



42 U.A.S. 16

Draft Minutes from April 14, 2011

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

1. Opening Remarks

Jonté: Welcome to everybody tonight. *Some missed introductory comments.* We're also going to take up international orientation. Without much further ado; I'm not sure I have anything else in my opening remarks.

2. Exec Update

Vrajesh: Nothing in particular to update Senate on at this time

Jonté: Excellent.

3. Report from Committees

Michael: Really quick list of everything that we're on right now. A lot of these were our goals in terms of concessions, stay in danger somewhere during games, DAPER tried that before, another interesting idea was to see if we can have a food truck near the track during athletics events. In terms of trainer availability, expansion would require a lot of money. We're seeing if more BU students would be willing to volunteer. We were talking to student groups about performing at the next lacrosse games. In terms of other sports we've talked to, Volleyball won't be able to do it. Soccer football and basketball. In terms of PE credit for club sports, kind of a pretty big issue, it might require hiring another administrative person, it might require the administration to look over, to give infrastructure that clubs probably do not have. So, they added it to DAPER's strategic plan. Even if this position was to be added, it would still be kind of a tough transition to get all club sports. In terms of enrollment, this actually could be a problem in a few years or so. Right now, DAPER's program has gotten filed up. Right now, they put 10 percent more people on, they sign up more than could go to classes, 20% attrition rate. Something we're going to talk with them about are ways to fix that or to expand the program in general. Finally, athletics weekend, it was too late this year to get that going. DAPER wants to notify 2-3 months in advance. We're working on the end of this year to get it ready for next semester.

Janet: When would athletics weekend be?

Michael: Not decided yet; we're discussing it, and DAPER is going to organize games around that weekend.

Jessica: Was athletics weekend something that usually happens?

Michael: It was pretty routine but have been sporadic lately. I haven't been to one. Obviously, that's one issue, because the committee was young and we weren't exactly sure how to plan it. It should look good for next semester.

Jonté: I think an email went out to undergrads recently about a tournament. What was that?

Michael: There have been a couple of tournaments. Ones that some organization in DAPER sponsors, we've been helping them out with publicity and getting more teams to sign up.



Janet: There's a Facebook event.

Michael: Yes, like it.

4. Approval of Minutes

Alec: Motion to postpone definitely to 17.

Motion passes with a white ballot.

5. Discussion

Guests: Thank you for inviting us today. We are presidents of the International Students Association, Isabella is an international freshman. We put together a presentation, it's in two sections, first to tell you what international orientation is. Then, we have a short survey, I don't know if you all are aware, but they're going to change international orientation from a 4 day event to just two days (in the mornings). We are kind of very concerned about this. As is the rest of the international student body.

Many of us don't come from English speaking countries, international orientation, for many, is the very first time we come to the United States, in our year, there was this guy, trust me there was this very big thing to find yourself in the middle of Boston, it's mostly a cultural shock, the MIT shock will come much later, in the survey, we asked for additional comments, this student really summarized very well the feelings on the impact of international orientation.

In previous years, international orientation would be one week before normal Orientation. That was very good for us, with all the regular students that come to MIT for orientation, it's super chaotic, that week gives us a very smooth introduction to what campus life issues. It gives us time for all these things we have to do. We don't have cell phones. You have to figure out how to open a bank account. We wouldn't have time to enjoy other activities. These are things, as an international student, you come and you have no idea how to figure it out. You are discovering this new place, and it really takes time. There are some sessions on immigration, financial aid, then we get some orientation. There were more informal sessions, like introduction to American culture. We get to learn of things that many of you might take for granted. People laugh at some of these things. Many of us don't know these things exist. The other things we have, with the upperclassmen, teach us how to move in the city, there are so many students that haven't been in a big city. As an international student, you feel very lost, you don't manage the language as well. What's happening now, international orientation will take place during Tuesday and Wednesday mornings of regular Orientation, and we're only going to have the mandatory immigration and banking sessions. They just tell you you're going to get deported for everything you do. Our main worry was cutting on the times you have to adapt. And the rest of the student body.

