



# 42 U.A.S. 15

Draft Minutes from April 04, 2011

**The meeting was called to order at 7:36 pm.**

## 1. Opening Remarks

Jonté: CPW is this weekend. Be on the lookout for the email about us asking you to show up and have your UA shirt on and do other things. Tell them about how they should come to MIT because they have great student governments. At this meeting, we're going to have reports from committees. We have two committee chairs missing: one is sick and one has other commitments. Other than that, the only things we have are approving allocations appeals, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, nominations for Senate officers, and then our discussion section. The only other thing you should be thinking about is whether or not we want to add another meeting.

## 2. Exec Update

Vrajesh: There's this thing coming up called the Next Century Convocation. It's on Sunday. It will be "an experience of a lifetime." Because, MIT will only be 150 years old once. So, they are arranging transportation from campus. I think there's a bus terminal stop at East Campus. I'm sure there will be more emails about it, but it's supposed to be pretty cool. This time they're going to have a whole set of really awesome speakers. If it's awesome and you're not there, you're going to really regret it later.

Tim J: Do you know who the speakers are?

Vrajesh: Yeah, they're on the blue forms.

Jessica: Do we still have to buy tickets?

Vrajesh: I don't think you can buy them. You can pick them up at the student center.

Jonté: I think you just show your ID, and you can bring up to 3 friends.

Vrajesh: I guess there's two other small things. Allan and I are beginning, and I think Alec and Sammi, we're going to start transitioning over the next few weeks. So, if I start forwarding things to them, just letting you know.

I think NomComm is going to work with a slightly later timeline. With all of CPW and stuff, it's just not practical to do the interviews this week. It's put off by roughly a week or so. It's still going to meet the requirements even if we move that date back.

Tim J: Where are Alex J and Sammi?

Vrajesh: Sammi is in rehearsal. Alex J wasn't here last week, but I don't know where she is this week.

## 3. Reports from Committees

Jonté: Michael I think was sick, and Radhika had another commitment as well. Richard, you have the floor.



Richard: I'll quickly go over what we've accomplished. Then, field any questions. Then, I'd like to talk to you about some new things. Then, I have a question for you.

The last time I was here, you guys gave us the suggestion to start working on cooking classes. We have met with Rich Berlin, and next semester, they're going to have cooking classes taught by a professional chef. Six of them, two hours each. They're probably going to be in Pritchett. We're even discussing making a PE class out of this. We're discussing if you can host parties in Pritchett after you've gone through it. If we can't use Walker, we'll be doing it elsewhere.

PLUS. I think you might know. It's a program when we pair freshmen mentees with upperclassmen mentors. Quite frankly, we tried doing cool things. As you remember, we really couldn't do much. The momentum was lost if you will. We recently met with Alicia in SAO. If you would apply, we're even thinking about making this a seminar. That's very cool.

Next is transportation. As some of you already know, there's the Boston Weekend Daytime. That's going great. The membership has steadily increased. We're trying to go to Dean Colombo to make it permanent. From the onset, it's probably going to take a full 3 semesters to get this approved. We're hopefully going to shorten it to one semester. Another thing about transportation. Rate your drivers. We've run completed reports through February; we're going to have the March one in about a week or so.

Wellness Week. We're actually ahead of schedule. We're going to have a few good events. Recently, we had a cool thing called Movie on the Lawn. We want to do it as a special event. We're starting to integrate more people. More on that at the end of April.

That's the main structure we're working on now. A few new things. A whole bunch of these came from a work group with DSL. We might as well start working on it now. First, a bike sharing system, essentially where students get to share bikes. Some people don't want to buy full bikes. You want to store it for a long time just to use quickly. We just started discussing this. We don't have all the kinks worked out. If you guys think we should go and move forward (or not), let me know. Another cool thing is vending machines. There are still some that don't have TechCash. Since there are a few that do, that doesn't seem obvious. We're thinking about continuing that. Lastly, there's the awesome funds project, by the way. That was the title some administrators gave. We all know that many cool things happen on campus. There are a few things that happen outside. EC has really cool rollercoasters, and they do it by themselves. Unfortunately, not everyone has the interest or the resources. In the working group, the fund and maybe some other resources, specifically for school projects, is being considered.

Tim R: What were the admins on this?

Richard: Forget who they were, but I'll let you more. This was the group for what CSL should do over the next 3-5 years.

Jonté: Was this the working group? I know Donna Denoncourt was there.

Jessica: Is this the MITERS thing?

Richard: It is, but this is more geared towards community building. Again, perfect example is the EC rollercoaster. It brings people together with cool engineering, but not everyone has the opportunity.

We've been working with other groups, such as with Space Planning, on several additions to campus, most notably the plugs in Stata. The plugs aren't fully installed, but they are mostly installed. Also, right now the CAC, the water fountains in the Student Center, they think it's expensive. But if you think it's



worth the expense, let me know. The last thing is the FSILG&D competition. Essentially, it's the community service competition that pits living groups with each other. Whoever does the most gets the award, and we're going to have a really cool dinner. It's going to be quite awesome.

