



# 42 U.A.S. 9

Minutes from February 07, 2011

**The meeting was called to order at 7:33 pm.**

## 1. Opening Remarks

Jonté: All I have to say is: Welcome! I hope everyone's first week of classes has been going pretty well, and things aren't too brutal yet. I guess what we'll be doing is...we first have to take care of electing a new Vice Speaker, confirm our treasurer, and then move on to State of the UA. Later on in the meeting, I'm going to discuss some of the expectations we have for Senators this semester. I'm also going to go into discussing some of the new programs and initiatives as an assembly this semester. I guess, that being said, we should probably introduce the new senators.

Chris: I'm Chris. I live in Macgregor, but I'm representing fraternities. I'm a brother of Nu Delta.

Karan: I'm a sophomore majoring in Course 14 and 18, and I'm the new Next House Senator.

Jonté: We'll have two more senators; I'll email those to you when those come through.

## 2. Nominations for Vice Speaker of the Senate

Jonté: The way this process works: first, we'll take nominations for people that want to run as Vice Speaker. Usually someone else nominates you. You should feel comfortable nominating yourself, if you want to run. Afterwards, we'll review who's nominated, and we'll ask people to leave. Then, we'll have closed discussion, and we'll vote. I'll open the floor for nominations.

**\*Nominations: Betsy, Allan, Will, and Jessica; everyone declined.\***

Alec: Point of Information – Are there any restrictions to who can be nominated?

Rachel M: I think it's restricted to voting members of Senate.

Jessica: Is this just for the rest of the semester?

Jonté: Yes, just for this semester. Now that food's here, we'll take a recess. You guys can also take some time to talk about this.

**Recess Begins: 7:38; Recess Ends 7:51.**

**\*Nominations: Jessica and Shuang; Jessica accepts this time, Shuang declines.\***

Vrajesh: You're nominating people for one of the seven officers of the UA. It's kind of an important position. There are a number of things that the Vice Speaker does. If you're interested in taking on a greater responsibility, you should consider running. If you're going to vote, you should give a lot of thought on who you want.

**\*Nominations: Almas; Almas accepts.\***

Adam: I think we should wait till the next meeting because it's an important position. You should need more time. Motion to postpone definitely until the next meeting.



Jonté: I'm going to comment. It's an important position. I really think you guys should've been thinking about it beforehand. I think Tim and I have said, on a number of occasions, that we will make ourselves available. I think we did that to the best of our ability. It appears, of those who stepped up, it felt like you guys had to be coerced. That's concerning.

Rachel M: I don't think chastising us will make us go back and have more time to redo it. I call the question.

**Motion to postpone Nominations for the Vice Speaker of the Senate till 42 U.A.S. 10 passes.**

### **3. Election for Vice Speaker of the Senate**

**\*Removed/postponed from agenda due to previous motion.\***

### **4. Confirmation of Anika Gupta as UA Treasurer**

Vrajesh: We're nominating Anika for the position of UA Treasurer. As Senate knows, Ellen, the past UA Treasurer, resigned halfway through IAP. For the process, we looked internal to the UA; we basically looked at every one who we thought either had the right skill set or the right position. The reason we ended up choosing Anika, even though she's only been here last semester, is because she's demonstrated that she's willing to keep up the initiative. We've decided to give her a chance. For the second part of IAP, she was all over IAP student-faculty dinner reimbursements and wrapping up things in the fall. I think she's proven she's qualified.

Anika: Hi guys; I'm Anika. I live in Bexley. Vrajesh said what I hoped to say. All of IAP, I devoted my time to trying out UA Treasurer. Just this past IAP, I've been trying to catch up on learning all the materials. I've met with everyone that would be appropriate. Vrajesh briefed me on things. I've been trying to catch up as fast as possible. I've done numerous reimbursements. I've done a lot of checks and things like that. I would love to be the UA Treasurer next semester.

Allan: Can you speak to your commitments and if you are retaining your spot on Class Council?

Anika: I have a UROP 9 hours a week, just Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday. I'm only taking 4 classes. And, I am going to retain my position on Class Council.

Sivakami: What is your position on Class Council?

Anika: I'm the Class Council secretary.

Tim R: What's your current stance on the fiscal policy? Do you think it's balanced, or...?

Anika: Yeah, absolutely. I went through all of our accounts. Based on our fall semester budget and spring, the spending seems reasonable. We know you're allocating out a huge amount. One of the things I did last week...I went through all 30 of our accounts. I made sure all of the spending added up. It did, and, absolutely, all of the committees...the majority of them are having meetings, using money correctly, etc. I know the money allocated to FinBoard has been allocated in good number. I don't know what else to say about that at this time.

Will: I move to close discussion.

