



42 U.A.S. 6

Minutes from November 8, 2010

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

1. Guest Panel on Student Engagement

Jonté: Tonight we have two very special guests; we have Noah Jessop'09 and Maggie Delano '10, former UA VP and Speaker. Noah is a former UA President. They're here to lead discussions on student engagement and how student engagement has been good or bad over the past few years. I think student engagement has been a pretty big issue for us this year, at least looking at the kind of things we passed in Senate this year. The first that comes to mind is dining, trying to figure out how best to work with HDAG, and we also have an enrollment increase. Now we go about a process of identifying those areas where students are going to be the most impacted. Things like Athena Printing and the Student Center Game Room are things we can go with; we need to do our jobs to see what students want to see. With that, I think I'm going to ask you guys to introduce yourself pretty briefly and go from there.

Noah: My name's Noah. I guess all I'll say is: Course 18 and 15, did a bunch of stuff here, including dining. We had a big "Rah, Rah!" the last time around this happened. It would've been February: Valentine's Day. We, in fact, had to go to an emergency planning session on Valentine's Day. I'm happy to see some familiar faces.

Maggie: I'm Maggie; I just graduated June, and I'm doing Masters'; I graduated Course 6. I joined the UA as a sophomore; I was a senator, then a senate officer, then an exec officer. I kind of moved around a bit. Any questions?

Jonté: If you guys could real quick tell us what you think the role of the UA is in gathering student feedback...What do you think the UA should be doing in terms of gathering feedback? What should they be doing in their own groups?

Noah: Is this macroscopic or relevant to current issues? I would urge Senate to be understanding the vibe, the pulse, and the heartbeat – what are people saying, if you have a dining hall, in the dining hall? If you don't, in a kitchen. What are people saying that is going on that you're concerned about? I guess it's really the way to, in a sense, educate people who are going through the MIT student experience without any insight into the administrative process that tries to regulate this experience or educate them about how students are involved in the process.

Maggie: I think something you'll learn to know is, MIT students love to complain. They talk about this one professor that's absolute horrible, and in two sentences you tell them about our academic committee that works on violations. That's one of those things that are popular with students; you tell them what you like, and you can say: oh, the UA has this.

Noah: It's not about selling the UA as much as understanding the big machine. You understand and have, I would say, a much better understanding on average of how it works. You can help other people understand that and figure out how you can get things done.



Jonté: While I did mention this is a discussion, these are guests, so if you can close your laptops during discussion...So, I guess I'll let you choose, you can go at it from that direction. Can you give us an example that you feel the UA handled very well, and how did student engagement go from UA, from UA to an administrator. How did that communication apply?

Maggie: Some of you guys might remember or have heard of the fact that we had this huge sort of budget crisis. MIT is sort of coming out of it. When Mike Bennie was the president and I was the vice president last year, a few of us, with a few others, we decided that we were going to write this report about...well...basically the MIT Administration wrote this really long report. It was my assignment over the summer to read through this report. If I wasn't UA VP, I probably wouldn't have done it. How do we really expect the everyday undergrad to ever read anything like this? We wanted to take that really long report and write a smaller report. We got it together in maybe 5 days. I wrote up a draft of this report. We were able to incorporate lots of UA committees; we got feedback from people like Hawkins and SCEP. We compiled this big report, and it ended up going on the desk of every faculty that we can find. We had this huge report. That was kind of an internal coordination of UA success. We created this website that gave the UA small summaries of specific budget recommendations. People can read the recommendation and see if they think this is good or bad. We have 100 people vote on this, and they all thought this was a really useful idea. A combination of the report we had written and all the feedback, we actually sat down with the Chancellor and went through the report. We actually sat down with the Chancellor and he specifically talked about this for awhile. For a lot of things, he was willing to give in a little bit. I think that was a pretty good example.

Sammi: I want to hear what happened when you were President for dining.