Last but not least, I have a very important question. I've been trying to figure out bylaws for the Committee on Student Life. I've come up with a few ideas for an answer, and I want to hear your thoughts. What's the purpose of CSL? CSL is in unique position where there are many things in student life. We also have many other cool committees: Space Planning, Dining, that type of stuff. There are some things that fit into our purview that can't fall anywhere else. Still, what's the purpose of CSL? Maybe if you guys have thoughts, that's great! If not, I'd greatly appreciate it if you email me later.

#### **4. Approval of Minutes**

Alec: Motion to do as previous, where I release the minutes during the week and, without objection on the Senate thread, it passes in 5 days.

Tim J: Why are they not ready?

Alec: No formal excuse.

Tim J: Can you tell us when they will be out?

Alec: The first set will be out within 24 hours.

**Motion passes for both sets of minutes.**

#### **5. FinBoard Spring II Allocations for Student Groups**

Emily: I don't have much more to add except what is already up there. If you have any questions, feel free to ask them.

Jonté: One thing that was noted in the office a little bit earlier this evening. In your experience, usually for FinBoard, how many appeals do we usually have?

Emily: We'd get about 20.

Jonté: Have you felt that the process you guys have followed has been useful in increasing the number of requests that are able to be worked through the first time?

Emily: Yeah, definitely the first time around people needed to get a lot of the questions answered. This round was also the same, but I don't know how representative it is. From my understanding, it was the easier of the two groups.

Rachel M: They had to come in and actually talked to us for a couple minutes. A lot of them would submit the exact same application. We didn't get any of those.

Karan: I have a question about the QuizBowl appeal. They are expected to recruit more dedicated members in the future by sending two people to nationals. Was that so they would attract more attention, or would that be discussed? How do they plan on recruiting?

Emily: The only thing attached is to recruit new members. The hope is that they will recruit more.

Rachel M: I was the one that voted against Quiz Bowl because it's 100 in person. That's not in line with Senate policy.

Will: I call the question.



**FinBoard Allocations are approved.**

## **6. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Restructuring**

Tim J: I don't know if my email got forwarded to Senate. So, we met, and we met a lot, and we talked for awhile about the proposal that you guys gave to us, which is 14.2. It's a draft. I'm emailing it to Senate right now. As you can see, it's not that many edits. We talked about what we wanted. We decided that incorporating leadership was key. We wanted the heads of all governments to be at the table. We wanted a body that would be seen as representative of the entire undergraduate student body. There's kind of an issue of scope and scale. It needs to be efficient; so you can communicate well. We didn't change too much, just some of the numbers. The main issue we tackled was how to represent dorms. IFC and Panhel already get an aggregate representative. There was an argument of why DormCon can't do the same thing. A lot of dorms expressed the sentiment that they can only be represented by their individual governments. They didn't want to pick another subset of the representatives who didn't have the title of President. We also felt like people who had the title of President had a lot more weight.

The proposal changes the 16 to 20. It give IFC 3 additional representatives to sit on the council and Panhel one additional representative. This came up in the committees a little bit. There were times where one person would say something and the conversation would drown out. Increasing IFC and Panhel would get...yes they can still vote, but it seems a lot more representative (and is) of the entire student population. And, they can have other people to kind of help express their ideas.

Kind of the two issues that the whole plan tries to fix are the internal functioning of the structure of the UA, how we can better manage ourselves. We went through the proposal, line by line, and determined what checks and balances were necessary. We incorporated those into the proposal. DormCon would have to vote to approve this. And they took a simulated vote. They needed 75% to pass it, they got 68%. Next House voted 91% against it, Simmons 100% against it, and BC 70% against it. Everyone else voted for it except for EC which had 2, and MacGregor which had 1. Those were the 3 dorms that voted against it. A lot of the reasoning, more personal pick on that, is that people were: A. Concerned of the speed of process, or B. Concerned about some of the checks and balances in the system which we revised and added a little bit more checks on the President. I felt like we filtered down the decision making process. Some dorm Presidents went around and polled individuals and voted on the population.

I think with more communication, many more would be happier as well. It was expressed multiple times that we should talk to administrators, at least see what they think about this plans; we don't have to take all of the recommendations, but we should at least consider them. I think if we can spread more word on this plan...a lot of the concerns I heard about the plan were things that had been considered in the implementation. If this is going to pass, it's getting the word out and having knowledgeable people and why things are done the way they are. A lot of those concerns could go away.

What I'm going to do is give this draft back to Senate and say this committee has completed its work. Our committee was tasked with 1 week and that was our 1 week. I'm just going to look at the bill. **\*Checks bill to assure all parts were completed.\*** With this, DormCon would be, if this is approved, DormCon in its current capacity would be dissolved, and I would very highly recommend a UA Committee on Dormitories be put into place that tries to envelop a lot of things that DormCon does. It creates a support structure for Dormitories. There are also some other forms of implementation, ways to go about it, funding dormitories and other things that are more dorm specific. Other aspects, include



communicating to students and administrators. I would urge Senate to do something about the implementation of this plan and not just take this proposal and keep it within Senate. Maybe give it to another committee. With that, do people have any questions? I'd be happy to field any of them. All of the minutes were sent out to the email list. Thanks a lot to Alec and Rachel and Janet for taking those. If you have any questions, ask me.