**\*Closed Session.\***

**Anika Gupta is confirmed as the UA Treasurer.**



## 5. State of the UA

Vrajesh: So, again, I want to reiterate...I want to welcome Karan, Charles, and Chris. I think it's terrific that we have a few new senators. What I want to do first is begin by recapping the State of the UA that I gave in the fall. First of all, I think there are some people that are here for the first time. It will give a little bit of context for where we're coming from.

We, as an organization, were facing a large number of really complicated or big issues. Certainly, these are issues that the UA has not really tackled in a number of years. I'm thinking about enrollment, dining, etc. Jonté and I had presented a plan to support development and get things done, and we talked about the roles of the senator and the specific responsibilities...how that was going to contribute to the UA. Tackling these complicated large issues. The big internal theme was the loss of institutional memory. We tend to forget what we're working on. We talked about how we have a young Senate, young Exec, and young voter turnout which was not on a very positive trend. The kind of conclusion that we drew from that in the fall was that it would make sense to reconnect with the interests of undergrads. On the external side, we were facing an MIT that was becoming more and more corporate. If you remember, I kind of presented that coming out of the economic downturn. We were looking at the MIT that needed to cut a lot of costs, that was focused on efficiency, that was focused on kind of bottom line impact...not kind of focused on other things that large institutions pay attention to, things like creativity and process. These are things that kind of fell by the wayside, urgency brought the budget like it needs to be.

We talked about how we had a plan. We were going to have special Senate guests, issue-based discussion, the UA advisory committee, Senate mentors, and communication on a whole bunch of ways. We talked about Senator Communication with constituents. To be a member of UA, to really contribute to Senate; that kind of thing. That's meant to provide a context for where we're coming from.

Let me kind of outline the presentation. So, I think, I don't know if there will be a whole lot of disagreement. On certain issues, we did a really good job, and, on others, we didn't. Yet the circumstances are really challenging. We were up against some really difficult odds in many places. It would be misrepresentation if I don't believe we were falling short of some goals.

We have a number of opportunities heading towards us next semester. I'm going to highlight this notion of individual initiative. On the part of Senators, the Senate is kind of the engine that drives the UA. When Senators take initiative, things get done. What I want to do here is to reflect a little bit. This is kind of where we're at now. I want to make sure we call attention to the successes. I think there's something we need to learn from them. On the internal side, I think the advisory committee has been very successful. Just to give context, it's a group of faculty and alumni, there as a few administrators who can tell us how we can work better as an organization. Those that have participated...the professors are like incoming chair of the faculty, etc. I know Bill is a former CEO. There are some pretty important people who are willing to put in their time to help this organization become successful. I think that will help. If we maintain that structure, these people will be able to say: this is an issue, things were tried, etc. Based on that, that will kind of put us on a path.

I think we did a terrific job of reaching out on Institute Committee Student Reps. That's, in large, partly due to Alex Jordan, UA Chief of Staff. I think the position provided the right level of influence and saying: hey, we had this many vacancies. Who's the student rep that goes there? We filled tons of



vacancies, and we really, you know, took a huge step further. We're ready to play if the Institute wants our input.

I think you guys did a great job on constituency events. I think you guys really deserve a lot of credit. In terms of your events...over the past semester, the amount that you spent on your constituency events was more than that which was spent in the constituency events three semesters before. That's a pat on the back for you guys.

There were some things on the internal side that did not go so well. We talked of the Senate Mentoring program. I didn't see that pan out, but we're going to try again. For the fall, I don't think that was a success. On guest speakers, I think we started out on the right track, then, we kind of fizzled out. We had a few speakers that were terrific. Moving into the fall, we had fewer and fewer guest speakers. They weren't really the right people to have in the room. I think one area the ball really got dropped was policy. I think something of the Senate is to work on UA policy. Do I need to say anything about that last one?

On the external side. We had some external successes. We need to make sure we paid attention to how we engaged; so we can kind of emulate on other things. I think Sammi did a terrific job as far as leading the student undergraduate piece on the Chancellor search. I know Alex Dehnert helped a lot to build that website, too. We don't know who the next Chancellor is going to be yet, but I'll say I'm pleased how the UA was involved in the process. I think Allan and the committee did a terrific job. You remember Senate got that kicked off. You guys created the ad hoc committee. Now, if you go in, you see some printers being piloted. That was one of the examples where the UA really had the ability to work with an office to bring forth a change. Similarly, on educational technology, I guess we'll hear more about this in a couple of weeks. I think we've done a good job. A number of senior administrators have come to me and said they're really happy that we've helped out with an issue that was not really on the top of our list but theirs. I think that one discussion with Vijay was also good. Thanks for Tim Jenks, Liz Denys, and Daniel Hawkins that played a role on that topic. The undergrads on those committees did terrific job.