Noah: So, I began my involvement with this devilish thing called Blue Ribbon Dining. The goal was to hire a consultant, put together a fully comprehensive survey, put it all together in the campus, and half of campus responded. Then, the consultant disappeared. Finally, the data came out. This involved going to lots of meetings of I'll say stakeholders who wanted very different things, trying to figure out on paper with data what you can distill. Everyone had sort of their veto. This 2 year process concluded the results that we established in the meetings were completely different from what the consulting company came back with. This was very upsetting. There was a leak at one point where the draft got out. I guess that the student opinion was really that good dining and good community are great, but economic constraints shouldn't prevent people from living where they want to live. EC costs less than Simmons, I think, is it a big spread?

Vrajesh: Not right now.

Noah: In general, what students felt is we should be able to all live where we want to live. Dining is great, but if you force people into it, it's a socioeconomic constraint.

Rachel: Didn't one of those have a mandatory contribution regardless of the dorm?

Maggie: Yes, people argued for awhile. Mandatory contribution wouldn't be completely useful if it didn't cost that much. They thought it was useful if you could put it into Shaw's or something. If they could only use that as a Dining dollars or something.

Noah: One of those big problems is preferred dining was a cost. Now you pay for X for dining or the food is twice as expensive. This isn't helpful...but thanks. Basically the students on the Blue Ribbon Committee, we had agreed to make this report a consensus report, but we said we cannot sign off on this



consensus. You'll have to say these people did not sign it. The UA rushed in with the data on hand to make a separate report called a Dining Proposal Committee (DPC). The two reports were launched into a void. Everyone who was around graduated

There was much teeth grinding. They seemed to be completely ignored, and you guys know the history from there. What I don't understand is over two years of student engagement did not seem to be anything. Whatever it is, I don't know where it came from, but it's not very popular is it? I guess this raises a couple questions: 1. Why do you guys have to do this again, 2. What happened to this data; don't MIT make decisions on data?, and 3. People are quick to put down things like a petition – this is a view of the current students, and we're making decisions longer than the lifetime of the current students. There's truth in planning for the future. It's the question of the culture lasting longer than the transient student stakeholders in so many of these student groups. I think it's the culture stake that's not being represented.

Hawkins: What should the UA do if we made a stake and it was completely ignored?

Noah: I believe that the administration is in place to continue and arguably improve. Most of all, carrying the torch and adding to the fire is fine, but carrying the torch, that's what the job is. If they stray from that, or make decisions that have a real economic impact on cultural things that have helped people by giving them friend networks that support them...if their classes are hard, they have friends that take them through hard times. Somebody should sit back and ask why. I don't ever think this should be a problem. Everyone thinks it's an economic thing, but forcing people into it and completely changing the economic balance is not the right way.

Sammi: You also made a thing about how the students on the committees said they weren't going to support that which was proposed.

Sivakami: I think that's part of the thing right? The students on HDAG completely support this.

Maggie: There was a recent letter to the Tech that had 3 dorm presidents. What about the 4th?

Rachel: He intentionally did not participate.

Alex J: What about the Phoenix Group?

Maggie: Did the Phoenix Group...

Alex J: Yeah, even the phoenix group is going to get owned the hardest. Everyone wants to pay five grand for food.

Noah: At dinner, she mentioned, she as an over 21 adult that eats off campus two meals a day including some consumption of alcohol eats less than this dining plan.

Tim J: I kind of think the administration has this idea as well. This is the right way to do it; this is what's best for the students, and they kind of, they don't know better. They're trying; they believe they're doing what's right and what's best. Students will like it in the future, etc. I think the administration is bullheaded and not wanting change.

Noah: Are we bullheaded and not wanting to change?

Ashley: We don't want to change to something that sucks. We told them clearly and peacefully why this plan is terrible; we need to like go to the corporation and be like: hey, these people aren't doing jobs.



Krishna: My feeling is that the administration is going on their experience for when they required all freshmen to live on campus. Everyone was opposed, and at this point, people just accept it as a way of life. No one questions it at all.