Jonté: Now we'll take up discussion. This body will discuss on how to deal with it. I guess a question to start us off: how well do you think you were able to review the present structure? How well do you think the committee was able to do that process?

Tim J: I think in our committee, we looked at the shortcomings of student government at MIT and identified the two key issues of how the UA deals with itself internally and how government structures communicate with each other at MIT. From those, we looked at the suggested plan and kept the floor open for any suggestions and for different plans that would fix those issues. The other smaller, not all dorm presidents plan was one that came up as a way to also solve those problems. That's how we went about looking at the structure of the UA. The committee was tasked with this proposal, and we took that as our guidance instead of we should look at Senate.

Anika: You said you didn't have support yet from enough dorm presidents. What would you have to do to get the other presidents on board?

Tim: We're reporting back on this report. I think a committee on implementation would be great. It would really help this report move forward, and I feel like a lot of people, if they just know about it, they can have the plan explained to them. I feel like there are fewer numbers of concerns that are expressed more often. If we can express those concerns, I think feedback on this plan will become more positive. If you can answer the why question, that will be enough.

Karan: As one of the three senate nominated members, I just want to echo, I would take objection to the decision process was filtered down and the information was known. Within Next house, Alec and I went to all constituents, and, with each bit, we had 5-10 minute conversations. We followed up, asked questions, explained things, and said: if you're not sure, please tell us you don't know, and we won't take your voice into account. We did a pretty thorough job of getting it out to our constituents in our dorm.

Jessica: My question was, you noted that they wanted the representatives to be dorm presidents. Was that the feelings of when you guys met as a committee at DormCon or was it like the student body.

Tim J: So, there was a large enough majority that felt like the dorm president was unilaterally the correct person that that was the direction the committee took.

Tim J: It might have been a majority of the dorm presidents that thought that. Also, I want to comment that there are a lot nuances of this plan that I don't think were properly discussed; the people I talked to on the lower levels, who had heard about the plan and were asked to give feedback, some of them had only gotten a quick 30 second email. Some had been talked to like in Next House. I feel like there were nuances in this plan that weren't entirely communicated. It's not something you can remember to tell in 2 minutes. In this plan, the role might be changing a little bit. Historically, they're elected to do a lot of internal issues. Being a representative, that might change to be quite a bit of external issues. That's something they'll have to recognize. If they have to create another vice president for internal affairs or change how they act, that's just a change in the process of the system. The committee felt like that was



the correct way to go. It would still give the dorm their vote. I feel like a nuance like that wasn't always properly communicated down to the students to give feedback.

A lot of feedback I heard is, wouldn't that create a lot of time commitments? If the dorm presidents, they can turn their dorm president into something that all they do is sit on the council. That's up to the dorm. I think the committee on implementation can really get that across and make sure those concerns were addressed. There was some concern of checks or balances. We added that the council can by a  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote overturn any decision of the President. That adds a bit of checks and balances.

Anika: I guess this goes back, what do you envision as an ideal timeline for this support? When would you see Senate and DormCon being dissolved? How do you picture it taking effect?

Tim J: My original schedule was to have a very high level and mid level vetting of this proposal and going through it done by yesterday or today. I think that definitely got done. I was kind envisioning the middle level issues with this proposal, like the committee on dormitories, if there were to be a dormitory funding committee, and if there were any major structure or tools the UA was losing. I think that a lot of things are being considered. I kind of envisioned people thinking about and sleeping on it for a couple more days, and I hope two weeks since last Monday, if there was enough support, is when it would go into effect. We got the very high level done; we did some of that with checks and balances; so, a week, a week and a half is when I think the proposal as it stands to the people who had a thorough understanding of it as a solid proposal. We need the extra time to get people aware and get them up to speed on the proposal.

Will: The next Senate meeting is in 2 weeks right?

Jonté: 3 weeks.

Tim J: On the agenda tonight is a discussion on the senate schedule. I'm going to recommend that we schedule a meeting some time between CPW and 4/16.

Will: Would Senate be comfortable with that?

Catherio: I just wanted to add on the topic of choosing presidents. That was point about which the restructuring committee had a lot of unanimity and agreement. I also wrote up a document for our rationale. If anyone would like to see more details, the legitimacy the president has among the constituency, the higher level commitment, and their role... we did analyze it.

Jessica: You said that it does redefine what the presidents are. Their vice president can now be internal but the president can be external. Would that be what the vice president takes what president does now, and the president takes what Senate does now?

Tim J: That's something not specified in the constitution. If the dorm wanted to do it now, they should do it now.

Shamdhru: I got a mail from the president before coming to the committee. He explained why he denied the idea. It seems like he wasn't sure about the administration. Do you have anything about what they want from administrative people, since there may be an interface; there's a proposed idea, if we have any idea about it, what the motion is?