I also think we did a terrific job on events and programs. Janet did a very good job as far as being a PR committee chair as well as the Thanksgiving event and those sorts of things. I think those events really brought out the UA. I think those events were much more successful than DormStorm. We also got written feedback and were willing to act on it.

With programs, I was mostly thinking about student-faculty dinners. The program has really grown but a number of students are really happy with it and have come back to say they are happy.

I think another success is this outreach piece. I think Alec deserves some praise for the newsletter, minutes, summaries, etc., as well as the summaries in the Tech and as well as the summaries of what individual committees have been working on every single week. We're putting a lot more useful documentation out there to help students see what we're working on and have input.

There's also some other issues that are also an external one. I think on projects, we did, quite frankly, few. There was a CFL exchange, but other than that, I'm having trouble coming up with specific projects we were really able to get done in that definite period that had a direct benefit on undergrads. I might be leaving someone out, but I hope I'm not. So, that's kind of looking back. This is saying where we are at now. The next slides are moving forward.



I think a number of you folks are still developing a number of knowledge and skills. I met with a number of Senators, and I'll be a little bit blunt here: I heard the same comment, I'll paraphrase it...it was like..."I was new in Senate, so I sat in the back and hoped that I would begin learning things by osmosis." And then, everyone had the same realization that it didn't work. I would say you guys are still in the process of getting up to speed. One of the best ways to do that is to really make some mistakes. Then, all of a sudden, you realize how to get it right...not if you're not participating. Structure of the Senate meetings...I think there's probably a way of thinking of the Senate meetings to make them more efficient. I'm thinking of something more close to the beginning of the year, when we can contribute to particular topics over those minutes. One thing I'm going to look at is Committee Chair turnover.

On the external side, this issue is not something that's just going to vanish. All the dining halls didn't vaporize over IAP. In the current proposal, it's still moving forward. Yes, we haven't been tremendously successful over the past semester. That doesn't mean we can't resolve an issue that clearly matters to us a lot. Orientation – we had a meeting two weeks ago. This is the current issue that I know all of you are hearing about from your constituents. It's on that the UA will need to move to address over the next week or two. Walker Memorial, we heard a little on this. We didn't want to pay a whole lot of attention to it. It's kind of my high priorities list, and it should be on Senate's high priority list. That building is going to be repurposed and being involved in the right way is going to have a big impact on how the student groups are going to be there and how that space is used. The enrollment is still going to go up. I know, towards the end of last semester, a number of committee chairs provided Senate with the report that Senate requested. I think that there's really an opportunity there to have Senate have substantial discussion around the content of those reports and to really nail down what areas we feel are going to be impacted the most as a result of enrollment increase. We need to take that and bring it back to kind of the right committee chairs. We think it will be better for MIT. I think there's the opportunity to have some input here. Then, there's this meta-issue of student engagement. Remember, I brought that up in the fall, as well, as an area with some challenge. I think the economy is at least, on some perspectives, on somewhat more stable ground. As we move into that sort of a mode, we, as a representative body, need to begin to think about how we are going to be consulted or involved in decisions that are being made. How are we going to be involved? How are we contributing as well? What does that look like in the ideal case? What am I going to do now? I want to make sure that as we move forward, everyone is on the same basic information. I'm going to give you guys a quick overview on the main topics.

DSL will be creating a House Dining Committee of dining chairs and housemasters from dining dorms. The UA and DormCon dining chairs are invited to participate. Remember, Maseeh Hall will have a dining hall; so, 5 dorms. We have been invited to participate. They're considering creating a parallel committee for non-dining dorms to discuss topics such as kitchens and cooking classes. The UA and DormCon will be invited to participate. DSL will also meet with IFC, Panhel, and LGC, just to kind of discuss the issue. I didn't get much clarity, but I imagine that's kind of to make sure there isn't some gigantic un-met need.

I want to give a quick overview of what's going on with Orientation. This is a little bit on the discussion that was raised last Wednesday. Discussions about policy are ongoing things like the total length and what the purpose should be. Is Orientation meeting those goals? Those discussions are going on now. UAAP, Dan Hastings, and the Chancellor – they are willing to discuss those issues with students. I know that they're talking to DormCon, and we've had meetings with Dan Hastings. This was a question that was raised at Exec. Will SLOPE have a role in policy? SLOPE is going to continue to work on event



planning and putting the puzzle pieces together. They're not going to get to choose which puzzle. They'll be given the constraints, and they'll solve the problem within the constraints.

On Walker, I want to give everyone the same understanding. That project has two different arms. One is a space and acoustics assessment, and the other arm of that project is student engagement – involving looking at the way that this place is currently used and then considering scenarios in the event that the members of the first arm comes back and says: yes, the space is feasible to move forward with the project. What is the optimal way to accommodate everyone else? That's my understanding of the two different arms of the project. Details of how students will have input are still in discussion. ASA and I had a meeting, and we're still trying to iron out how students are going to have a voice in this.