So, on Monday we issued a survey, so just 4 short questions. The first was do you agree with the international orientation changes? 84% of respondents said No. We received 135, and that's 35% of the 391 international students. Second question was how important was international orientation if for making friends, adapting to the US, and adapting to campus. They could rate in a scale. The purple and green bars summed up to more than 80%, so it does have a very big impact.

On the 3rd slide, for networking, personal, mentoring, extracurricular, and academic success. Same scale. For all the aspects, very important and important summed up to over 50%. The two most important were networking and personal, more than 80%. Finally, the last question, how do you feel the changes might affect the experience, almost 80% said it would have a negative effect.



So what are the main concerns? It's really not a matter of shortening orientation. Shift it, instead of starting on Monday you can start on Wednesday. It's really about the overlap with regular orientation. You're basically taking a 4 day event and making it a 6 hour event. The first will be we'll have a harder time adjusting to US culture. There are still things that might sound unimportant, perhaps some things we'll take for granted. Learning that "how are you" doesn't mean give me an entire report of how your day was. Second, less interaction between internationals, I'm sure you've seen it around, fairly limited interaction, we have these two events going on at the same time, not only to go to the mandatory events for Orientation, but also to just settle down in the US. Get a phone, get a computer. Exchange your money. Things perhaps, like how many of us actually have family plans with other international students. We kind of all go together to get our phones. The 3rd point is losing that support network that is actually there for our 4 years at MIT, going through the same troubles, filing taxes for the first time, etc. All these issues that come up eventually. Our parents can't help us, they haven't been through it. All we have is that network of peers. Just to sum it up, it's not just about learning legal laws, but it's really about just giving us that time to adjust to MIT and American culture. We don't understand the reasons. We assume it's to cut down costs, we're willing to collaborate, and we understand their financial concerns. We really ask you to understand how important this is for us, and just kind of respect the time and perhaps you can reach the middle ground. I don't know if there are any questions.

Tim J: How were you informed?

Guests: The way we found out about this was it was imbedded in one of the articles a while ago. The first thing we did was speak , it turns out that they were super kept in the dark. We were just informed, it was them who in the end told us that. MIT just told us it's being shortened. They already have events planned, there's something they can really do about it. I'm not sure what are the decisions behind it and what can be done.

I guess what works is that, every year I think there is like 8% of the undergraduates, I think we're still a pretty big group that it seems to us very unfair to be kept completely in the dark, Perhaps we would understand more if we were actually given the reasons.

Tim R: Do you have leadership within the international community. I know students stick close together after international orientation. Do you have weekly lunch or something?

We're actually an association for both graduate and undergraduate students. We try to have study breaks, it's also really strange, we don't work with international student office, but we tried to have immigration session. We have discussion sessions, etc. We try to keep the momentum of international orientation along. There's no like official leadership.

MIT has considered the International Student Office as the voice for them. It's become a fuzzy area. If you have any suggestions on how to approach, that would be great.

Jonté: Can you give some more information on this Vrajesh?

Vrajesh: I honestly don't know.

Guests: I think it had something to do with REX. You know, they were not changing REX but now we're changing international orientation. UAAP perhaps. Perhaps you can just help us out. What they actually mean by no it's not possible and yes it's possible.

Tim R: Nobody you know was contacted about this? No survey, nothing.



Tim J: You don't know who specifically does this right?

Guests: It's in the international students. They're like student coordinators, I don't know who's actually the head about that.

Sandra: I don't know how much you know, but do you know when the international students will be flying in. I remember trying to get a flight, if you come, you have to get a flight, come in Sunday.

Guests: It used to be that you'll be able to come in Saturday before Orientation starts. I assume in this case, you'll be able to come in the Saturday before all the undergrads. We don't actually know who gets to make the decision. If one of our main problems is getting the phone, the bank account, etc.

Vrajesh: I would start with UAAP, their office is 7-103, 104. If you walk down it's on the right side.

Guests: Someone in particular?

Vrajesh: Julie Norman.

Rachel M: Also, Elizabeth Young.

Will: We also have this Orientation Committee.