Jonté: I'll go ahead and take a crack at it. Over the past week, I met with a few admins. The sense that I get is that they're worried about the process; they feel as though the proposal itself is something left with us to decide about what is actually the structure. Essentially, I went into the meeting and talked to them,





and we didn't really need to talk about the actual proposal in any detail. Once we clarify what process we're going to have for buy in, I think we can start to have this discussion about the actual structure.

Tim R: Would the admins you talked to be okay with them knowing?

Jonté: I met with Dean Colombo on Friday, and I met with Phil Walsh and Leah Flynn last Monday.

Rachel M: To add on to that is part of the institute committee purpose is communication, communicating all details to stakeholders. In response to Jessica's point on dorm presidents. A lot of dorms already have this set up. The president is external. Simmons is like that too.

Will: On the administrators, Vrajesh, have you met with administrators?

Vrajesh: Almost uniformly on the advisory board, folks were fine with it. I also agree with Jonté's other point that the question of progress was wasted in those meetings. I think taking an extra couple of weeks rather than voting on it today would be the right thing to do.

Tim R: Speaking with people that I knew, even the ones that are not at the committee, most of their problems were just procedural.

Sivakami: I just have an overall concern that I'm not positive that the committees addressed. I think it's important for any government community to have continuity. It seems like almost all your dorm presidents are there for no more than a year. That doesn't happen with IFC or Panhel either. And neither is the UA president and VP.

Rachel M: My only response is there's also really little continuity among senators.

Ashley: One thing I'd like to say about that is, one of the things that help continuity is dorm presidents usually run calendar year, usually when you get the new one. If you could be like hey, I'm now taking the job, help me figure out what we're doing.

Will: I'm also running as the committee of history chair. I feel like that's one method of ensuring continuity. Personally, I just wanted that there's some continuity between the old plan and the new plan. If people want, they can join a committee or something like that.

Sivakami: So first, I'm not sure if committee chairs would be coming to these meetings because it's more quality control. And then second, I think right now there's a lot of continuity in senate. I think your vice speaker, quite a few senators, and your vice president and president are all senators. In the future are committee chairs going to become presidents, and all dorm presidents are replaced?

Jonté: I guess to get to a broader point, with the process being compacted into a week, we didn't get to investigate things like, if we're concerned about continuity in the existing structure. I don't think that's one of our primary concerns, but we didn't really discuss things like if we want things, we want more continuity, we can change Senate elections to the spring as opposed to the fall, that way you've got freshmen who want to join and can be a member of the living groups for a semester. You also get that transition period. I think that's my main concern with how the committee's operations took place because the timeline was so condensed. Especially the things of the existing structure; things that could be addressed were not really examined.

Will: I think there are some serious things to look at. The committee looked at the high level things. I think there's definitely need for another committee to examine the details of the plans. I was wondering if it would be okay to see the proposal for the committee you said you had.



Jonté: I would recommend that we take that up during new business. If we want to take it up now, I would recommend that we motion to change the agenda.

Sivakami: I motion to change the agenda.

**Motion to add the bill to the agenda passes. (20-0)**

Tim J: **\*Authors bill (15.1)\*** I think I've given my justification on why this needs to happen.

Jonté: So, I think I got the feeling from that comments that were made earlier that maybe we need to be informing students more about the plan. While I think there is a definitely a need to inform students about the plan being proposed, we have to be very careful in the communication of that we're not pulling an HDAG and informing people what we're proposing is the new system without giving them an opportunity to know about the new proposal.

Tim R: Who were you thinking would chair this?

Tim J: That's up to the president. I was hoping it would be somebody who has contributed a fair amount and was part of the last committee on restructuring. People that really understood the proposal on what needs to be done.

Jessica: This is, in a way, approving the proposed constitution. That would be going along with the proposed system. I think it's important to say it's not going to be implemented but potentially may be.

Tim J: I want to comment on pulling an HDAG. The comment that was made was, to inform people about the current system. If you were to ask about HDAG, I think people are quite informed about the dining system. The undergrad might know of the UA system now. That's to be taken with a grain of salt. And, also going off of the last comment. The purpose of this committee isn't to say this is what's going to happen. This is what's been suggested by a lot of people who know the system, but we want to get your feedback on what you think. If a bunch of people come to us and say: hey, we want to see this in the proposal. Then, the committee should report that back to Senate and say we had a bunch of people lobbying for X.

Anika: Because DormCon is so effected by this, is it possible that we allow DormCon to elect their own second representative other than necessarily the VP. Just to make it clear for them, if they want to elect the VP. I'd like to propose the amendment of DormCon VP to a second member of DormCon elected by DormCon.

Rachel M: This committee needs to do the work before the next dorm meeting. Also, the DormCon president would probably appoint the DormCon VP.

Anika: I withdraw the motion.

Sivakami: I was wondering why the IFC and Panhel presidents weren't a part of the committee membership and why there was only 1 additional member, no UA senators, other than you as the chair of Ad Hoc committee on restructuring. Also, I wonder if the meetings are open.