On enrollment, which was kind of the 4<sup>th</sup> issue, as I understand it, the senior leadership of MIT is approaching individual units to determine when they're going to begin to face challenges and what additional accommodations need to be made. Beyond that, I certainly haven't been involved in any additional outreach on enrollment. I think this is an area we can explore a little bit. If we have the right kind of feedback, we can sort of present the right ways we can move forward to give input to help MIT.

All that being said, I want to kind of bring it back to...I've just kind of presented these kinds of heavy issues. Focusing on the internal side, I reiterate the importance of Senate participation. There are different areas I think are important. One is on the committees. It's nice to balance the issues that you're working on. I know many of the Senators feel like Senate has been really wrong, but some of the more fast paced action takes turns in the committees. That's why you should get involved on that side as well. I think it would be much more rewarding and satisfying to be working on stuff that's going to be implemented and actually play a role in that.

Participation in Senate, I think, is a very important step at this point. A number of you...I know many of you are freshmen. Almost all of you have had a semester in how Senate operates. There's so many of you that it's really up to each and every one of you if you want to make it into lively discussion. I made the decision to not show a chart of how much legislation came out. I made a similar decision. I think it's probably time to put some of that learning into practice and begin working on some policy. I think the UA Senate mailing list has been particularly quiet this past semester. The folks who have been in the UA have the contrast, but those that are new might not realize that the mailing list has historically served a very important function. First of all, getting information about issues out. Second, providing an issue to get questions. Third, it's a place where some of the legislation and other things can get vetted and proposed without having a vote, without taking up everyone's time in Senate. I think it's a very strong recommendation that the list starts getting used. By using this list outside of Senate, you'll make Senate more efficient when people are here.

Another topic I want to talk about is preparing adequately for guest speakers. For those that were at the meeting with Julie and Liz a couple days ago, I think there was an effort, by in large, if you look at the minutes from the meetings. The meeting didn't really progress from where it started very much. The same thing got repeated over and over again. As we look at bringing guest speakers such as the Chancellor and President, it might be more valuable, not just for Senate but also kind of for the guests, if both sides can really benefit more from that interaction rather than just kind of having it be a one way communication on that one particular topic. So, I would encourage that one good way to prepare for guest speakers is to think of the different issues you want to make sure they kind of address; then, I would encourage different Senators to talk to one another prior to the meeting. If Will has a particular question



and then Allan has a question that's similar, those two questions can be lumped into one question. You can get that, and you want to ask different questions; so, you're not asking 80% of what was said again.

You guys did a terrific job on the constituency events, but there's a bit more on constituency communication. If I walked into any dorm and knocked on 10 random dorm rooms, how many of those random people are going to know what's going on with the issues? How does that particular issue affect them? That's the level I know you guys are capable of communicating with constituents, not once a month or once a semester, but at least once a week; so, everyone feels like they have said and know what's going on.

So that's kind of internal. On the external side, that's what I'm charging you to do if this happens. On dining, I would encourage the Senate to realize the current UA policy and the 2009 DPC report. I can tell you that the report is saying something that's very, very different from the direction dining at MIT is moving right now. I'm not suggesting that you blindly copy what the administration wants; what I am suggesting is that you give a lot of thought as to whether you want to recommend something on that's what we want because that has an impact on how much impact at we have. That's to say, if they're moving forward on a particular part, that's different from us, we'll have presumably a little bit less influence on that if the decision has already been made. If we don't think that's the right thing all together, the right thing for us to do is to say we don't think we're going the right direction. It would be really helpful to me if the Senate looks at the report.

On Orientation, it's a similar situation. Again I want to charge you to evaluate the UA policy captured in the 2006 Orientation Report. It's not that long ago, but it's also not in the last couple of years as well; so, I think some things might need to be changed. The way I see it, there might need to be 3 cases: that report is completely wrong, basically the report is correct but it needs some amendments, or it's perfect. Whatever you come back with, that will help give a more current feel with the report.

On Walker, there's an open meeting next Monday at 5 pm. You should go.

I understand there will be a presentation by the Associate Provost talking about the project on enrollment. I would encourage Senate to follow up on the committee report to really make sure Senate understands what specific adjustments are going to be made in order to accommodate the enrollment increase. Then, there's a substantive decision on whether those adjustments are sufficient to meet the needs that are going to be there in the future.

So, I'll summarize it. At this point, the State of the UA...I'm not calling it strong. A turning point? That's up to you.