Rachel M: We're talking about Orientation 2012 that we're looking at. Definitely getting feedback for long term issues, but it looks like you also need to address this coming year. I think the best first step for now would be to go to UAAP.

Will: You can check with Rachel and the other student members of that committee. They have more background.

Jessica: Do international students participate in FPOPs?

Guests: It's fuzzy. They tell us that we can't, but if we ask they allow us. I think last year we could apply. I think we could choose whether or not to go to many of the events.

Karan: Do you have knowledge on what events [in regular Orientation] that they'll be missing out on with the proposed changes?

Guests: I'm assuming they'll be doing things then. The first couple of days are important, if the international students are forced to miss those days, it's very hard for us to connect with other students. Also, as you said before. It's not as much of the events themselves, and just giving us the separate time to say we're not in the same boat, we're all alone. It sounds really like a minor thing. It allows us to deal with the extra shock a better way.

Betsy: If international orientation is during regular orientation, as a temporary solution, have you considered the International Students Association doing an FPOP, basically doing it like an FPOP for Orientation. You could do something this year as an alternative.

Guests: That's a good idea. How are FPOPs run?

Betsy: I don't know who they're managed by.

Rachel: UAAP. There's one half that are run by various programs, sets of students, etc. that are fairly closely tied with UAAP. And the other half are the academic ones that are more directly managed by the academic departments.



Will: There seems to be kind of this new information, it might get people attention, you could write a letter for the tech. You might get a change. That will get people looking and contacting you.

Jonté: Do you have any allies in the international student office you can work with? I think you should and we will help you go to UAAP. We do, but to be completely honest, the person is not this pushy type of person, so it might be hard. Historically, they've always kind of taken things.

Tim J: These O-Coordinators, are they regular O-Coordinators, just for international students. Because there might be ones that can help you moving forward?

Guests: Yeah, she's also in our committee.

Hawkins: I was curious if Leah has anything on this.

Leah: This is the first I've heard about this change. Everything I heard about changes was waiting for 2012. I'm going to reiterate on a couple of points. I'm going through the emails, I've seen the emails. I'd say go right to UAAP, go right to the sources, Elizabeth Young and Julie Normam. Let them know your concerns. The big concern is that you're so disconnected from this. Don't have. I would go right to UAAP. That's my two cents. DO the same thing you did here.

Jonté: Thank you guys very much for coming.

Next on the agenda is kitchen renovations. This was my chance to ask Hawkins. If there have been any change or anything that needs Senate action.

Hawkins: Actually, it's been a pretty rough week. I may not have had enough time to think about this. I touched on this last week, but I think one of the things that's being misunderstood is the idea of a template. I think template in this case will be more of a ratio of students to type of kitchen facilities. Instead of standardized setups.

Betsy: Ratio, what do you mean?

Hawkins: Like if you have 50 students, you need so many refrigerators. But I haven't been able to think much beyond that.

Betsy: Dean Humphreys is coming to East Campus.

Will: He went to senior house. He liked our deep fried chicken with bacon bits. We had a potluck. It went reasonably well. We were suggesting the idea of having specific outside staff to clean the kitchens. We personally feel if we want that or not. I raise the idea of having the students hired for this. Kind of just making sure that there aren't dishes in the sinks.

Jessica: I think Humphreys was at MacGregor. There weren't really any notes, but he apparently talked to some entries. Do you think the ratios will be different for cook for yourself and dining dorms?

Hawkins: Good question. I don't have an answer.

Jonté: The next topic was raised to be through the officers. Essentially, it's been put on the radar that it's been suggested, an potentially decided, that Maseeh Hall may have binding RBA. The residents have been speaking to their housemasters to try and discuss if RBA is what their community wants. How they can interface with administration to make it nonbinding. As you recall, our report on Orientation was re-endorsed, back then when Next House was still under binding RBA. Our statement was if a dorm has RBA, they should be able to choose if it's binding.



Tim J: If you have binding RBA, can you not move out of the dorm?

Alec: Not during REX. Non-binding dorm people can move during REX.

