

39 UAS 7 Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 19th, 2008
8:00pm
Senate Chambers

1. Bish Sanyal speaks to Senate
 - a. Background: Came to MIT in 1984 as professor in course 11, chair of department in 1994, chair of faculty since June 15, very interesting responsibility, students and administrators are heavily impacted by faculty, need to understand relationships with other groups, faculty care about teaching, but also need to publish and research
 - b. Q&A session:
 - i. Irina: researchers first and educators second?
 - ii. Bish: some faculty do and others don't, look at teaching evaluations carefully during promotion and tenure, need to give faculty more feedback sooner
 - iii. Irina: how does dept. head assess quality of teaching?
 - iv. Bish: evaluations, ask students
 - v. Paul: TA system problems and poor teachers? Reward good TAs?
 - vi. Bish: Good idea, ad-hoc problems
 - vii. Itai: UROPs?
 - viii. Bish: major case of pride, extremely good, world-renowned
 - ix. Luke: why don't students know importance of advising? Need to better communicate?
 - x. Bish: Dan thinking of online evaluations, some happy, some scared, advising is a major impact on students, why not more frequent meetings
 - xi. Brittany: If I were faculty member, I would want to know what is required for tenure. Can we include this?
 - xii. Bish: students should demand higher quality of advising, need to know they are entitled
 - xiii. Erik: many requirements don't know graduation requirements, most fundamental role, any way to fix this?
 - xiv. Bish: advisors need to be informed, meet with course program officers
 - xv. Keone: awards vs. general support, what's more useful? Double Major
 - xvi. Bish: awards will have limited impact, students need to be proactive about asking for help and lunch, double major will come to FPC in 3 weeks and then faculty floor
 - xvii. Shreyes: Double Degree vs Double Major explanation
 - xviii. Paul: advisors should be the primary faculty members that students know for all issues
 - xix. Martin: community issues, educational reforms, international
 - xx. Bish: I sense...I'm hearing from people that the administration is different, deans and administrators are new, people are less accustomed to MIT culture, President is concerned about community, Provost is concerned, staff and others are concerned, lots of questions, it is in a flux and still taking shape, Chuck took a few years to adjust, Medical Facilities and Mental facilities are pretty strong, need more interaction to strengthen community

2. Approval of 39 UAS 7 and Special Budget Review Minutes
 - a. Unanimous approval for 39 UAS 7 minutes
 - b. Unanimous approval for Special Budget Review Minutes
3. Swear-In New Senators
 - a. New senators sworn in
 - b. New senators introduce themselves
 - i. Cyril Lan – freshman representing Baker
 - ii. Cathy Melnikow – sophomore in 15, representing BC
 - iii. Dennis Perepelitsa – senior in 8 & 18, representing Senior House
4. State of the UA - Martin delivers update
 - a. Accomplishments last semester: obtained 10K for student-faculty dinners, created Advisor of the Year Award, committee providing textbook information online, solved career fair issue (time and date), worked w/chancellor on hacking statement, blue ribbon committee for dining, new shuttletrak system (Nextbus.com), transparency issues (visibility → newsletters, traveling UA meetings), improvements in Subway service (nametags, suggestion boxes, video cameras), working to get TechCash at Shaw's, Bertucci's, Subway across river, Pour House, committee on Undergraduate Enrollment (Paul asked to be chair), lobby administration for complete W1 renovations, Next House RBA problem solved
 - b. Needed improvement: to establish good website, dealing w/critical issues (e.g. UA involvement in Financial Aid, endowment, housing, hacking),
 - c. Poor progress in creating MIT community (e.g. Star Simpson press statement, Faculty Club arrests, NW35?, W1, Green Hall, freshman on campus decision, dollar bill mural) → what is role of student's in community and working w/administration?
 - d. 5-6 major controversies in Year in Review → perhaps eroding at relations between students and administrations
 - e. plan to improve:
 - i. internal UA visibility and transparency → Senators more active
 - ii. coordination w/student reps → DormCon, UA committees, etc.
 - iii. access and involvement → have students on committees,
 1. going through hierarchy, administrators
 2. working with Clay, Kolenbrander, etc.
 - f. will address issues in 3 ways
 - i. student involvement
 - ii. Martin will write articles for student publications
 - iii. form committee on Student involvement, strengthening MIT community
5. Committee/Institute Reports:
 - a. Committee on the Undergraduate Program (CUP)—GIR structure (Next week's topic of the week: GIRs)
 - i. Shreyes addresses Senate
 - ii. Committee (formed 3-4 years ago), has been looking into GIR recommendations