**Recess Begins: 8:54 pm; Recess Ends: 9:00 pm.**

## **6. Confirmation of Michael Walsh as the Chair of the Committee on Athletics**

Sammi: So, Riley decided to step down, and he, in the process of doing that, emailed out to the committee to see who was interested. Mike stepped forward as somebody who is interested. We interviewed him, and he has been part of the Athletics before and has ideas for next semester. I think he's done a great job last semester, and he's ready to step up and take the initiative.

Michael: I've met with Riley a couple times already. I kind of know the logistics on what he was doing. I kind of want to continue with those; they're kind of two things I want to look at. One is policy, which



gets into the issues of the varsity athletics cuts, etc. I'm not trying to get them back, although that would be nice, but more trying to see what can be done to optimize the athletics program to benefit as many students as possible. The other thing is to kind of pump up the athletics enthusiasm here. There are a couple of events, kind of to keep people in the loops, and I also want to look on communication between DAPER and students with regards to events and general information. That's all I've got.

Alex J: Can you tell us what you do as a rep to DAPER if they've met at all?

Michael: I'm also a rep to DAPER. That's a lot of communication-based stuff. For the next meeting, we're trying to evaluate the website so students can get information quickly and effectively. On that note, I talked to a few people. I'm going to be fuzzy on names. Someone wanted to work on trying to get an email chain, or something that I want to do, as kind of a network, of one person from each dorm and fraternity to kind of help spread the information that way. They talk to the constituents about varsity athletics or anything related to DAPER.

Allan: I know you spoke a lot of goals, and I'm glad you did that. Can you also speak to your commitments?

Michael: I'm taking 6 classes now, and 2 are HASS. I'm also a UA senator and with the DAPER advisory board; that's not a huge commitment – it doesn't commit a lot of outside time. I think I'll have a lot of time for this.

Jessica: Are you a rep to DAPER because of this?

Alex J: It was separate.

**\*Closed Session\***

**Michael Walsh is confirmed as the Chair of the Committee on Athletics.**

## **7. Confirmation of Alix de Monts as Chair of the Committee on Sustainability**

Sammi: The previous chair, Krishna, stepped down for personal reasons at the end of last semester. He reached out to see who is interested in taking on a leadership role. We interviewed everybody. I think Alix is qualified. She seems to have some of the management and leadership qualities good for who's going to be representing the committee to outside people including the administrators.

Alix: So first off, I want to speak to the goals. I have internal and external goals. Internal goals: I want to improve communication within the committee. I think something we need to work on is letting the members in the committee know what we're doing, so I plan to encourage much information on our committee mailing list as well and make the minutes more detailed. External goals: moving forward, with the event that's happening this month, it's an 8 week program. Another goal is instituting an Orientation program. Right now we're going to let that wait until the REX situation has calmed down. Another goal that I had is to...Maseeh Hall is going to be opening up and setting precedence there for sustainable living practices would be great. So, for example, already encouraging them to use clamshells from the get go, setting up a reasonable grocery bag system (there was a pilot program for this in Burton Conner) as well as having CFL's available so that Maseeh Hall can really lead the way. In terms of personal qualifications, I am a member of the solar electric vehicle team, and I'm very comfortable talking to





faculty members. At the MIT Energy Initiative was Dean Hastings as well and the Edgerton center. I'm very comfortable with emails, communicating, both oral and written, that stuff. Any questions?

Karan: As far as this falls, how much of the role do you plan on having to interact with the new dining vendor coming in?

Alix: In the interest of dining, our role is to focus on clamshells. But, if you could talk to the new dining vendor to encourage the employees there to use the clamshells, that's really the main goal.

Allan: I have sort of three questions. I'll ask them separately. First off, your personal commitments?

Alix: I'm taking 4 and a half classes, so 2 of them are within my major. So, commitments: I'm on the solar electric vehicle team; it's like a UROP in terms of time commitments. I will not be playing a varsity sport this spring; so, that give me weekends and 2 extra hours a day.

Allan: As sustainability committee chair, where do you feel the sustainability of the older dorms will fall into the agenda? I'm from Random, and I can tell you first hand it's not sustainable. Is it on your agenda?

Alix: Something we're working on is improving insulation of the dorms. We had one committee member who was looking towards insulating windows. Random Hall has not been discussed directly yet, as well as CFL. I've been working with John DiFava and the faculty to see what effect the CFL exchange has on the dorms, and we believe it has a great effect in dorms where lighting matters.

Allan: What do you think your biggest challenges will be as committee chair?

Alix: MIT students seem to be opposed to change; and so, something that I would like to work on is new dorms setting precedence for sustainable lives, encouraging freshmen from the get go to have sustainable practices. For example, the Orientation program will be another step in encouraging students right from the get go.