Rachel M: IFC, Panhel, LGC, and Off-Campus, the idea was the main governments being affected by the implementation plan, as opposed to the proposal itself, are the dorms. Particularly, it's DormCon. As far as the one additional member, I think one thing that a lot of people observed was it was great to generate ideas then. In a committee like this, to work out details, it will be very hard to make progress. As far as





another senator goes, I think one additional member is fine. That could be a senator or the IFC or Panhel president.

Tim R: I was going to say it would be nice for us to have a bunch of experts go over the process and bring a lot of things to them that was well thought-out and had the full details which they can then decide upon and look at. I don't think we're overstepping the bounds of create another committee.

Karan: I wanted to ask if the UA P/VP-Elect were asked to serve on this committee.

Rachel M: Those may follow their relevant stakeholders. If they don't have anyone there, they'd also be consulted.

Betsy: Also, the UA SG is Alec.

Jonté: About the meetings being open, I think it would be a mistake to have this meeting not be open. Yes, it made it so that it may have been perceived as difficult to get things done. Having a committee that's open is not the same as having one that's open all the time for speaking rights. In addition to that, the way I would've liked to see the committee operate over the last week would be to have smaller breakout groups, work on stuff individually, and have it bring it back to the group. Senators are not going to be effective drafting legislation on the fly. If we did, it would probably take us an hour or two. I think the committee members last time were great. We had all people there. They came there and they knew what they were bringing themselves to. They could weigh in and say you didn't speak on that. To speak to the IFC, Panhel, and the President-Elect and VP Elect, I think the timeline is something that's going to be important to them. I guess I'm saying, with the UA P/VP Elect, it's not even-handed to have UA P on there but not P/VP-Elect, if they're going to have an equal state.

Will: I think the Ad Hoc Committee on Restructuring did a lot of work. This is their chance to come to Senate. I think they can go and do a lot of work, and at the next Senate meeting. They can report back and have a chance to get the input from a lot of stakeholders. I think the UA President and VP-Elect. I trust Vrajesh that he will take the Elects and work with them on a very close level. To make sure those concerns are addressed. I think in terms of membership, I think it's very important that members, I think that's a great thing, one additional member as appointed by the chair. I think that they should contribute to the committee.

Tim J: The UA Secretary General was put on this committee because it is known that it was the VP-Elect.

Vrajesh: I think that, from the whereas clauses, it looks like communication was a piece of this. I'm comfortable adding and the UA VP Elect if that makes people feel better, but I think there ought to be some degree of balance between UA and DormCon as we move the implementation phase. I would be reluctant to make them feel overpowered.

Betsy: I think that the restructuring committee, there was definitely too many people in the room. You don't need breakup rooms to look at the implementation plan.

Jessica: Point of information: Is this open? Are these meetings open or not?

Vrajesh: As a default, since it doesn't say, meetings of UA committees are by default open. Although, senate should talk about whether or not they actually want to put in a clause. Meetings should be closed at the discretion of the chair.

Rachel M: Having smaller membership was not that those are going to be there was those are not the only people in the room, then you would have a smaller group too.



Karan: The main concerns, I think those have been addressed numerous times. I would move to call the question.

**Motion to close discussion passes 12-4.**

**15.1 passes 18-0.**

**Motion to recess for 5 minutes passes.**

**Recess Begins: 8:55 PM; Recess Ends: 9:01 PM.**

Vrajesh: I would like to nominate Rachel Meyer because Tim Jenks recommend her and several others have nominated her.

Rachel M: I served as one of the members at large. I also took minutes. I'm very familiar to what went on. I was on the previous UA constitution bylaws review committee. I also worked on similar implementation style things; so, I think I have the experience to do something like this.

Jonté: What tasks specifically, what specific things do you think the committee will set off to do.

Rachel M: We'd get people to read over the current proposal. Should we work off this or start new. What areas do you think we should work on, what are the relevant stakeholders? I can help set up a plan before the first meeting. We can put that into action. Maybe some things that some people are more familiar with, like dormitory funding, and then assigning people probably more sets of people to talk to relevant people.

Sivakami: What's your stance on the restructuring?

Rachel M: I don't think it matters. I can stay impartial. The purpose of this committee is to focus on creating the best implementation plan possible, if you chose that plan, and to make sure the whole thing is well done.

**\*Senate enters closed discussion.\***

**Rachel Meyer is confirmed as the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Implementation of Potential Restructuring.**

Anika: Do we have to do something with the proposal?

Jonté: That proposal is just laying on the table. We can leave it on the table or refer.

Anika: I move to refer the report to the committee outlined by 15.1

Tim J: It's been referred to in the bill.

Jessica: If they do make amendments, is that what we'll be reviewing or reviewing the old constitution.

Jonté: Technically, the actual thing that Senate has before it is the original proposal. We have not taken up the amendments proposed by the committee. That's a detail. It's my assumption you guys probably want that. To answer your question, if this committee makes amendments, if someone objects, we will have to take an official vote. Technically we shouldn't do it that way but yeah.