Tim J: I heard upperclassmen had to sign contract saying they'll live there.

Rachel M; RBA doesn't apply to upperclassmen, only freshmen

Jessica: What's the impact? Do they want RBA or not?

Tim J: When was this communicated?

Vrajesh: Late February.

Jessica: What keeps it binding? Where is it binding, only McCormick?

Alec: New, some of the cultural houses.

Rachel M: For what keeps it binding – Inter-dorm move day is the same day as freshmen meet with their advisers and get registered, so the assertion is that it would make it difficult to assign advisers or transfer advisers later.

Alec: The notification was late February.

Jonté: So Residence Based Advising, you have an advisory group that's in your living group and an RAA that lives in your dorm. You can have dorm based events that are residence based. Is there any discussion here? My recommendation is, if they run into any issues, we can have a discussion about the topic itself as well.

6. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Implementation of Potential Restructuring

Rachel M: Hopefully, you've all seen the summary so I'm not going to read that. I've already read it 5 times today. In terms of what the committee members have done, we worked a lot on communication; the summary document was the big thing. We had a lot of people reaching out to different faculty, staff, and administrators, as well as other student entities. We got the right range of feedback. Basically, the feedback was either they didn't want to express their particular opinion or they didn't particularly have an opinion or they wanted to leave the details up to students. It ranged from, 'Why didn't you do this years ago?' to "You should wait a couple weeks," 'You should wait a few months', or 'You should wait a year or two.' In terms of the aggregate of that, I think it was wait a bit, but you can't really statistically analyze that data. In terms of the implementation plan, the recommendations we made were to flush out some of the committees, potentially add some committees. We also updated all the dates. They were based on a April 4, not April 14 Senate meeting. In terms of participation, my impression was that issues were addressed and we reached out extensively. We didn't get too much feedback. We could have ideas come up. There was some proposal from cultural houses to represent their groups. I guess the point that I was leading into, as many of you know, the vote failed DormCon at a lower percentage than last time. My understanding was that we are not ready to move forward because there is no buy in. The current recommendation from myself as chair is to postpone, which means at the current point, this proposal dies since it's been on the table for a while.

Shuang: How much did the vote fail by in DormCon?

Rachel: Previously it was 67% in favor. Today, it was 57% in favor.



Tim R: Did you email that out? Or is that information on the mailing list?

Will: Why don't you email it out.

Tim R: I'm just asking for it.

Rachel M: I can do that later.

Jonté: Your recommendations were to postpone?

Rachel M: My recommendations were not to postpone this bill, it was to postpone consideration of this matter. The level of amendments to make DormCon agree are not something that can happen quickly.

Jonté: How do you see Senate moving forward?

Rachel M: Senate can pursue what they want to do in this matter. I'm not convinced that the dorm presidents against would participate in the council, had it been formed. If you don't have participation, then it won't be successful. There are more drastic measures, but I don't think you can do it in three weeks and carry it out successfully.

Hawkins: Was there discussion?

Rachel M: There were a few points of discussion. There were actually some amendments. One for those was allowing the presidents to appoint a proxy. It was brought up that this was not a time commitment they signed up for, allowing a longer period. There was also something that needed a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote as opposed to a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote for next semester to make amendments. The third was having DormCon continue to meet for the remainder of next semester to figure out details, transition to committees, and figure out finances, that was to occur after REX or at the end of REX. It appears the consensus was to do it before the end of the semester. I tried to ask but there was a room of blank stares. Then the president adjourned.

Tim J: Do you know how many went to communicate?

Rachel M: Not particularly. I know emails went out on some dorms. I know Alec has been talking actively. I found out from Jessica that it came up at a HouseComm meeting, but that was not something shared at DormCon.

Karan: One concern moving forward is also an issue now. We're currently in April 13th or 14th. We have very little time by the end of the semester. There's going to be a new UA P and VP. We also passed some sort of structure, some sort of new system. That's very short non-existent transition period. Either something has to be done very quickly, or it would have to be pushed back.