Alex D: No, that's not true.

Maggie: They don't effectively question it.

Alex D: They just get annoyed, and they just gave in.

Maggie: I think there's a point here though.

Krishna: This is not causing the administration a huge problem right? We haven't given them any reason to think otherwise. Four years down the line, students will be like: oh, we have a \$4900 a year, okay.

Cynthia: I agree with Krishna, a bit like how we think of the dining plan right now. We've heard the most from one particular dorm. From the administration side, there's only like four dorms out there, and we only hear one. These people don't effectively word their voice. We haven't found a way that effectively gets to the administration. I don't have any recommendations, but I think that's one thing we probably need to work on. We need a better system that makes it so we don't run into these headaches.

Noah: I guess the tricky thing is when Blue Ribbon is talking about all that is on the table. Why not close McCormick? Here are the numbers. We could make this food so much better at Baker; then, you raise the point of how you're eliminating the ability to live in an all girls' residence that has food for parents and students who want that choice.

Sivakami: Now you're eliminating the choice that students don't have – the ability to live as a resident that doesn't have the extra ability to spend on food.

Noah: There's a balance between covering the greatest amount of people as possible and covering the interest of the few; currently it's spread too thin.

Maggie: I think we need to have some sort of compromise. Someone has to give in. However, there's something that still has yet to be agree on.

Noah: In the Student Center, if there's good food, build a giant dining hall in the student center and have people dine in it.

David: I think their trump card is Maseeh Hall. I don't think they're willing to negotiate until they see what Maseeh Hall does.

Alex J: The picture of Next House when their food was small, it started another mini flourishing of activity. I can't believe you had to pay \$9 for that or something.

Jonté: I think reposing that question you brought up before...where the disconnect was the product of student input or decision making.

Noah: Or perhaps I'll say it backwards. Who have we asked: help me, I'm trying to create a process or a flow diagram, and where is it falling? I'll be curious to see the different people on the pipeline point out the gap.

Jonté: Do you want to address that Vrajesh?

Vrajesh: No.



Jonté: What I feel the UA has tried? We've seen one petition that has prompted us to have an emergency meeting. Because of that, we've passed a piece of legislation that tasked the UA president to go and meet with Chancellor Clay. We've been trying to halt the process because, at this point in the process, student feedback hadn't been heard enough. Meetings happen all the time. I met with Chancellor Clay, and now we have another petition.

Rachel: It got sent to Hockfield and the Tech.

Maggie: There's like this email basically flaming the head of the MIT financial. I think it was so effective because it came from the head. It's accomplishing something.

Ashley: What I think we can do, we can get a lot of these letters, and we can send it out to the corporation. If we can't get people to engage, then people living there won't care that much. We should be able to like start doing something.

Maggie: I question if the corporation will be more paternalistic. You need to find someone you know that won't just sort of chew you away.

Ashley: They like it to look like everything's nice and happy. It makes them look very bad. But, they want it settle quickly.

Maggie: We actually talked about dining at a meeting, and a lot of people coming to evaluate dining were from other schools. They were dramatically more expensive. They kind of completely shrugged us off. That's the challenge there. Other people don't see this as the kind of problem we do.

Noah: I think that's another point, just speaking generally about student representation. Intrinsically, as students we haven't been working here. We haven't been distinguishing. A lot of those times, they say, I'm going to do A. Everyone I know would have A if you would do A. B seems logical from where I sit. And they go, that's outrage, how about A'. Whatever, you say, they'll keep giving you modulo of A', and whatever you do it will never get to the point you want. But, it gets so far away that it's fine.

You're both there to be helpful to students. You can be helpful, be smart, and use your intelligence to make things better. The leverage that we feel in the student position, relative to another business location, is somewhat limited. On a student front, it's really important to know that your opinions are correct and understand what you believe are edge conditions. There will be a lot of pushback.

