experiencing college experience,
 - i. Unhappy w/dining system handed down from administration, no kitchens (where many communities built)
 - ii. Administrations not listening to what we want
- hh. Q: Faculty meetings not recorded, why?
- ii. CC: some think only way to experience faculty meeting is to be there, perhaps not being there would lead to misinterpretation
 - i. Taped for accurate minutes, but destroyed afterwards
 - ii. May lead to restrictions in speech
- jj. Q: how to address dialogue between administrations and students?
- kk. CC: faculty members can change, can be proposed by anyone
- ll. Q: what are we doing to seek funding for extracurricular development? D'Arbeloff grants running out
- mm. CC: one of items in campaign; will always have some \$ - but D'Arbeloff grants gave us a bigger range of projects to explore
- nn. Discussion ends

VII. Approval of 29 UAS 7 minutes

- a. Vote: All in favor

VIII. Exec Update

- a. Biggest thing has been drafting piece for faculty newsletter in conjunction w/GSC, will come out in March/April which goes to all faculty and Corporation members - To start thinking about student involvement
 - i. Have gotten faculty support, Institute professors
 - ii. Asked president to write response to this
- b. Career Fair: GSC is opposed to moving date to Monday
 - i. GSC, Class of 2009, SWE ultimately control decision
 - ii. Employers less willing to travel on Sunday to get here on Monday
 - iii. Logistics of setting up on Monday (weekend = overtime costs)
 - iv. 3 Day weekend – some students will decide to take holiday instead of going to career fair
 - v. 3 deans offered to put together financial package to prevent employers' loss of \$

- IX. Vote on New Committee Chairs
 - a. Athletics Committee Chair: Sam Jasinski
 - i. Course II, has been very involved in athletics, sees as very important part of student life at MIT
 - ii. Last term was Vice-Chair of Athletics
 - iii. Sees a lot of improvements necessary to translate into Athletics Comm
 - iv. Martin: past chair has resigned, Sam has been taking responsibilities informally
 - v. Allen: what are improvements?
 - vi. Sam: low meeting attendance (need to recruit), blurb for undergraduate newsletter, networking for meeting this Sunday
 - vii. Keone: what are goals?
 - viii. Sam: last term full list of things to do, want to focus
 - 1. Set up Athletics Weekend – athletes want to see support
 - a. During a weekend w/many home games
 - b. Raffles, fun – “awareness weekend”
 - 2. Maybe put mural on brick wall adjacent to athletic facilities?
 - 3. Communication to people about athletics
 - ix. Further discussion
 - x. Vote: majority in favor (all)
 - b. Undergraduate Enrollment Chair – Paul Baranay
 - i. Senator from Simmons, freshman
 - ii. 4 people on committee right now
 - iii. Put together list of potential effects of increasing enrollment, presented to CJAC last week
 - iv. Motion to close discussion: majority in favor
 - v. Vote: majority in favor (all)
 - c. Events Committee Chair - Amanda McGuire
 - i. Junior, Course II
 - ii. Join fall and spring events together
 - iii. Simmons social chair
 - iv. Senator for 2 years
 - v. Vice Chair for Dining
 - vi. On ElectComm and Dining committees
 - vii. Paul: manage responsibilities given past successes?
 - viii. Amanda: overseeing and ensuring consistent communication
 - ix. Administrators that oversee committee favor
 - x. Motion to end discussion: majority in favor
 - xi. Vote: majority in favor (all)
- X. Senate Project Updates - what, progress, roadblocks
 - a. Dennis: no project for now, Kat didn't get back to him
 - b. Sun also needs project

- c. Itai: 2 projects
 - i. Bringing MacGregor convenience-type store to east side of campus
 - 1. Talked to dining committee, Chris, EC/Senior Haus
 - a. Suggested convenience store in Walker a couple of
 - 2. James would be happy to assist as EC Senator (on Dining Comm at EC)
 - 3. Maybe survey should be conducted first
 - ii. "Ten at ten" at MIT – performance at MIT - Needs help
 - 1. Brighten people's day
 - 2. Not much development so far
 - 3. Akash interested in helping
 - 4. Goal to get budget by next Monday (3/17)
- d. Take break to discuss 39 UAS 7.4 Class Councils