Rachel M: The committee did discuss that. I can show you the draft transition plan. That's why we slated it for transition starting today. I think the committee whole-heartedly agreed to that. That's what we conveyed to presidents and we did not receive negative feedback, beyond the vote.

Abel: I believe Burton Conner voted 100% again. Alex told me the reason for that is that he believes the timeline would seem rushed to the administration and the new structure would lose legitimacy to the eyes of the administration. You don't have any other specific reasons for why the other dorms voted against it?

Rachel M: I think my personal, and my committee's argument was that no one offered up concrete things. The few things that came up were forming an institute committee or consultants. It was quickly dismissed that neither are possible. In fact, I know institute committees have tried to approach this and have been unsuccessful, including some at the top. If they can't do it, a new institute committee isn't going to be



able to. There was some concern about whether or not we're engaging. There was actual lack of understanding. We're really at a loss of what else we could be doing.

Abel: You also mentioned the reaction varied very widely. You said you can't really quantify qualitative data like that. Can you give us a rough idea of where the general trend lies.

Rachel M: Housemasters were of a vague, 'You should take longer.' The Chancellor and Dean Colombo agreed with them. My understanding is the Chancellor is supporting the Dean's position on this. I could hypothesize on why he holds various opinions. As far as that, some of the more technical excerpts, SLOAN, Faculty Chair, CJAC members were ones that recommended faster timeline and pushing forward consistently.

Jonté: You mentioned that the Chancellor is in support of the dean's decision - why do you think that?

Rachel M: My understanding is that he has told people that. This is something, since Colombo has been...he sees this as a DSL centric matter. If Colombo has an opinion on it, he's going to support them on that opinion. That said, I didn't speak to Colombo or Grimson; so, I can tell you little about what questions were asked or answered.

Jonté: So, I met with the Chancellor and from what I gathered, I mentioned at DormCon, he was open to the idea of doing an institute committee. You said you think that's impractical, but he was open to this idea. My recommendation to Senate is that we figure out whether we want to restructure, and if so, in light of that, we try to engage him with moving forward with asking these questions. I think we need to define the problem or at least get started in that process and then engage him, create a committee, or restart another committee to relook at the issue. Otherwise, I think we're going to be wasting our time if we're not getting a buy in already. My recommendation is we should consider if we're going to restructure and if so how we're going to do that.

Betsy: I think we've spent over a month now, in the form of a variety of committee. If people who don't show up to meetings think we should restructure, I don't care what you think. We've had so many things, if there are still people out there who still think we need to have things, and if you're not an active member, I don't care what you think. I think it's been decided.

Off the record

Will: I think if we're going to make a proposal, the people we should talk to are the dorm presidents. Any proposal we need, needs to have a buy in. We need to talk to them and I don't think an institute committee is the way to do that. If we need to change how senate works, we need to have the support of this body. We don't need an institute committee

Karan: Two things. One, I'd just like to bring up a point that Betsy has made. People aren't engaged by a political body. Guys, 30% actually votes on UA P elections, but does that mean we don't consider the remaining 70? Second, the current proposal, it doesn't have buy in. It lost buy in, in fact, at DormCon, by 10%. How do we communicate that to the people voting on it current? We can say we love this proposal, but if we can't get DormCon to buy in, we can't move forward.

James: We've been studying this for over a month, don't you mean we've been studying it for 10 years. This had repeatedly come up. The answer has always been yes. Every single time CJAC says yes, the Corporation says yes, the Advisory Board says yes. Everyone says we need to restructure. I'm just curious why we need to form a committee.



Tim R: As an elected member, I'm sadly disappointed with how things have passed. I don't think we should hold back on a change, just because a small amount of people disagree with it. Like it or not there are benefits. To have a couple people derail what could have been a much better step is saddening to me.