Betsy: One idea that's been tossed around is using alumni in the process. I'm from EC so alums are feisty.

Noah: I tell you that, if I were in the position to make a large contribution to MIT's financial success right now, it sure wouldn't be for a capital expenditure. It would be to fix these things about student life.

Betsy: It seems like a lot of people believe that. Do you think it's effective?

Noah: Alumni get things in rosy wrappers. The only things I see are "dear friend," "dear alumni"; they're all rosy about this one UROP student that achieves these great results despite that that kid is unhappy and eats 3 meals a day at LaVerde's. I would say from the alumni's fear, people largely don't know what's going on as soon as they become detached from the heartbeat. Perhaps the UA could build a list and try to recruit alumni onto the list – even getting involved with the alumni association itself, since they are big proponent.

Vrajesh: We created an alumni relations committee permanently last week.



Maggie: I think last year, we have had past UA Presidents, UA Senate Officers, etc. come. You can have more, you can expand that.

Noah: Push beyond those people; see if the alumni you care about are the ones that might not give a donation if they hear that not all is well. I would encourage any kind of formal outreach.

Maggie: EC started the, I don't know what it's called, they started the ...East Side club? The framework exists. That sort of thing is definitely worth getting on that list. People I know are actually alums from awhile ago.

Noah: I guess adding to those young alumni that care is the young corporation members...I know that they're ready to help listen to and try and understand what's going on. At our time, we just didn't have the resources to actually get the information.

Jonté: Thank you guys very much for coming and being mentors for some of the senators.

Recess Begins: 8:18 pm, Recess Ends: 8:24 pm.

2. Opening Remarks

Jonté: I think we just had a great session. I think the speakers just provided us with a very good discussion. I think they've been provided us useful advice as well. Moving on, we just had a petition last night about dining, and it's from Next House. I want you guys to be thinking of constituency events as well. Shuang and Bobby ran their event. I think I would call it a success.

Bobby: Yeah, it was great.

Jonté: I think we have two more this week. I think the New House Senators and Almas are planning to do one. There's a lot more senators here, and let me know guys. I want to help you guys work and plan events. We want to find student opinion, and we want to make sure we know what students want. If you're not on a committee, my question to you is: why not. Please ask me, if you're not on one, and we need to find out how.

3. Exec Update

Vrajesh: So, I have five things. First of all, last week was the first meeting for the Task Force for Student Engagement, including Chancellor Clay, Kirk, Dean Colmobo, the GSC President and Vice President, the UA President, DormCon, IFC, Panhel, etc. It's a pretty strong group of people. We've decided we'll be surveying the student reps on institute committees just to get a little background. The student engagement committee was created a few years ago. The channel that the institute has in its decision making process is the Undergraduate and Graduate positions on student committees. We'll be working to make sure they're functioning as intended.

Second, if you're interested in serving on the Kendall Square Advising Committee, send an email to UA NomComm. Those nominations will be happening short term. The requirements are you have to be around for 12-18 months.

There was a group of students formed to give input on the Chancellor search. As many of you know, Chancellor Clay has decided to step down and a group of students are on this, including IFC, Panhel, GSC, UA, and some graduate students. I would say, if you have any interest related on this topic...that's not a committee that has open spots, but we'd be glad to take your input and we'll share as much as we can. I'll tell you a bit more on that process, I think that committee is looking to. It's a pretty condensed



timeline, so we're looking to make recommendations by early next year because the New Chancellor is going to be in by late Spring, next year meaning the next calendar year so within this academic year. My understanding is that there will not be a search committee, but President Hockfield will basically be selecting who the next chancellor is.

The fourth point is there will be a meeting tomorrow of the HSG subcommittee. There will be a discussion on which dorms should be staying open this next summer. So far, I haven't gotten any information, with the exception of the input at last week's Exec meeting. Information like, I want my dorm to stay open is much less useful than a well thought out reasonable statement of why a particular dorm should stay open.