**\*Closed Session\***

**Alix de Monts is confirmed as the Chair of the Committee on Sustainability.**

## **8. Confirmation of Radhika Malik as Chair of the Student Committee on Educational Policy**

Sammi: So, Radhika started taking over for David at the end of last semester. As David went abroad this semester, he put a lot of time into transitioning her. She was the Vice Chair last semester; she did a really good job as Vice Chair, taking a lot of things that often fall towards the Chair. She took care of it. She has some good ideas with getting the position and taking initiatives out of it. We think she'll do a really good job.

Radhika: I've been on SCEP since freshmen year. I'm a junior now. Last semester, I was Vice Chair with David being Chair. I've taken care of violations. Last semester I sort of transitioned. I helped out with the enrollment report, senate activities, etc. We worked with violations during faculty dinners, and now we're working on a couple new projects. We're still brainstorming right now; so, I'm looking forward to a new semester with a lot of people taking more initiative than just doing projects that Senate requires them to do. Members have already been working; they're already brainstorming and coming up with ideas. We're looking for great stuff to do.



Ben: Do you have a plan for the coming semester? Any main topics you want to address?

Radhika: We try to keep violations and student faculty dinners. Apart from that we have projects starting last semester. One of those is a violation system. Vrajesh was talking to David about it. Right now, we're restarting on that project; just identifying what the current system in place is, looking for students on how to improve that system. Apart from that, we've met with the Chair of the Faculty last semester. What we're recommending to do is to formulate the guidelines. He has agreed to publish it in the faculty newsletter in the summer. Apart from that, members have been brainstorming. We're encouraging them to take a lead.

Jessica: What are some of the new initiatives like?

Radhika: The Chair of the Faculty wants us to look forward to getting student input. Coming up with a list ourselves and sending it out and to take a look at which one of those they think are good, what they think professors should really know. We're looking with the evaluations team. We've been approached by them in basically trying to increase the response rate. What kind of questions students would want on the evaluation and on the evaluation right now.

Alec: As I recall, in faculty meetings, the chair and members of SCEP have speaking rights?

Sami: That's CUP.

Alec: I retract my question.

Alex J: Have you tried to ask the Chair of the Faculty to help handle violations?

Radhika: What we did on the project. We're starting to handle violations, and that was the end of it. We actually maintained an active spreadsheet: what kind of violation there is, what action was taken ultimately at the end, etc. What we do by the 3<sup>rd</sup> week, by the time the syllabus gets finalized, we take that spreadsheet (we've been maintaining that data) and we find that data. We don't really need any help from the Chair of the Faculty because we have that data already. We find classes to check on whether the class has violated the rules or not; if it has, we can just email the professor. There's a violation, we can handle it in time, rather than emailing them in the last week of classes.

Alex J: On that same issue, do you think it's appropriate for them to handle that because ultimately it's his job. SCEP is a useful tool for students because a lot of times they are the intermediate, and students don't know they can go to the faculty. Ultimately, though, it's his job.

Radhika: Is it really his job to find out who and what they are?

Alex J: It's his job to address violations.

Radhika: What we have noticed in the last few semesters is that, if we don't handle those violations, it will probably come to us by the end of term. Some students will find it and report it to us. If we just leave it, it might find students later on. Our committee has been active in taking handling that. I think it's a big initiative. The violations have been taken care of.

Alex J: At the 3<sup>rd</sup> week, do you report on the classes that have repeatedly violated? Does the Chair of the Faculty know that these courses are continually violating these rules, or are you only communicating to professors?



Radhika: When we are having a problem, then, we'll go to the Chair of the Faculty. That's what's been helpful in the past. You have to do what is in your best capability to handle. If you are suggesting we incorporate him more, we can definitely do that more next semester. If you think that will be helpful.

Bockelie: First, an idea for the top 10 list. Classes start 5 minutes after and end 5 minutes before. You said you have a lot of excited people; how do you maintain that throughout the semester when people get bogged down by work?

Radhika: Last semester, we didn't really have members that have taken initiative. We were given projects. There was a lot of, I was just a member, I wasn't really Chair or Vice Chair or anything. As long as this is my project, I was taking care of it. That's one thing. Members will be taking initiatives on their own projects. Apart from that, the Chair has to keep taking violations from the members. If they are on board, the chairs should also be available to help them with guidance. That's what my job is, I'm hoping.

Almas: A lot of my constituents expressed concerns about the inconsistencies and unfair grading system in particular courses and classes. When I asked a lot of people, they hadn't reported any violations, since it's not like an official rule. What are you going to do to address those concerns?

Radhika: There is no formal written rule for it. While we can, we really try to help out students who come to us reporting that kind of violations. My exam wasn't graded properly or anything...we can recommend students what they can do. We had grading issues; we had an issue in 7.012. Michelle Mischke, who was the course administrator, announced that we had too many students, we can't regrade. This is something we talked to administrators about because they have to change that. I don't think there's anything we can do on that. We can probably go to faculty, in specific issues. I don't know if there's any possible solution to that. If you have any in mind, we can address that and take that as a proper project.