Jonté: I want to respond to a few points. The fact that CJAC was unable to come to a solution, are we more qualified than CJAC? I'm not sure why that's a sufficient reason to stop that. What I'm saying is, we have a chance to speak to the issue of whether we should restructure at all. I wanted to make sure everyone's on the same page that there are problems. What I'm saying is, throughout the process, I don't think we've figured out what the problems are and we haven't followed a process that is clear in articulating those problems. You start with a problem and then generate solutions. You don't generate a solution and then point to a problem. The last point, to a few points indicated by the process. Our constitution sets $\frac{3}{4}$ because that's the level of buy in we need. I think some changed we need; however, completely replacing the constitution is not something we can do given the thought. I think we should separate the structure from how we're running the organization because we're not following the constitution as we laid out here.

Betsy: To respond to Karan, if 70% don't care, should we just totally ignore them? What did we do. We have to extrapolate from the 30%. One thing the UA should do is reach 100% campus participation. I don't think spending another month, just sitting and waiting for people to respond, works. Second, I think that, regarding Grimson, he's a great guy. He's not doing this in our best interest. He's willing to work with us. That doesn't mean to agree with us. We started from the ground up, a blank slate. That discussion worked because there were six people. It doesn't work to have a discussion in any of the committees we had. We're not going to be able to have that in a room of 30 people. I don't think the mindset is such that we're going to have that productive discussion.

Rachel M: To reiterate and to speak further on the Chancellor, I wouldn't question if he has our best interests in mind, but I will state it is not his sole job. He has other responsibilities too and sometimes they come in conflict. As is true for every single faculty member, it is our job to determine that. As far as need to get buy in, to DormCon specifically, I think it's a big presumption to say we need DormCon buy in completely. Additionally, whether is 57% or 67%, the majority of their government does not think their government is effective. Whether or not they're a government is a huge blow to the dorm's identity. It's up to those dorms and not 75% of them..

Sivakami: I just wanted to bring up something to James' point. I've spoken to many faculty member that aren't on board with this. Maybe at the end of the day, they'll come back with the same overall suggestion about disbanding DormCon. I think the faculty led the creation of DormCon in 1944 and it sort of puts us at odds with them because we're disbanding something they supported.

Alec: I'm uncomfortable saying we were elected to represent students without consulting them. The last time someone said that, HDAG happened and it destroyed a big percent of my dorm.

Will: To kind of move the conversation along. There are a lot of internal things. For example, there's a position of speaker for nominations. They're going to have a lot of control over how senate should exist for things will be done. To move that along, I would like to nominate myself to Speaker. If there are no objections, I'm willing to go along and take it.

Vrajesh: Objection.



Tim R: I was going to get back to the statement, I think what I meant to clarify is to do what's been implied as best based on obligation and consulting with constituencies.

Hawkins: I was also thinking of moving the conversation along. maybe it is generally agreed that we need to restructure. That's the start of looking at the problems. That's the look at the why. What are the current structures?

Tim J: A lot of this comes from: A, people don't know; B, people don't care; or C people don't think for themselves. If you get it on with all those three, you can come to your own conclusions on that. I don't think more people are with it. I'm not going to say more because I want to move on. Motion to close discussion and move on.

Rachel M: My one piece of business; can we please just dissolve this committee?

Will: Motion to end discussion on Restructuring.

Motion to dissolve committee passes.

7. New Business and Discussion

Jonté: We'll now take up nominations for Senate officers. As soon as it gets a second, I'll accept.

Seconded.

Jonté: The floor is still open for nominations for speaker or vice speaker.

Allan: I just want to remind people to think of Senate Rep to Exec.

Shuang: What's the title for the Senate Rep to Exec, or is it just that?

Janet: Yes, it's just that.

Jonté: Would you like something more formal?

Vrajesh: I nominate Betsy for Dining Committee Chair. I think Betsy can go ahead and answer questions.

Jessica: Point of information - is this dining chair for the end of this year?

Vrajesh: End of this year.

Sivakami: I thought Allan and Alec were going to do this.

Some confusion.

Allan: I did the interviews, and I nominated Betsy with Alec besides me. But it's still Vrajesh's administration.

Shuang: Do we know who the dining vendor is?

Everyone: Bon Appetit.

Senate enters closed discussion

Betsy Riley is confirmed as Chair of the Dining Committee.