Will: Is the meeting open?

Vrajesh: No.

Rachel: It's essentially an institute committee.

Vrajesh: Finally, there was a petition of around 63% of Next House that was sent out yesterday. Sammi and I will be meeting with Dean Colombo. That meeting will be scheduled and will take place in the next week or two. We'll keep you up to date. I can try and answer questions, but I can't really give you very much information.

Jonté: Do you have anything on the status of the RFP?

Vrajesh: My understanding was it was sent out Friday.

Betsy: Do you know if it's the same group of people?

Vrajesh: Obviously, we had some same signatures, due to percentages, but the people that sent the emails were different.

4. Approval of Minutes from 42 U.A.S. 5

Motion to modify the minutes passes.

Minutes are approved.

5. 42 U.A.S. 4.3: Bill on Senate Minutes

Jonté: In this case, this piece of legislation was vetoed. I'm going to give Vrajesh the floor.

Vrajesh: If you don't mind, does anyone have any questions about the reasons why I've vetoed the bill?

Rachel: Given that Senate passed something about the way senate operates, on a more abstract level, why do you feel you should override this decision?

Vrajesh: In this case, the UA made a commitment a couple of years ago. I think the UA, in this case, needs to show we're willing to stand by commitments made from year to year.

Alex D: In the text of the minutes bill as quoted, I see nothing about maximally verbose minutes. I see things on maximizing transparency and promoting communication; it's not as all clear to me why longer, more thorough minutes promote transparency, though. As you're fond of saying, I think meetings past 11 aren't transparent because people are too hosed to come to them. Lengthy minutes are similarly untransparent.



Vrajesh: I respect your point of view. In my judgment, this is how I perceive details and the level of transparency. I can cite several specific instances where I am able to take minutes to a meeting and cite specifically what I've heard due to the level of details that have been included.

Will: I for one don't have a strong opinion, while Vrajesh does. I'm going to trust Vrajesh. If people strongly oppose it, they can mention it. I don't think people are strongly opposed. If there's a utility for keeping these minutes, we should keep them.

Rachel: I think the point has been made. I have no opinion either way. If officers aren't willing to listen its fine. My final question is: are you making a commitment to all past precedence that have been determined?

Jonté: You may or may not answer.

Vrajesh: I would say if there's a different situation where I'm not doing that, I would appreciate knowing about it. I'm generally not one to make a blanket statement. I don't like a one size fits all policy, because I don't think that's useful, but I can speak to specifics.

Sivakami: My question is: are you just opposed to the specific page limit or less detailed minutes?

Vrajesh: I'm opposed to less detailed minutes.

Sammi: I just wanted to say that a lot of the arguments for this bill are the senators reading a whole set of minutes or constituents reading a whole set of minutes. I just want everyone here to think carefully about whether you would read 15 pages of minutes or your constituents would before voting yes.

Benjamin: I don't think people who are not willing to read 15 minutes would read them if it were 5 page minutes.

Owen: Point of information – is it mandatory that we vote on it?

Alex D: We just have to reconsider.

Allan: I motion to move on.

Sivakami: Point of Parliamentary Inquiry – what happens next, do we vote or not?

Jonté: We can do both.

Vrajesh: I motion to close discussion and vote.

Some confusion on if we have to vote or not

Rachel: I object to voting.

Discussion on veto is closed.

Sivakami: Motion to open discussion.

Discussion on the legislation is opened.

Vrajesh: I motion to close discussion and vote.

Motion to close discussion passes 17-6.

Legislation is vetoed, since the override vote fails 8-10.



6. 42 U.A.S. 5.1: Bill to Task UA Representatives and HDAG to Work Together on a Dining Survey

Jonté: On this, we'll take the report of a subcommittee. Tim Jenks would you like to present the report?