Betsy: I was just looking at the enrollment report from last semester. It seemed like a number of departments haven't thought about it very much. They had no plan to accommodate the increase in enrollment. Do you intend on following up and talking about specifics?

Radhika: We definitely will follow up on them. One major improvement is with the chemistry department. They definitely weren't aware that enrollment in 3.091 will go down as Sadoway leaves. I don't think there's anything apart from that we can do. We'll continue our conversations with them and give any recommendation on what we can do.

Karan: I know that, at least, they were looking at changes to the HASS and TEAL systems, and I was wondering if you want to continue looking on those subjects and what we're trying to do to continue working on these issues.

Radhika: Since there has been a change on the HASS system, we'll probably want to get some student input. We'll probably just like send out a survey to get some input on that in terms of asking freshmen and what their expectations from it will be. In terms of the TEAL, we had focus groups with Professor Greytek. We'll probably just get in touch with the physics department again to see whether they want any input again. That was initiated by the physics department itself. Apart from that, last semester goals, we're always open to projects that we want to succeed. I think it will be useful for us to do. If you have anything in mind, just shoot me an email about what we should do.



Tim R: It seems to me that, in your position, we have knowledge backed up by experience. It seems to me you have a wealth of knowledge backed up in the last couple of minutes. In your last comments, though, it didn't seem like you willing to defend the students at the cost of additional time and effort. In this position, you are effectively speaking for the students who as a whole may feel like they are taken advantage of at a certain grading scheme. I don't accept the idea that we can't do anything about things. I would be happy to back up or like support you with your experience, if I can trust that you are willing to go and yell at a professor or any admin when sacrificing student interests. That's probably just me being a bit wrong, I can understand that. I'm a little bit cautious right now.

Rachel M: Is he going to ask a question, or can we save that for discussion. I think it's out of order for people to attack people without asking them a question to answer.

Tim R: Okay, will you be out there to defend students on faculty policy?

Radhika: The reason I said that is, there isn't anything they can do when we're backed by official rules. We're given a set of rules; we can just go to faculty and say that this is section 2.5; end of story; you're violating that. If there is a legitimate concern and rage, for example, if assignments haven't been graded by the 7<sup>th</sup> week or anything, we are ready to contact the professor – if there's actually a legitimate concern. We'd be more than able. We're going to talk to faculty about it. In my 3 years of experience, I've really seen that, even though it doesn't seem like it, at the end of the day, the faculty really want you to learn. But I think, if we want them to understand soon, we have to understand their position of course. There's really...I don't think there's nothing specific we can do. We really do have to help our violations policy. We just won't go tell the professor something without backing for it. If we have some backing, we can definitely do something about it.

Will: The Chair of the Faculty does have, in their rules, some authority over this. I think you should contact that, since he has authority. The Chair of the Faculty may be a resource in such a situation.

Radhika: I guess we can use this more. The times we've talked to the Chair of the Faculty...he usually says these are the rules, so go by the rules.

Alex J: What are you guys doing to gather student feedback on interdisciplinary majors and minors? Cause that's kind of the trend...6-7 major, potentially new course 10 major, 16 engineering major, which is an interdisciplinary major, sustainability minor which is similar to energy, etc. What are you doing to collect student feedback and present students a view on future of MIT curriculum?

Radhika: We haven't done anything so far. I've done a bunch in the class, so we do have experience in gathering student input, for example when the GIR changes were coming. We tried to see what the general changes were. If you guys think that interdisciplinary majors are something we should take the initiative on getting student engagement, that would definitely be one of our things.

Ben: I was wondering what...I guess there are situations where there are no policies. How do you feel about proposing new policies to the administrators?

Radhika: New policies to the administration goes through a different process. It has to go through CUP, etc. While we can suggest or ask for student reps on these committees, we can also talk to the Chair of the Faculty about it. We can suggest these things, but we really can't tell them what to do.

Tim J: I think while what we are doing are good points, some of these discussions are better suited for what SCEP would do and not this discussion. Thus, I move to close discussion.



**\*Closed Session.\***

**Radhika Malik is approved as the Chair of SCEP.**

## **9. Exec Update**

Jonté: I think the discussion that we've had, the past two we have had, have been trending towards positive. I want to congratulate Senate in demonstrating that you guys have been really engaged. I think we've all spoken with a number of you, and it's very obvious to me that you guys are engaged and want to be involved in some way. I think the question for us is just how and where you guys get involved. So, later in the meeting, we're going to discuss in particular how we think we can better match you guys up to positively affect student life. Thank you guys for what I think were two very productive agenda items. Let's move on the Exec Update.