Tim J: I sent out an e-mail to Senate about a bill for international orientation. ***Closed session*** I'd love to get a bill out tonight if you all can take a look at it. We need a couple clauses. I think this is a good issue and it means a lot for the 8%. If they didn't want or care for the issue, they wouldn't be here so we can support them. With that you all should edit the Google document.



Jonté: I'm going to recommend that we take a recess now or recommend that we take this up as a discussion topic.

Tim J: Motion to recess.

Recess Begins: 8:59 pm; Recess Ends: 9:14 pm.

Jessica: Motion to postpone new business until after discussion.

Motion passes.

Alec: Motion to close discussion.

Recess Begins: 9:16pm; Recess Ends: 9:20 pm.

Tim J: ***Authors bill***

Karan: We heard their presentation, maybe 8 members of the committee, they're currently being disenfranchised, and it is our opportunity to speak on behalf of them.

Vrajesh: In what context are they representative of the 8%?

Rachel M: The two presidents were representative of the International Students Association.

Vrajesh: Who have we consulted in the International Students Office?

Betsy: What if they did consult ISO and they said sure?

Rachel M: Their understanding is that ISO was told that the decision was made.

Jonté: I'm going to point out the point that people are getting out. I really like the idea of the bill. We have to independently verify, otherwise our legislation doesn't seem like it has power. I'm concerned about us not being able to do very much about this. My Recommendation is we task the President or President Elect informally to do this. If that process is not successful and if ISA is not successful in engaging, then we pass this.

Vrajesh: We did say at that time, the international student orientation will be moved forward to overlap. Obviously you do have the right to overrule decisions that are made by us, with a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote, but that's something that should be considered with what you guys want to do. If you want this to be done in an expedient method, this may not be the best thing for me to do. I have other things on my plate.

Karan: In the letter, they said there would be potential overlap with the ASEs. The new structure is an entire overlap of the international orientation with regular orientation. The second thing I would agree is that this is a time sensitive issue. We can informally task someone; if the UAP has a busy workload, then the UAP Elect can do it.

Tim J: Question, when you signed the letter, how much did you talk to international students?

Vrajesh: Not much.

Tim J: Okay, I'd like to get this passed tonight, so can you strike that? That the International Student Office has not been sufficiently consulted.

Jonté: Any objections? I'll just go ahead and do it.

Vrajesh: Also, I think the UA AVP of Orientation can do this, too.

Some confusion on this position



Jonté: My understanding was that the AVP would be operating for a narrow timeframe.

Vrajesh: I'm just putting a different option. If you guys want, one of us can do it. But if you want it fast, I have stuff this week and it's Thursday already.

Allan: So I have a lot of things on my plate; I'm not opposed. There are logistical issues, like the letter Vrajesh signed. If I go advocate as anti-policy, it would look bad.

Tim J: How about, we give this piece of paper to the ladies who came in here and presented. You can ask Julie Norman to say hey, this is a problem and you should talk to them and just let them take over.

Allan: I'm not opposed to fighting for students.

Vrajesh: I think you should decide which battles we pick; you can't have every single battle. There are a number of things this year that we haven't fought, and we might pick this one; that's up to Senate. I would say, given the letter clearly said this change is made for financial reasons or for resources, that leads me to believe that the office is not going to have full information anymore.

Tim R: I have to second what Vrajesh is saying. It was my impression that the letter was the end to UA's involvement and knocking on doors. If we're trying to reset this, I don't know if that's the most appropriate way to do it. It's certainly not optimal to have somebody sign off and not reconsider something because they got mad. I think we should postpone this.

Tim J: I think this would be a great example of a significant issue that really does affect people on campus and would help them a lot. I think this is a battle that, if we can fight, and lose. ***Off the record.*** I think this would be a great example of a significant issue that really does affect people on campus and would help them a lot. I think this is a battle, that if we can fight, and lose. ***Off the record.***

Vrajesh: The first thing is, we should scratch the first That clause. That That clause conflicts with that. I like the spirit of the rest of the bill. The second That clause is interesting; that's actually fine, but the question was raised whether an international student representative should exist on the Orientation committee. I think ultimately, it was either one of the deans or the chair that said it was not necessary. So, that's just background information. It doesn't prohibit them from actively engaging them. The future of those, including international students should be engaged.