Rachel M: I don't envision this committee taking a proactive approach to the structure. In implementation, if we find a proposed amendment, we may bring it back.

Jessica: I just meant before in the original, in the old new constitution, it has an implementation plan; that would all be changed right?



Rachel M: A lot of what needs to be changed is dates, but the spirit of it probably still stands.

## 7. Nominations for Senate Officers

Jonté: Nominations for speaker for 43 UAS. A little bit of background, the period has to be open; therefore, we have to have this here.

Karan: Point of information, how does this work now that we're nominating for a position that won't exist?

Tim J: Right now, it still exists.

Betsy: Tim Jenks.

### **Declines.**

Rachel M: Betsy.

### **Accepts.**

Jessica: Karan.

### **Accepts.**

Karan: Ben.

### **Accepts.**

Sivikami: Janet.

### **Declines.**

Rachel M: I nominate all people that were nominated for Speaker for Vice Speaker.

### **All accepts.**

Rachel M: I nominate Tim J.

### **Declines.**

Ben: Jessica.

### **Declines.**

Alec: Allan.

### **Declines.**

Allan: Point of information – does the Senate Rep to Exec need to be nominated now?

Jonté: I think exec bylaws said it has to be done in the same process. I'll open up the floor. Senate Rep to Exec is essentially a member of Senate; the rules for who this person should be, it's essentially a person who would serve as a voting member of Exec in place for Senate. While you have all the committee chairs and officers, the only voting membership are the President, VP, Speaker, V Speaker, one nominee by the President, and Senate Rep to Exec nominated and approved by Senate. That's the idea; they go there and help the Speaker and Vice Speaker convey what happened to Exec and vice versa.

Jessica: I thought Exec was at senate meetings; why do they still need a rep?



Jonté: Committee chairs should be at a meeting, but depending on how they are run, they may or may not be. If we're going around the table and having people give an update, we might as well have someone who can say Senate's position at an Exec meeting.

Will: I recommend that we send emails out to Senate, and we have this at our next meeting.

## 8. New Business and Discussion

Alec: What are we going to do in terms of approving this set of minutes?

Betsy: Didn't we want another meeting?

Jonté: Okay, I was going to do it during discussion. I want you guys to discuss. I should back up a second; so the bylaws are kind of unclear. This needs to be on the record. They say that I can change a meeting given a week's notice; so, it doesn't say anything about adding meetings. The way I'm going to interpret that is, we take a 2/3 vote. If we all vote we want another meeting on a specific date, we'll have another meeting. Otherwise, you can't call an emergency meeting to amend to the constitution. We couldn't just generally take up topics that are arising. We would have to really focus on the topic. Should we do that?

Betsy: The Chair can talk about this, but I think waiting until the 25<sup>th</sup> really limits implementation options. I think having a voting meeting before then will be good.

Jonté: What do you mean by implementation options?

Betsy: If we vote in the next meeting and don't wait til the 25<sup>th</sup> – by having an earlier meeting, we would have more options; they can take five weeks.

Jessica: I think having a meeting before that will give us time to see what they are proposing to implementation. And if they don't, we still have the meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> to do more work on this.

Rachel M: We're looking at Thursday, April 14<sup>th</sup> or Tuesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>.

Ben: Are these the potential dates for meetings?

Will: I think that's the long weekend. I would recommend having it before the long weekend.

Anika: Can we make it on Monday the 11<sup>th</sup>?

Karan: That's right after CPW.

Alec: I object.

Jessica: That's not enough time.

Betsy: I think it should be Thursday the 14<sup>th</sup>. That will give us time to get some feedback.

Rachel M: I was going to agree with not supporting the Monday after CPW. A lot of us are at least busy 1-3 days of CPW.

Karan: I think will a lot of people have said that before the long weekend is preferable, so we can reach a decision around this 5 day gap. Could we vote on having it on either the 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup>? I motion to having the meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup>.

Anika: What time?

Jonté: That can be decided, but 7:30 if regularly.



Betsy: I was going to say it should be around 7:30, which is after the Dormcon meeting at 5.

Jessica: it's not on a Friday night. And it's not in the middle of the week.

Anika: Motion to close discussion and take a vote.

**Motion passes.**

Jonté: Recap: we had a meeting with new Senators before the Senate Caucus to answer any questions people might have had coming into Senate. At the actual Caucus, what we did was look at some topics. As you might recall, at 42 UAS 14, where there hasn't been much interest, we kind of figured out who wanted to take which topics and we split up into groups of 3-5 to discuss them individually. The topics we took up were Walker, kitchens, and the dining referendum. With Walker Memorial, we went through the process and tried to really flesh it out. We gathered information, generated solutions, and tried to think of the probable solving process we should really be going through. It's pretty elementary, but I've noticed we've been going straight to the solutions. With the Walker discussion, we whittled it down to two main concerns. First is the student groups who might be relocated and second is the loss of activity space that a lot of student groups use. Morss Hall is where I'm sure a lot of student groups hold functions; I know the 2013 class council last year held a semiformal there. That was the discussion; Will came in about halfway through, and he kind of gave us more insight on the actual charge of the committee. We reviewed the charge. With that said, I think I'm going to pass it off to Will, and I'll make a few comments after.