- iii. Suggests stopping by faculty meeting tomorrow (32-141 @ 3:30pm)
- iv. Will have town hall type meeting w/in next couple of weeks
- v. 2 components looking at:
 - 1. science & engineering – main issues is flexibility, have spoken to some departments about integration into degree programs and
 - 2. HASS – biggest concerns are flexibility, distribution and communication requirements
 - a. want to integrate to also decrease overlap
- vi. Shreyes's contact info is on agenda
- vii. Moving from double degrees to double majors – more imminent than GIRs
- viii. Irina opens floor for discussion
 - 1. Lucia: will students be able to participate to faculty meeting?
 - 2. Shreyes: Only Martin and Ali have speaking rights but anyone can attend
 - 3. Shreyes: will send recap of faculty meeting tomorrow
 - 4. Cathy: what about options of both double degrees and double majors
 - 5. Shreyes: not a lot of support for both because would create some competition w/one another and complicate system
 - 6. Lucia: have we asked students on campus about this issue?
 - 7. Shreyes: believe most students are in support b/c surveys in past have indicated in favor; Committee on Curricula: had questions so Shreyes's email solicited responses from
 - 8. Paul: Why does double degree system exist?
 - 9. Shreyes: Institute used to allow triple degrees but many concerned about student health, 2 degree system (including 90 unit addition) was a compromise
 - 10. Hans: are there motions to bring back triple major idea
 - 11. Shreyes: has not been discussed
 - 12. Straw poll: supporters of old v. new proposed system? 12 old system v. 6 new system
- b. Committee on Student Life (CSL)—Go-Cross Campus
 - i. Goal is to increase campus enthusiasm and spirit
 - ii. Game has been launched in other schools and has been successful
 - iii. Game explained on handout
 - iv. Please introduce to your living groups and decide on commander of teams
 - v. End of March – end of term
 - vi. Change from “frat” to “fraternity”
 - vii. Other campus games so successful that didn't have enough server capacity to enable MIT to participate
 - viii. Hans: off-campus community has not been recognized
 - ix. Swetha: will be added and changed
 - x. Ye: will an email explaining games rules and objectives be sent out to
 - xi. Swetha: yes, template email will be sent out to senators
 - xii. Cyril: what is incentive?
 - xiii. Swetha: Prizes will be awarded, TBD

- xiv. Swetha: Senators do not have to do additional work after game launch, only need to get name of commander and disperse information

6. UA Budget Approval

- a. Vote on budget: unanimous approval

7. 39 UAS 7.1: Student Life Decisions

- a. drafted at GSC, wanted to make joint bill
- b. Martin: lines up w/student involvement goals of UA
- c. Bennie: has been unwritten request for last few years → why will this be helpful b/c just a resolution?
- d. Martin: has not teeth, but has influence and puts pressure on administration to consider change
- e. Maggie: DormCon should also be involved
- f. Martin: suggests adding clause “DormCon, Panhel, IFC”
 - g. Hans: should not alter text of bill since already passed by GSC
 - h. Amendment opened for debate:
 - i. Paul: should seek prior consent of DormCon, Panhel, IFC
 - ii. James: nothing like DormCon for grad students, so perhaps why they weren’t mentioned
 - iii. Akash: can’t say things for Dormcon, IFC, Panhel without speaking to them first
 - iv. Ye: if just used as ammo, don’t think addition would matter
- i. Motion to extend debate for 2 minutes: unanimous approval
 - i. Steve: could go on adding other housing/residential groups, “as needed” is sufficient
 - ii. Bennie: IFC, Panhel consider themselves on same level as UA so believe it’s important to add; resolution not policy, still w/in spirit of bill
- j. Motion to vote: unanimous approval
- k. Vote on amendment: “and as necessary the dormitory council, IFC, and Panhel”
 - 1. 7 approve, 12 oppose, 1 abstention
 - 2. Vote for general resolution: 19 approve, 0 oppose, 1 abstention