Tim J: The subcommittee, we met. We recommend postponing the bill indefinitely. We had a very lengthy discussion on this bill. I'd like to point out that none of the senators from the dorms in dining hall were at this meeting. That was one of the main reasons we think it should be postponed indefinitely. We did have a very long discussion on it. If you have any major recommendations, I recommend talking to me, Will, or Vrajesh after the meeting.

Will: In the end it was a unanimous decision.

Tim J: We all decided we should kill the bill. We can take general discussion.

Alex D: I move to adopt the subcommittee's report by postponing this indefinitely.

Allan: Motion to close discussion and vote.

Motion to postpone indefinitely passes.

7. 42 U.A.S. 6.1: Bill to Update the Constitution to Reflect Changes to the Nominations Committee

Alex J authors the bill.

Alex J: There's a lot of text. It doesn't say a whole lot. It just says we're adding the text to the constitution. It's just so it's noted somewhere official. The election code is mentioned because it's another similar document. It also re-tasks committee chairs to vote on their own bylaws. They're supposed to do this in accordance with their own constitution. Adam and I have started to come together and put together these bylaws.

Jessica: Would these bylaws be published in the constitution or separately?

Alex J: Separately.

Rachel: Should we specify that ASA isn't included in this?

Alex J: It doesn't need to be moved. I guess I haven't really thought about this – is this a standing committee?

Vrajesh: I haven't given it a lot of thought, but if all of these committees, by instinct, produce their set of bylaws, there should be a point where ASA is moved. It sounds to be like the purpose of this is to promote the bylaws.

Alex D: To respond to Vrajesh, the ASA is wacky because it's also under GSC. Including the ASA's bylaws, in a UA document would also suggest putting it in the GSC document as well, and I don't like having multiple copies.

Sammi: I don't have a really strong opinion. In general, we have a lot of documents with a lot of rules. I don't think we are in great needs of a lot more. The committees run pretty well the way they are now, and the chairs spend a lot of time already. I don't think they want to spend time working on this. Frankly, I'm not prepared to really make them do so.



Alex J: If you guys don't want to task committee chairs to write bylaws, you should take it out of the constitution. If you don't think it's useful for other committees besides ElecComm and NomComm, you should do that.

Jessica: You said they are already tasked to write them; where are they placed now?

Alex J: There's only two committees that have them. For now, they're kind of scattered.

Allan: So, um, if we want to do battle on whether or not we should do this in the first place, this is not the place to do this. This is a housekeeping bill, anyways. So, I motion to postpone definitely until the next meeting and for us to discuss outside of Senate.

Motion to postpone definitely until the next meeting passes.

8. New Business and Discussion

Jonté: Before I ask for new business, I would like to say the point of new business is for legislation that has been brought up before or new legislation can be brought before it. Therefore, every time we introduce new business, a majority vote is needed. Is there any new business? Seeing none, we'll move into discussion. I'm not sure what there is to say, so I'm opening the floor.

Betsy: For the subcommittee, the bill on working with HDAG, is there another solution you think will work better?

Vrajesh: As Tim mentioned, I think one of the concerns is that none of the senators that were tasked to write the survey were at the meeting. I would actually like to talk to those people after the meeting.

Allan: I'm curious now if any part of the UA is still actively involved in dining.

Vrajesh: As I mentioned earlier, Sammi and I will be at the meeting with the Dean and the members of the dining committee.

Allan: Has any thought been brought to the administrators?

Sammi: We've talked to a number of people on it.

Jessica: As of now, when is the new dining plan supposed to be implemented?

Ashley: Fall of next year.

Allan: Do we have a stance on this new petition? Do we have any stake in this?

Alex D: I think we may need to hold a meeting within 3 business days, which we're doing now anyway.

Jonté: It was sent to ua-senate. The way I've interpreted that....

Vrajesh: It was sent to ua-officers and some anonymous person sent it to ua-senate.

Jonté: If they want an emergency meeting, they should tell me, and we'll make it happen. I'm not sure that that was stated explicitly,

Alex J: For the first petition, he asked for one. Not this one, though.

