



42 U.A.S. 4

Minutes from October 25, 2010

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

1. Opening Remarks on Meeting Structure, Procedure, and Length

Jonté: We're going to open up with just a few remarks on structure and how it's different. Take a look at the agenda. One of the things you might notice is that I have a note at the bottom of the agenda; we had some issues with orders of the day, so I decided to go ahead and make sure everyone understands the agenda. It's not in order because of the nature of our agenda. By that, I mean it's not in order for the times on the agenda. You'll also note that discussion is not anywhere close to the top of the agenda; in fact it's at the bottom. I personally think there are some negatives with doing this; I'll wait for you guys to tell me, though. With that section, we also have New Business before we move into discussion mode. If anyone wants to introduce new business, they can make a motion to do so. The general idea is, if you're introducing new business, Senate should've been notified of it unless there's a serious reason. I'm going to put it to a 2/3 vote if whatever piece that comes up has not been publicized.

Now for things concerning everyone's role as Senators. I have a few sheets I'd like to pass around. It's concerning the constituency fund. I think Senate is in full swing at this point. We should be trying to reach out to constituents and building trust between us and members of the Association. I think constituency fund events are a great way to do that, so what I am passing around is an example of how to do it. This is an example of when I had an event at Next House. This includes the funds I used, and the survey for that event. I think we would like to see you guys coming to myself and Tim with proposals. We need to make sure this process is ongoing. In those dorms with two senators, you have a great opportunity to run one event, get people's opinions, and later on in this semester run a second event to update them on the status and find new issues they're interested in. For those of you with one senator, you have \$150. If you split it up, you can make two awesome events. You'll also notice we don't have a speaker this week. We will have a speaker next week. I put on the agenda for discussion "Guest Speakers": Who do you guys want to see? What kind of issue would you like to discuss? Senate is an open forum, and we'd like to see what you want.

2. Exec Update

Sammi: A couple things are going on. Alex and I met with the staff of a bunch of faculty committees to talk about how we can smooth out the nominations process and communication to get reps that everybody's happy with. I also met with people from IS&T and the Registrar's Office to talk about online registration and the timeline for that. We have more nominations which are coming before Senate in a bit. Next week, you guys are going to see our midterm review for our committee chairs, and those will be presented to Senate on Monday.

3. Approval of Minutes from 42 U.A.S. 3

Jonté: Because there's a bill on minutes tonight, Tim has decided to go ahead and take minutes to just compare back and forth and hopefully get some ideas from you guys about what you exactly want to see.



I'll be running the projector and the meeting tonight. I just wanted to provide you guys with that note, and I apologize for delays. I'll pull up the minutes now.

Adam: Motion to postpone approval until after the bill 4.2 passes or fails.

Motion passes with a clear majority.

4. 42 U.A.S. 3.1 – Bill to Create Committee on Alumni Relations

Jonté: This bill had to sit on the table because it amended the bylaws. We'll open discussion now.

Krishna: I think this is a good idea since this is a pertinent topic now. It will probably get done effectively as well. I call the question.

42 U.A.S. 3.1 passes with a clear majority.

5. 42 U.A.S. 3.2 – Bill to Create Athena Printing Committee

Betsy: *Reads bills*

Vrajesh: I move to amend "by the UAP/VP" to be "by the Senate" at the last scheduled Senate meeting in the fall term. The purpose is to make it consistent.

Alex D: Personally, I'd rather not amend this bill. I think the UAP/VP will have more perspective. I don't think Senate discussing it will be as effective.

Allan: I call the question.

Motion to amend passes 12 – 2.

Michael P: As I was saying, last year I was the UA representative on the Institute Committee to change Athena cluster. We were part of the after Institute-Wide Planning Task Force. The only question that the committee really considered last year was the Athena printing. We had IS&T provide the toner and paper for dorms. I think largely we also worked on the idea of Pharos and possibly the idea of a very high 2000 page quota. It would possibly also include Copytech course notes. Where we are right now is that the committee of faculty and staff all found ideas. We're at the point now where it's time to implement those ideas. The context here, though, is Oliver asked for feedback. Also, last year printing came from CSL. Richard and Hawkins and I worked closely on this issue and discussed. So, I think that's all I have on this issue. Thank you.

Vrajesh: I move to strike the 4th whereas clause.

Krishna: Call the question.

Motion to close discussion fails 5 – 10.

Vrajesh: We have a representative on ISTAB.

Alex D: Do you have some definition of representative? ISTAB hasn't met in a year or so. That said, there are other ways of keeping in touch with IS&T like talking to them on Zephyr.

Alex J: Point of information – did you want me to prod ISTAB to talk about Athena printing?

Alex D: I have no idea, but there are definitely other methods for getting in touch with IS&T.