Will: Rachel, the ASA president – you should have also gotten an email, with a copy of the charge. Basically we've got this assessment process, which involves students and also involves associate provosts in charge of all space decisions, some administrators, and faculty members. We'll be looking at all the details; we'll come up with a recommendation which will be presented to the committee for review of space planning with the building committee of MIT, and they will make the final decision. Our main deliverable will be a report of that report to Chris. The two main things we're trying to address is space that's currently allocated to specific student groups and also just large event space like Morss Hall and everyone's favorite gym.

Jonté: One of the recommendations you brought up to the group was about the assessment team itself, and what they really need out of their space. Do you want to talk to those mini details?

Rachel M: I just want to add that those that are in Walker are major or special users.

Will: So, the associate provost has run a process, but we'd like to have much more in depth information. We'd like a whole bunch of questions for major users. That said, anyone can contact the whole assessment team. There are users of Morss Hall. That's [walker-input@mit.edu](mailto:walker-input@mit.edu). That has all the committee members on it. We're going to go through the process. We're going to be looking over the next couple of weeks for feedback. We should expect to have this list of questions out by the end of this weekend or early next week. We also hope to have a chance for people to speak to the committee. It also depends on the committee members themselves. These were the questions that would get a response from interviews or discussions.

Karan: Just one question: I'm pretty sure that there's no net creation for this week. MTA is currently scattered all around campus; they have a bunch of space in building 4 (a suite of offices); they use Kresge, they also have E33, kind of a different space.



Will: The Kendall Square renovations would involve space for 33 and 38. Then there are lots of groups who want space in building 4 or 10. It's unlikely that I can convince people to give student groups the second floor from building 10, which is 5 doors down from administrators. I think we're going to try and work more for space elsewhere unless Senate for some reason desires that. That's kind of what's going to happen. There are a bunch of projects that MIT is pursuing through this whole 2030 process. There's also a lot of integration of other possibilities. A lot of projects may dislocate a lot of people. It's a lot of a case of a jigsaw puzzle. We intend to have the same volume of space leaving Walker Memorial that is generated.

Jonté: One thing we tried to do during the caucus was come up with action items. The tangible was actually getting the recommendation forms to student groups on what they actually need. If someone wanted to draft something saying we support this and just let the committee take care of it, that's a question you guys might want to consider over the next week.

I wanted you guys to kind of pitch any action items to Senate that you believe are important and any process that you guys went through in arriving at those action items.

Jessica: Ok, so for kitchen renovations, we wanted to be clear as to exactly what type of input Dean Humphreys wanted. Did he just want a recommendation of the process or what exactly? The way we saw it was, we believe that the dining and facility chairs from every dorm should be gathered. Once it is made clear to us how he wants to go about the dorm order, it should be clearer with the specific dorm that would be undergoing the renovations that they should specify what their dorm needs. We recommend that it would be a project of contacting the relevant people or leaving it up to a resurrected dining committee, since that seems to be what will work. We'd let that go for now.

Ben: One of the main concerns was about timing. If we want to respond quickly, we need a point person to talk to. We were hoping we're going to have a new dining chair for a couple of weeks.

Vrajesh: I can suggest one thing, which is slightly dangerous because we didn't ask beforehand. Hawkins, can you be the point person for now? That way we can at least have someone working on something beforehand.

Allan: I promise you nothing, but we'll likely have someone for you by the next meeting. I have some interviews, and I'd like to have more. I would encourage some of the freshmen senators this year looking to move up to apply. It's a great way to do something.

Jonté: Hawkins, do you have a good idea of what's going on?

Jessica: When we were gathering information, we didn't know much about the specifics or if he wants a specific dining chair. We understand that he has been going to the dorms, but we don't know what he's been asking them or what they said. A little bit more clarification on that would help.

Jonté: If I recall from your presentation at the caucus, going off that last point: yes, he's going around and seeing them, but it would be really nice if he could communicate what he intends. The point person could communicate this stuff that he needs to know when he comes to dorms, so that they're prepared. I think the idea is that there needs to be coordination.

Ashley: He came to Senior House basically asking what we wanted. That's very specific to the dorm itself. The basic idea is that we sit down with them and they come up with a plan and see if it is possible: if it's expensive, they just take the plan back and forth until they actually do the renovations. There will





probably also need to be some adjustment time. Things like, you may want that, but it's actually a fire hazard. It seems like there's going to be a 2-5 year plan. You would usually round up. The whole point of the dorm discussions is going to see the space itself. It's to say, yes we want those things, or we actually want a list of completely different things.

Jessica: If he's going off of a template, it needs to be relevant and it needs to apply to all the dorms. Some of the kitchens are in suites, some are used by 40 people, and others are used by 20. The way that he presented it seemed like he was going to use a template. If each individual dorm wants their own renovations, they should just stay in touch but there would no longer be a need for any template.