Allan: Do our dining senators still have petition going around?

Bobby: We're doing one in Simmons; Shuang is doing that.

Allan: Is it going well?



Bobby: To my knowledge.

Vrajesh: I move to close discussion.

Discussion on dining closed without objection.

Allan: Just a reminder: the Athena bill is still up.

Ben: Are we still discussing that topic? Some of my constituency was asking for security. Mainly their concern was the Anna. I know campus took our cell phone numbers.

Jonté: I'm calling this a discussion topic security.

Vrajesh: I think this is a really important issue. I'm wondering why the system didn't activate when they had all of our cell phone numbers. Right now we've been overwhelmed by dining, but if this is something you're willing to take on, maybe as a senator project, we'd be interested to see what we can do on it. It's definitely an important issue, and there's been a number of safety related issues.

Jonté: Point of information – which of our committees would we task?

Vrajesh: If it would go to one committee, it would go to CSL. I don't think it's a very...it's a matter of seeing if that system gets activated, if that system will be used.

Owen: This isn't a point of disagreement. Maybe they don't want to send out a phone thing. Maybe they're afraid to do that because they don't want mass panic. The question was the suspect bolted, he wasn't intent on a hazard for student health. Then again, you can disagree.

Jonté: is there any more discussion? Seeing none we'll move on. Any other topics?

9. Closing Remarks

Vrajesh: I wanted to reiterate this; if you're a senator from Baker, McCormick, Next House, Simmons, or the Phoenix group, please stay after the meeting.

Alex J: It's Michael Walsh's birthday, and he's here. That sucks, so we should sing to him.

Jonté: Are there any objections? Seeing none.

Everyone: Happy birthday to you. Happy birthday to you. Happy birthday dear Michael. Happy birthday to you.

Jonté: This was a pretty quick meeting. As always, we want to hear your feedback. Please let us know at ua-senate-officers. Please guys, as I mentioned before, give us your proposals for constituency fund, either events or projects or things of that nature. You don't have to run an event; you can do a project. In the past someone did a project of putting up message boards so senators can hang up legislation that was passed, important messages from the UA. Things they start, students might be interested in seeing. That's definitely something that's valid.

Jessica: Wait, there are message boards we can use?

Jonté: Presumably.

Vrajesh: If you don't have one, we have a couple of extras. We can give you one, and you can talk to Exec. My original comment was, Alec puts a lot of work into summaries, not just minutes, so if you're lazy, you might look at that like as a way of telling your constituencies what happened. At the very least, if you want to keep people informed, that's a good way to do that.



Jonté: Other than that, I'll reemphasize committees. I know many of you are already involved. You should get involved. Other than that, please remember, this is something that came up with attendance. Please remember that in order for someone to serve as a proxy, they need to be from your constituency. That's kind of important, since we're representing each of them individually. Guys please do your best to gather opinions, since as an organization, we're taking a tax from the administration questioning our representation of the students. Please represent your constituenc; they need to feel as though we're relevant. That's our task; spend some time doing that this week. Any announcements?

Vrajesh: I want to tell you a really good project. I live at East Campus. One of our senators has been very proactive in making improvements to the dorm.

Betsy: You should talk to your housemaster. That seemed to work the best in Senior House and East Campus.

Vrajesh: So, those of you who still have a blank box next to you name as far as what you've accomplished...there's a surprising amount of power you get as a senator. You should start using it. You'd be surprised what people you can get meetings with, what you can get done if you start trying. If you start caring about things on campus, you can use your senator hat to get to people on campus. If you care about something off-campus, you can start getting support. There's a lot of potential that's still untapped. As we near the 2/3 point, I would encourage you all to use the last 1/3 to get something going.

Jonté: Anything else? Thank you for coming. Closing roll? Oh, is it done?

Alec: Yep, my tyrannical rule is over.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai
UA Secretary General