Tim J: Also, one of the Whereas clauses disappeared.

Confusion on previous amendment was just to take out "ISO"

Rachel M: I'd agree with Vrajesh's comment about the first couple That clauses. What I would recommend is framing it before finalizing changed. They would engage the community for this year, but not state that it should not be changed. Maybe things like moving it closer or not overlapping and leaving future orientation issues would be my two reasons for amending those clauses.

Vrajesh: Two points. The first point is, messing up something like this, will affect our credibility. With the second Whereas clause, the way you frame it, will affect things. I don't think we have enough data on whether or not they were consulted. It would be much fairer to say particular people feel like they weren't included, rather than say that the body wasn't consulted. I guess the first thing I'm going to do is move to remove the first That clause. I move to white ballot that.

Amendment passes.



Vrajesh: About the second Whereas clause, I would move to amend it, the 'is necessary and successful' to 'serve as a successful transition period.' Move to white ballot.

Amendment passes.

Vrajesh: For the third Whereas, 'Whereas particular members of the International Student Committee did not feel sufficiently consulted.' Move to white ballot.

Rachel M: Do we really want to say particular? They do have some survey data that it does support. I amend the amendment to take out 'particular.'

Alec: White ballot.

Vrajesh: Double white ballot.

Double white ballot passes.

Vrajesh: I move to strike the last two Whereas clauses.

Rachel M: My suggestion was the spirit of those is useful. What's causing issues is the definitiveness. Even just changing the two 'will's in those associations may convey the same sentiment and not seem extreme and unsupported.

Vrajesh: I withdraw this amendment and then I propose what Rachel just suggested.

Jonté: I don't think people have any objections to that.

Vrajesh: Finally, I think we should change UA President.

Tim J: Motion to change it to UA President-Elect.

Vrajesh: I'm not happy but I'm not going to make a big objection. You know what, I'll do it. I move to pass this right now. It's fine, I'll do it.

Allan: Do you just not like me?

Tim J: I'm going to continue with my motion to change it to UA President-Elect.

Rachel M: Even if it says president, he can delegate it, and he gave us more of a consistent message.

Betsy: What Rachel said.

Tim R: I trust Vrajesh more right now.

Allan: I don't feel that was necessary but that's okay. Constitutionally, the UA President is the sole spokesman. Constitutionally, he should be doing it. I don't think people should be insulting my character publicly because that's just bullshit. But I call to question.

Karan: We keep saying we've already set policy. 'm going to read one sentence quickly - "The schedule for 2011, to save MIT resources, International Orientation will be later" and this does not mention that it will be cute, it just mentions a conflict of ASEs. There is leeway for us to represent on this issue. I move to call to question.

Rachel M: I move to change the first That clause to 'That the UAAP and Dean for Undergraduate Education actively engage the international student community before any changes to International Orientation are finalized or Orientation 2011.'

Karan: Have current changes already been finalized. In that case, the That clauses don't apply anyway.



Rachel M: For what definition of 'finalized'. Have they printed the schedules and ordered the food?

Karan: Have we reached a point of no return on International Orientation 2011?

Sivakami: I doubt it because they have to e-mail out to the students, so there should be leeway.

Jessica: Does this address the issue of whether or not this committee was really engaged, because if they were, changed that were going to be made are valid.

Rachel M: The real motivation is we don't want to address issues beyond Orientation 2011. We're speaking with people from International Orientation; it would further subvert that committee to create other ways to do that.

Vrajesh: I think it's a reasonable concern and I think it's fine. I call to question.

The amendment carries.

Sivakami: I call to question on the bill.

16.1 passes.

8. Closing Remarks

Jonté: Very interesting meeting. I think you guys got something real good done. I know group thinking is hard with this big of a group. We got it done. Hopefully this is something to be proud of. Be on the lookout for more e-mails from me over the next week. To be quite honest, I have to go back and do more planning. That's all I have.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai
UA Secretary General