Ashley: I think each dorm establishes their own template.

Jonté: I'm going to interject. My interpretation of the template was to be used for budgeting. Even though there are all these different dorms, look at it from the administration's standpoint. I'm going to make a budget and propose that somebody, probably the dean of student life and the finances department specifically, look at it and make sure it's going to be proposed over the next few years. They need to budget. They're not going to spend 5 million dollars.

Jonté: I think in general, it seems like there are some points that need to be qualified. I 'm going to recommend that Hawkins, if you're going to be the point person, you just follow up.

Hawkins: My idea of a template was more of, "how many refrigerators do you need for 100 students." That can be applied to a lot. Same with number of microwaves for students.

Ben: It might be useful to have a meeting with Dean Humphreys to get more things fleshed out. To put that as a kind of action item.

Jonté: The last caucus topic was the dining referendum; we had a couple others in that group. I don't know which one wants to take it. We had a dining referendum, so now what do we do?

Janet: We can see that the results clearly show that the majority of students don't support the new dining plan. What we want to figure out now is how much do they not support it. One way to see that is to look at how many people want to move out of their dorms for dining. McCormick seems to have six people. After that, if we do find out that students really want to push dining, potential action items can be to try to form a focus group to figure out what the issues are and try to run some kind of survey. We could talk to relevant administrators and figure out what we're going to establish at this point and how far along we are in the process, and at the very least, we'd want to be involved in the implementation. The other thing we want to do is also write a report detailing that if we don't think the HDAG process was fair, how we want the process to run in the future, so that we don't repeat this.

Jonté: To summarize, what are the recommendations within the next week or two, or month or semester?

Janet: I guess we don't really have a dining chair, but maybe we could get a temporary one to try and start working on some of these things. Figure out how much of an issue dining still is.

Rachel M: Just to clarify, there were only 6 from McCormick that wanted to move to BC or MacGregor; others may be moving to other dorms.

Karan: Are we any closer to having a timeline for decisions from the administration?

Vrajesh: I know they're very close to selecting a vendor.



Karan: For my constituents, yes, a lot of people don't like the plan coming in, but they understand that it's going to happen. What they'd like to see within this plan are ways to improve the experience. There are a lot of little points that can make or break dining for students. If we ignore those, we're missing a lot of potential to speak up from our constituents.

Jessica: Just to follow up, they have mentioned that they'll still be making modifications, and I feel like that's where our constituents' voices should still be heard.

Jonté: I think what I hear is a case for a dining committee. So what I would recommend is that once we have it set up, we need to give the committee very specific tasks for what they should be working to accomplish. Otherwise, I think we're going to be in a situation where we keep saying that we don't have a dining committee and have been kicking the can. I would strongly recommend someone to take the steps that would provide the right focus.

Karan: If such a committee existed, probably the most useful thing to look at would be, what are small tasks within the broader plan that we can take. They want to see under the knowledge that the broader system can exist. I feel like we need a long time; it won't help us to come back to this again.

Jonté: If our two main things are to make this dining plan less painful, we need to collect feedback from the students as it stands. That's if we want to take a stand on the process and ensure that the process going forward and reviewing it is going to be effective. I think this committee also needs to take a look at the process and maybe it just needs to outline the major missteps. Talk about how we can go about working with administrators to devise process that's more effective and representative in the future. Hopefully you guys, if you're interested in writing the legislation -- I was involved in the legislation passed in December last year. If you have questions, please feel free to find me, Janet, any of the officers, to try and gain some support. You guys all have a lot of great ideas. Is there any more discussion on this topic? The last question I have is on advising. I haven't heard that much on it.

Vrajesh: I know there's been a group pilot this year. The last I heard about it, once the year's over, they'll be looking at the data to assess whether it will be successful or not.

Jonté: Can you give us more details?

Vrajesh: I think it was testing an advising-centered model. There's a pilot going on.

## 9. Closing Remarks

Jonté: We have a meeting, not this Thursday but the week after that. It seems like we're in a mode where we're trying to review the proposal. I would also encourage you guys that if you have any other ideas, that you are prepared should we need to take a vote at either meeting, and hopefully at the last. You need to make sure you are absolutely certain that the choices we're making are in line with what your constituents want. Please review some of the action items and think about if you'll be interested in running for senate officer positions, or have any questions for those candidates that are here now. In general, think about what you'd like to accomplish through the rest of the semester. Although we nearly had 11 constituency events last semester, we've had less than two, if that maybe, this semester. You guys have money to spend on your constituencies, and now that we're reviewing this proposal, it might be a good time to reach out to them and get your feedback. The process is to submit the proposal, then we review it. Also, come to CPW, help us out, help us get prefrish interested in the Institute. One of the



reasons I chose MIT was that I saw that we had a pretty strong student life and student government. Keep in mind that you guys have the opportunity to bring excited prefrish to MIT.

Rachel M: People interested in being on the committee, talk to me.

**The meeting was adjourned at 10:01 pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai  
UA Secretary General