Almas: What I wanted to say is: who are our representatives to IS&T?

Sammi: The other is MITCET. I believe at some point Liz Denys was...



Vrajesh: I only disagree with the idea that there's no existing mechanism. I'm generally happy with the scope of the bill.

Michael P: There is an email address posted next to the printers for students. The policy issues are locked down, though. What Oliver is asking for is feedback and implementation. I feel like there is no need to have a committee.

Alex J: Call the question.

Motion to amend passes with a clear majority.

Vrajesh: I call the question.

42 U.A.S. 3.2 passes with a clear majority.

Vrajesh: If you have any interest in chairing or participating in this committee, please send an email to ua-admin so we can populate the committee because they're looking at a pretty fast time line. We'll try and bring our nominee before Senate next week.

6. Approval of Ryan Normandin as Vice Chair of the Events Committee

(Postponed because Ryan isn't here yet. Meeting is ahead of time estimates on schedule.)

7. Approval of Additional FinBoard Appeal

Cynthia: The treasurer of Hillel had a few problems, so they were given an extension. Later, though, we forgot about this extension, and now we're bringing their appeal. We voted to give them \$450 in operations, \$200 in capital, \$1200 in events, and \$150 in printing. That's a total of \$2000 for the fall semester. Just wanted to make sure you guys are okay with that. We have money to spare.

Vrajesh: What amount did they receive before the appeal, and what was the difference of the appeal?

Cynthia: The treasurer was new, and the treasurer had asked for \$7000. So, when they were submitting the appeal, they submitted a more ideal budget, so to speak. We did feel cut from them because they asked for things we generally don't find.

Krishna: Is this pretty typical for what we give them?

Cynthia: Yes typically.

Krishna: In that case I move to call the question.

Appeal is approved with a clear majority.

8. 42 U.A.S. 3.3 – Resolution/Bill to Ensure Transparency in Increasing MIT Enrollment

Jonté: We started a subcommittee and they reported back with an amendment – 42 UAS 3.3A. What they'll be presenting is a set of amendments for the reservation. At request, I can show the original version as well.

Allan: It's a pretty heavy handed amendment. *Reads bill* To speak on what has happened, we've had a pretty successfully subcommittee meeting. If you compare the bill, the things we've asked for are all the same things. We've decided, though, to task the arms of the UA to report back on these items to us.

Rachel: I'm curious what kind of report you're asking for.



Allan: Nothing formal. I'm not asking you guys to draft a full report.

Vrajesh: I move to insert "informal written" between "a" and "preliminary" and between "a" and "final."

Allan: I call the question.

Motion to amend passes with a clear majority

Alex D: This bill seems basically reasonable; it looks like the people who care came up with something.

David: I'm kind of curious, as the chair of SCEP, what you guys expect. We'll just address SCEP in particular. They're kind of magical things if you ask me. I mean, I'm not being particularly well-worded here, but, for instance, the UROP office has X number of dollars. Unless you're going to increase funding, they're going to be able to give out X number of UROPs. Your definition of sufficient has to be practical. Do we keep the number of UROP the same, or do we trade it off for wages? I'm curious where you guys think on that and others: GIR classes, registration will not become overcrowded while being available to all, etc. Am I free to go forth with making the reasonable choices, or do you guys actually have an opinion?

Allan: Magic is always nice, but the point of this is we don't want you to take an opinion to these groups. You need to figure out what they are going to do, and we're going to decide what we think.

David: I'm research, then?

Allan: Yes, this is purely a research bill. We don't want to push an agenda.

Krishna: I would call the question, but I'll see first if there's an objection.

Alex D: This bill seems poorly worded to one that is purely research.

Vrajesh: I think the point that you made is a good one. In certain cases, you're right that the wording did imply a position, and, in certain cases, we did. We chose the cases where we felt that it was kind of obvious that those were good things for students. I think the intention here was, broadly speaking on average across all the different areas: based on what the committee chairs report back to Senate, we'll have a discussion on what the UA position is.

Almas: I think we're too concerned about bias. I think that we're implying that we're opposed to admitting new students. I don't think this bill says anything about being opposed to or against. It's more like basic issues. That's why I think the bill is fine.

Alex D: You say that the committee considered and carefully decided on which of the "that" clauses to push an agenda in? Can you identify a that clause in which no agenda was pushed?

Vrajesh: The UA Housing committee clause, for example.

Alex D: That pushed the agenda that the administration needs to have a plan that both fills Maseeh and decrowds existing dorms.

Vrajesh: In order to make it more neutral, I move to amend it to say that "the various academic departments confer with the various academic departments to determine whether the GIR classes will become overcrowded."

David: In particular, I wish to amend the 3rd and 5th bullet. I don't know if ensure is the right word we're looking for.

Jonté: That's not amending the amendment, so I don't think that's in order.