XI. Unfinished Business

- a. 39 UAS 7.4 Class Councils – Akash authors bill
 - i. Friendly amendment in first that clause: hold general body (not council) meeting monthly (not weekly)
 - 1. Enables people to come give concerns
 - 2. Increase transparency
- b. Elected and voluntary member – to ensure voices all heard
- c. Jenn D'Ascoli on 2008 Class Council
 - i. General body meeting monthly
 - 1. 2008 class council tried; biweekly and went to different areas of campus (inc across river)
 - a. Was not successful, few people came
 - ii. Akash: don't know how it was implemented, allowing people to voice opinions
 - iii. James: some people in EC don't like idea, leads to embezzlement/popularity contest (bringing your friends) – do things for your friend
 - 1. General body: Don't know what's feasible
 - iv. Martin: last year 08 class council president, did advertise 2-3 days in advance, 2-3 emails
 - 1. At most 20 people in BC who mostly stayed for food
 - 2. Should do a trial before definite transition
- d. Motion to extend discussion for 5 minutes: all in favor
- e. James: think they were advertised well; class council should just publish minutes
 - i. Restrictions would mean a lot of red tape
 - ii. Doesn't think there's a good way to do open meetings
- f. Milo: 08 publicity chair
 - i. Have been advertising open meetings
 - 1. 1 person has ever come
 - 2. Post meeting minutes weekly
- g. Vivian: not opposed to have people come in, posting meeting minutes

- i. Now publicizing events 2-3 weeks in advance from a suggestion
 - ii. east v. west is not diversity
- h. Akash:
 - i. Class councils concerned about taking exclusive power away
 - ii. Class of 2011 not here b/c this is something they're trying to do
- i. James: the bill says all agenda items to be voted on
 - i. Akash: gives class council discretion on what needs to be voted on
- j. Motion to extend discussion for 5 minutes: majority in favor
- k. Motion to amend: "24 hours" should be changed to "72 hours" for posting class minutes
- l. Paul: 2011, did have an open meeting
 - i. Felt more informed about what was going on in class council
 - ii. Don't know if it's necessary to give everyone vote on everything
 - iii. Slows down the
- m. Crystal: 2010 publicity chair
 - i. Not opposed to clauses in general
 - ii. But opposed to how to integrate people's ideas into meeting
 - iii. Motion to amend: 4th that clause "at each general body"
- n. Cyril: maybe we need to have people concerned about bigger UA issues, rather than smaller issues
- o. Keone: Creates additional complexity, 2 meetings of council and then open body → when are decisions made? In public or private meetings?
- p. Vote: 2, in favor, 11 oppose, 3 abstentions

XII. Senate Projects (Continued)

- a. Cyril: does not have project next
- b. Riley: original project was going to look at dorm weight rooms, will look at it w/Sam
 - i. Joined Grace on bulletin boards
- c. Cathy: wood-paneling in BC – want to get them removed, schedule meeting by 3/17
- d. Nana: assist CSL
 - i. Undergraduate Mentorship Program: ensure communication, strengthen ties → Coffeehouse get-together coming up
 - ii. Wellness week: April 28-May 4
 - 1. 4/28 movie on lawn of Kresge
 - 2. 4/30 field day on Kresge
 - 3. May 3 – triathlon
- e. Grace: working on bulletin board, one obstacle → haven't been getting feedback from Senators
 - i. Maybe put up bulletin board in Student Center
- f. James: DSL committee to get student input for new dean
 - i. Gave Martin list of what they're looking for
 - ii. Became EC Dining guy
 - iii. DSL committee is waiting for applicants (next DSL Search Comm is Friday)