8. 39 UAS 7.2: Funding for McCormick and Simmons Formal

- a. Alison: want to make sure that vision is fulfilled, budget on back
- b. Akash: cuts made, does that cover New House’s contribution
- c. Alison: New House has stopped communication, were going to get \$3K from them, but cut back expected expenditure to \$2K
- d. Akash: cross-outs?
- e. Alison: cuts made before proposal submitted
- f. Ye: concerned that would deplete 2/3 of Senate Discretionary Fund
- g. Lucia: once SDF used, can use Institute Reserve fund; ½ of past attendees were from non-residents (open to all MIT undergrads)
- h. Dan Denis: where are you in Large Events Funding process?
- i. Lisa: waiting to hear back from LEF
- j. Lucia: LEF will be allocated Sunday

- k. Alison: numbers in parentheses are expected funding
 - l. Hans: motions to amend to \$500, don't need that \$1K much money for decorations
 - i. Amendment opened for debate:
 - ii. Itai: why not just give it to them
 - iii. Lucia: decorations add to ambiance
 - iv. Akash: less than \$2K should be given b/c costs have been cut
 - v. Vote on amendment: 5 approve, 14 oppose, 0 abstentions
 - m. Friendly amendment: \$2K changed to \$3K in 3rd whereas clause
 - n. Motion to change \$2000 to \$1500, not approved
 - o. Motion to close debate: 18 approve, 1 oppose,
 - p. Vote on funding request: 17 approve, 2 oppose, 2 abstentions
9. 39 UAS 7.3: Commendation and Support for UA Dining
- a. Bennie: strange to submit when on committee
 - b. Paul: have decreased withdrawn involvement
 - c. Bennie: has reservations about Berlin regarding consideration of student input
 - d. Riley added as co-sponsor
 - e. Motion to vote: 12 approve, 7 oppose, 1 abstention
 - f. Vote of resolution: 12 approve, 7 oppose, 3 abstention
10. Action Items Review
- a. Generate ideas based on meeting w/Bish
 - b. Go-Cross-Campus – emails, choosing leader from constituency
 - c. Paul: welcomes discussion on 39 UAS 7.3
 - d. Riley: Grace following up on bulletin board in dorms idea, please email Riley and/or Grace for sizes and numbers to budget
 - e. Jason: which dorms already posting areas? (Just MacGregor)
11. New Business
- a. 39 UAS 7.4 - Bill to reorganize student council structure
 - i. Akash brings to floor
 - ii. Vote to address as new business: 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions
 - iii. Itai: suggests delaying to next meeting to get feedback from constituents
 - iv. Motion to table discussion until 3/10: 5 approve, 9 oppose, 3 abstain
 - v. Allen: should ask class councils for opinions
 - vi. Lucia: historically class councils have not spent well; maybe elect other positions to make sure someone is responsible for those
 - vii. James: should specify how elected officers and class constituents will interact, integrating people's opinions w/officers
 - viii. Kelch: good idea, but need to discuss membership, student group status, oversight and accountability and interaction w/UA
 - ix. Keone: accountability and ability of class councils to take on long term projects → maybe just need more oversight to enforce accountability; perhaps create social subcommittee (application-form)
 - x. Akash: general whole committee contributes to social events, current officers not owed anything (addressing concern that positions taken away)

- xi. Vote on tabling discussion: unanimous approval
- b. 39 UAS 7.5 – Resolution to Dissuade Administrative Irresponsibility
 - i. Hans authors bill
 - ii. Vote to address as new business: 3 in favor, 12 opposed, 4 abstentions

12. Good of the Order

- a. Bennie: perhaps need to discuss 39 UAS 7.3 more
- b. Martin: talked to Provost Rafael Reif (#2 at MIT, controls budget), will come to talk to UA members at 8pm next Monday → oversees faculty, departments
- c. Motion to adjourn: unanimous approval

13. Adjournment/Tears about having to leave Senate room