Krishna: It might make sense, instead of doing it here, to do it on the next page, and for now they're confirming that these things are not going to happen. We should decide what sort of things they're going to take in if it's going to happen.

Will: I'm interpreting this as I'm allowed to speak for the UA on these issues, and this provides research. I think this should be a general interpretation, and there shouldn't be so much concern about this specific wording. If an issue does come up, I'll bring it before Senate. I think that's reasonable.

Vrajesh: Given that there seems to be a number of concerns, I move to committee this to a committee. If you think this is fine, I hope you move to vote on it.

Jonté: First, I'll ask for a vote on this amendment.

Motion to close discussion fails 9 – 8.

Allan: So, I would urge this body to stop splitting hairs. I think at this point you guys should understand the general interpretation. I would hesitate to make more amendments due to farther splitting of hairs.

Jonté: We'll now take a vote, then.

Motion to amend passes 11 – 7.

Betsy: It seems that the only other clause that's questionable is the Housing Committee clause. I don't think they should be actively doing that. I think the UA Housing Committee should communicate with the Housing Committee to learn more about what's going on.

Allan: I brought this before you guys; if you guys really want to change this one word at a time, you should've damn hell done it before hand. I'd rather pass this thing and not recommit it.

Betsy: I think this is the only thing that needs to be changed; I think the meaning is very different. The rest is fine and can be interpreted loosely enough.

Krishna: I move to call the question.

Motion to amend passes with a clear majority.

Krishna: I move to call the question.

42 U.A.S. 3.3A passes with a clear majority.

9. 42 U.A.S. 4.1 – Bill to Establish Bylaws for the Nominations Committee

Alex J: *Reads bill.* So, this is basically just a housekeeping bill. This is how we've been running things. It was always our intention to change the structure, and I just got around to writing the bill.

Jonté: I just added "Article V." I'll now take discussion.

Krishna: Since we can't actually vote on this now, I move postpone this definitely until next meeting.

Allan: I call the question.

Motion to close discussion passes 14 – 3.

42 U.A.S. 4.1 passes with a clear majority.



10. Approval of Ryan Normadin as Vice Chair of the Events Committee

Ryan: I'm up for Vice Chair; I also served on Events last year. I'll say some stuff I've done so far. When I was at high school, I organized district wide competitions. I've had contact with different schools. Over the summer, I helped organize multiple rallies as well. I also served on the committee last year, and I helped organize the festival last year and the concert this year.

Almas: What year are you?

Ryan: I'm a sophomore.

Almas: What are you planning on doing?

Ryan: We're thinking about switching up in the spring for the concert. Something I'd like to do is have more events than just the Big 2. I'm kind of hoping to do an MIT American Idol type of thing, when you have each dorm send two participants or something.

Krishna: I move to close session.

Ryan is approved as the Vice Chair of the Events Committee.

11. 42 U.A.S. 4.3 – Bill on Senate Minutes

Rachel: *Reads bill.*

Alec: I may have originally complained about the minutes, but after the E1 meeting, the verbatim minutes have shown to be useful. They've managed to keep the administration accountable for what they say, and they can keep all our guest speakers accountable as well. In addition, we shouldn't waste time talking about minutes; I don't want to take minutes of Senate's time talking about minutes, since our main focus should be serving the students.

Laura: I have a concern about 10 pages at 2 pages an hour. That implies we're going to be here for 5 hours. I also don't know about having a set page limit, in general.

Betsy: It's kind of a grammar thing and kind of a meaning thing. What is the second to last "whereas" clause?

Rachel: Something is off in the warning; the intent is that I didn't read those minutes. I don't think Senate should've approved them. That may not be what that said, and I'm asserting that the minutes are not a legitimate source. I move to amend that whereas clause to read: "where Senate members unwillingness to read the minutes decreases their legitimacy as the speakers do not check and proof their quotes."

Alec: Point of Order – Can you do that in a direct response?

Betsy: Well, I motion to change that whereas clause to what Rachel just said, then.

Krishna: Call the question.

Motion passes with a clear majority.

Krishna: Here's my general feeling on this, I think in one sense, verbatim minutes are good; it would be nice to have a one page summary which already happens. Given that that's the case, I move to postpone this indefinitely.



Rachel: I think if the intent of this motion is to get rid of this bill, you should just vote on it. I don't think we should postpone it.

Jonté: Parliamentarian, is calling the question in order to override postponing indefinitely?

Alex D: I don't think you can do that.

Janet: I guess since Tim Jenks is taking minutes now, it would be interesting to see how they compare.

Tim J: Point of Information – I'm just taking minutes for one meeting.

Janet: It would be interesting to see what it looks like still.