- g. Ye: putting in plasma screen in McCormick featured food menus
 - i. Featuring UA news, things going on on-campus, events
 - ii. Plastic utensils for takeout – housemaster is against
 - iii. Irina: Where is \$ coming from?
- h. Keone: establish West Campus reading room
 - i. Possible location: TFL of MacGregor
 - ii. Met w/P and VP of MacGregor – supportive of idea
 - iii. Obstacles: some concerned that making MacGregor public space would make it hard to take back if wanted to convert to something else down the road → want to make it MacGregor only?
 - 1. Question of exclusivity? What about dorms who want their own study room?
 - 2. Giving non-residents access to space
 - iv. Nana: good idea, maybe not use TFL
 - 1. Sometimes used as conference rooms
 - 2. Many groups meet there, would be taking space away from others
 - v. Akash: what about implementing on EC? Student Center is middle of EC and WC
 - vi. Paul: Motivations for building this cramped and far
 - 1. Dorms already have ones in their own dorms
- i. Sun: needs new task, was on idea of
- j. Kate:
 - i. History Committee (have catalogued reports)
 - 1. Maybe making reports found made public on library
 - ii. NomComm interviews this week
 - iii. DSL committee (already reported)
- k. Paul: Enrollment Committee – went in front of CJAC
 - i. Will send presentation in a few minutes
 - ii. Plans to draft timeline in next few days
 - iii. Want to recruit 4-10 members
- l. Akash:
 - i. Uniting campus efforts: voted down
 - ii. Increased transparency in class council: voted down, plans to keep pushing for reform
 - iii. Printing: MIT Energy Initiative – need to cut down on energy/paper used
 - 1. UNC has implemented really well: print to printer, then swipe at printer w/card → prints
 - iv. MIT Radio: should be used more often, people are generally happy when music
 - 1. Maybe play during lunch hours
 - v. Reading Room bill: Group space don't have walls that reach the ceiling
- m. Allen:
 - i. find out what's happening to ShuttleTrak
 - ii. more bike racks on Mass Ave

- n. Luke:
 - i. New bridge shuttle or changing schedule – will be meeting w/Larry Brutti soon
 - ii. New shuttletrack system provided by outside company. Setup might take 3 months due to going through MIT legal.
 - iii. 15 minute schedule shift to Boston West, which will probably start next semester. This way, a shuttle crosses the bridge every 15 min instead of 30
- o. Rajiv:
 - i. Recycling for FSILGs hit a lot of hurdles. A number of groups have given me the runaround and have pointed me to each other, or have been hard to work with
 - ii. Contacted recycling companies, which work better but are more expensive
 - iii. Martin – work with Mitch who is a rep from Chi Phi, and Austin Oehlerking who is UA Sustainability Committee Chair
 - iv. Akash – my fraternity has also just implemented recycling
- p. Arti:
 - i. Working with Resource Development Committee on student-alumni relations
 - ii. Alumni could be contacted to help new or floundering student groups
 - iii. Website setup is complete, but we need help putting it together

XIII. New Business –

- a. 39 UAS 8.1
 - i. Ali: MIT would have to undertake fewer responsibilities than some of peer institutions
 - 1. No one has approached Hockfield on signing this
 - ii. Sun added as co-sponsor
 - iii. Motion to vote
 - iv. Vote: all in favor
- b. 39 UAS 8.2
 - i. An extra “that” clause has been added:
 - 1. “That these signs be replaceable and updated upon changes to the schedule”
 - ii. Maggie, Luke, Allen is added as co-sponsor
 - iii. Keone: good idea, but shuttles are so off so maybe not estimated times?
 - iv. Allen: right of MIT to put up signs in Cambridge, Boston
 - v. Paul: maybe impracticality of situation should be reflected in bill
 - 1. Paul: MIT should deal with it
 - 2. Arti: Residential areas – is almost impossible to get all residents to sign allowing MIT to put up sign
 - vi. Motion to extend debate for 2 minutes
 - vii. Keone: what about putting it on fraternity/sorority house property
 - viii. Friendly motion to amend:
 - 1. First that clause: “ And work with the cities of Boston and Cambridge to get signs placed”

- 2. Second that clause: “on the Tech and Northwest shuttle stops and state number of minutes between cycles for other shuttles”
 - ix. Motion to extend debate for 1 minute
 - x. Riley: place maps of routes in dorms, make more accessible
 - xi. Cathy: Put hours of operations on shuttle signs
 - xii. Friendly motion to amend to 2nd that clause: “elaborate hours of operation”
 - xiii. Vote: All in favor
- c. 39 UAS 8.3
 - i. Paul: concern of traffic on Ames St. – already a crosswalk there
 - ii. Allen added as co-sponsor
 - iii. Sun: how effective has UA been in altering SafeRide schedule
 - 1. Martin: have been able to make substantial changes ,usually issues remaining have to do w/drivers
 - iv. Itai: collaborating with GSC to gain momentum
 - v. Motion to vote
 - vi. Vote: All in favor
- d. 39 UAS 8.4
 - i. Motion to amend by Keone:
 - 1. Added Whereas clause: “Whereas the trial run of the NextBus shuttle tracking system on the Boston Daytime shuttle has been extremely successful”
 - 2. Change last “That” clause to “That the Undergraduate Association encourages MIT Facilities to expand NextBus tracking to all shuttles as soon as possible”
 - ii. Luke: 3 months to go through MIT Legal, paperwork
 - iii. Motion to vote
 - iv. Vote: All in favor
- e. 39 UAS 8.5
 - i. Allen: we have a board in Infinite, one in Student Center should be on 1st floor
 - ii. Friendly motion to amend by Keone: “change to budget \$300”, “is” changed to “be”
 - iii. Paul: where in Student Center put FSILGs?
 - 1. Riley: not sure yet
 - 2. Maybe outside IFC office? – nothing above 1st floor is usually seen
 - 3. Maybe Senator present at Fraternity president meeting
 - iv. Motion to vote
 - v. Vote: all in favor
- f. 39 UAS 8.6
 - i. Irina: should come from Invested Reserve
 - ii. Friendly amendment: second “that” clause changed to “Invested Reserve” (not discretionary fund)
 - 1. Martin: UA bought \$3K server for ElectComm, maybe should share?
 - iii. James: would need to change software on UA server

1. Splitting server w/DSL – would cover most of costs
2. If ASA database shuts down, no one can reserve rooms or get reimbursements
- iv. Nana: where does IST fall into this, why do we need to pay?
- v. Keone: don't want IST involved, estimated at \$5K and maintenance costs → last time IST maintained, broke it
- vi. James: would mainly be responsible for hardware maintenance
- vii. Vote: All in favor
- g. 39 UAS 8.7
 - i. Jarrell Johnson addresses Senate: 1st time in about 5 years where flying large distance required
 1. Have made many cutbacks, participants already paying for registration (~\$120), cost of shuttle
 - ii. Motion to vote
 - iii. Vote: All in favor
- h. Motion to bring 39 UAS 8.1 back to discussion
 - i. Motion to open debate on possibility of discussion
 1. Keone: last whereas clause – don't believe that that is only thing that needs to happen, but agrees with bill in spirit
 - ii. Vote on opening for discussion: 8 in favor, 0 oppose, 6 abstentions
 - iii. Motion to strike last "whereas" clause
 - iv. Motion to close discussion on 8.1: does not pass
 - v. Allen's friendly amendment, change "whereas" clause not "only" → changed to "one"
 - vi. Ali reviews what MIT has been doing to meet Climate Commitment
 1. 1a – Energy Initiative
 2. 1b – something MIT already does, docs available online
 3. 1c – MIT could implement by next year if wanted to (from speaking to experts on campus)
 - vii. Motion to end discussion
 - viii. Vote on 8.1: All in favor
- XIV. New Business
 - a. 39 UAS 8.8: Resolution to express condolences for the tragedy at UNC Chapel-Hill – Paul authors on behalf of Akash
 - i. Vote to open for discussion: All in favor
 - ii. Motion amend: change to "Whereas UNC Class President"
 - iii. Itai: add UA Senate as Co-sponsors
 - iv. Motion to white ballot: passes
- XV. Action Items Review
- XVI. Good of the Order
 - a. Rallying students, contact Martin if interested in joining
- XVII. Adjournment