Tim J: Motion to postpone indefinitely is probably the most effective way to say we want to kill the bill without actually killing it. I think what's also good about postponing indefinitely: if we vote it down and we decide 4 months later otherwise, then we can bring it back up. If we want to kill the bill, postponing it indefinitely works well.

Rachel: If you postpone indefinitely and it doesn't come up at the next meeting, it dies.

Alex J: Can you not still bring it back up again?

Alex D: As a general principle of parliamentary procedure, if you vote something like an amendment down, you can't propose the same change later. I'm not if this holds for bills within different meetings, as opposed to amendments within one meeting...basically, we're confused about Tim's assertion on what happens if we vote down a bill.

Tim J: I retract the statement. I still call the question.

Motion to postpone indefinitely passes 11 – 3.

Jonté: I will give you a clarification later tonight. Now, 42 UAS 4.4.

Vrajesh: I call orders of the day. Approval of minutes was next on the agenda.

12. Approval of Minutes from 42 U.A.S. 3

Betsy: I motion to approve these minutes.

Minutes for 42 U.A.S. 3 are approved with a clear majority.

13. 42 U.A.S. 4.4 – Bill on Use of Laptops During Senate Meetings

Rachel: *Reads bill.* I had an amendment actually; I guess I have two: "Presiding officers for the remainder of this session" and adding a 3rd "that" clause to read "That laptops not be used when formal guests are giving presentations."

Jonté: This is one of the rare occasions where I'm going to speak. The policy standing is that by default during discussion sessions, when we have speakers, that laptops will be closed, and the reason is that discussion can't go on if people are distracted.

Alec: By the wording of the current state of the bill, I'm not sure what exactly is different from that and what Jonté just presented. In addition, similar to my previous points on 42 U.A.S. 4.3, I would prefer to not write in the summary that we spent time benefiting the undergraduate student body by approving the use of laptops during Senate meetings.



Rachel: First to respond to Jonte's point: _____. As to Alec's point on what it changes, it doesn't automatically disallow them during discussion. As for using up time in Senate, I emailed it, and since I didn't hear back, I submitted this bill.

Tim J: If you don't want to put it in the summary of your minutes, you should choose to leave it out of your minutes.

Alex D: I think it's pretty reasonable for Alec to leave out internal matters.

Tim: Call the question.

42 UAS 4.4 passes 17 – 4.

14. Nominees for Vacancies on Institute Committees

Alex J: We still have a few more vacancies. If you guys are interested in the ROTC committee, you should let me know. Also, if you're interested in the Online Student Study Group, it's those two plus Hawkins. This is on expanding MIT's online initiatives. Please tell us, too.

Krishna: Given that Alex has done an excellent job so far and I trust her judgment, I call the question.

Nominees are approved with a clear majority.

15. New Business and Discussion

Tim: Today is a wonderful day; today is the birthday of our amazing treasurer, Ellen McIsaac. I motion to sing "Happy Birthday" to Ellen McIsaac.

Motion passes with a clear majority.

All: Happy birthday to you, happy birthday to you, happy birthday dear Ellen, happy birthday to you.

Krishna: I move to close the New Business section.

Jonté: Moving into discussion. The first item of discussion is dining. The bill passed without a signature. It has been featured in the Tech, so I think we should talk about it.

Off-the-record discussion

Jonté: Guest speakers. Who do you want to see?

Allan: I want Dean Colombo, and I want HDAG.

Jonté: We are already planning on inviting Dean Colombo.

Allan: I think it's pertinent on having these groups here sooner rather than later.

Rachel: What do you mean by HDAG?

Sammi: It seems highly improbable to have all of HDAG come.

Allan: I would like all the students on HDAG.

Sivakami: I think it would be helpful to have all the housemasters here because we need their viewpoints.

Richard: May I recommend that you invite Dean Colombo alone? When you bring a lot of people, they may take up more time instead of answering more questions.

Jonté: If Dean Colombo comes, he'll likely come with someone from the communications department.



Will: Can we also have Rich Berlin?

Jonté: What has been Rich Berlin's involvement with this process?

Vrajesh: He's on HDAG.

Jonté: Any more topics?

16. Closing Remarks and Good of the Order

Jonté: Thank you guys for coming. We got through things very quickly. It said 10 pm on the agenda; it's only 9:50 pm, and I think we had a very fruitful discussion. I hope the discussion does not stop here. We should be having this discussion at our constituencies, and we should be sharing feedback. If you're interested in running a constituency communication event, please let me know soon. Tim and I would like to attend to be there and help you out. The sooner you guys let us know you're interested, the sooner we can have people there to help you out. If you guys have any suggestions, send us an email at ua-senate-officers. If there's anything you believe I should be doing as well, please let me know.

Alec: I already took closing roll, but I would also like to note: when we're this efficient, the number of pages of minutes is under double digits.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai
UA Secretary General