Vrajesh: I think we've covered what we need to say in State of the UA, but I'm willing to take any questions.

Alex J: I have a question. Where are we in the RFP process in the new dining program?

Vrajesh: Well, the UA dining chair used to be the UA's rep on that committee.

Will: Can that be changed?

Vrajesh: My opinion is the Senate should review the current UA policy on dining because whether senate continues to believe in that policy will help determine whether we ought to have a speaker on the committee.

Betsy: I'm wondering about Walker. I was reading, talking to some people, etc. They were in a student group; so, I'm wondering if that's them sort of making assumptions. All student groups are going somewhere that has yet to be determined, right?

Vrajesh: My understanding is that there's a commitment that no student group will need to move this academic year. That's mostly a function of the fact that they're not that far along in the process yet anyways. My understanding is that the working group, which is Marty Schmidt, Phil Walsh, and John Dunbar, have been having one on one meetings, individual meetings with particular student groups. I don't know if the specific content of these discussions have been released.

Betsy: Are there any specific ideas for things?

Vrajesh: My understanding is, at a holistic level, they are assessing the ways that student groups currently use space, as opposed to being in, the second phase, in the student engagement arm which is considering scenarios for accommodations. I'm pretty confident in that we're in the first part of that.

Will: They haven't given me any official decision letters to move forward. Therefore, they're not looking at other spaces.

Betsy: They haven't sent it out yet?

Will: They haven't sent out anything.

Rachel M: They're still waiting for architects.

Betsy: Like "still waiting"?

Rachel M: Legitimately.



Almas: What exactly are they doing to the Walker memorial?

Will: The music and theater arts departments have been looking for appropriate space allegedly for a long time. Potentially, if you walk to walker gym, there would be an auditorium, performance space, etc.

Betsy: Can you tell us the details of your conversation with Dean Hastings on REX?

Vrajesh: There were 4 questions that were raised in the UA Exec meeting which Sammi and I asked for specific answers to. The first is the role of SLOPE changing from event planning to policy. No, still event planning was his response. The second question was the role of DSL vs. DUE in this whole issue. His response was they would need to work together and coordinate, and the different people involved would be Humphreys, Baker, DSL, and Norman and Young from DUE. The reason for the change...they were trying to make Orientation better, and we asked if an alternative solution was proposed, what constraints must be met? There were two constraints. One is REX should not be shortened, that's what he's committed to. The second was that there would not be a cost increase by doing this.

Betsy: To make Orientation better, did he elaborate at all on that? How did he define "better"?

Vrajesh: I didn't write down any quotes. I'm speculating here as to what he meant when he said that. What he is thinking is, if we can preserve all of the different benefits that come out of Orientation and simultaneously do it using fewer resources or, alternatively, if we can use the same amount of resources and have all of the same benefits and more come out of the Orientation, that would be great.

Betsy: Is there like a cost concern?

Vrajesh: There was a constraint in making Orientation better. It was considered not acceptable in increasing the cost. Any improvements to make it better would have to be accompanied with something else; it could not be solely for the cost changes.

Betsy: By making it shorter, is that seen as preserving all the qualitative aspects or is that preserving itself seem like a qualitative improvement?

Vrajesh: I preface this with: we didn't drill down into that particular question. I'm imaging it was seen as a bit of both actually. If we can actually get all of the benefits of Orientation in fewer resources, then that would definitely be better.

Jessica: I was just confused a little bit. Did they say anything about cost? If they were trying to make it better, I understand why they would try to see what events from Orientation were better and what were not. How did it get to the point of when REX was shortened?

Vrajesh: I know that Julie talked about that at the Senate meeting that we had. She walked us through her process. I imagined that she was primarily kind of the point of contact in UAAP as far as being directly in contact with that process, whereas Dan is kind of the Dean for all of DUE. I imagine he was less directly intact of the process; so we didn't walk through how we came to the recommendations they came through. I do think Julie kind of walked through that process in here.

Betsy: Does DSL know it's involved, yet?

Vrajesh: In the future, he'll be involved. I also met with Hastings but not with Barbara or Henry.

Sammi: I'm pretty sure they know it's involved as far as they are sort of in charge of orchestrating SLOPE. They know they need to get on that. I don't know if they are actively in at changes to housing lotteries.



Jonté: What are your plans for meeting with Henry Humphreys and Barbara Baker?

Vrajesh: My current, I guess, next step, is actually what I suggested to Senate. I think it would be tremendously beneficial if Senate reviewed the current standing UA policy because it would be, I think, a waste of time and resources, among other things, if Sammi and I move forward and advocate for a 5 year old policy and Senate comes back and says they disagree with portions of it. We would have to go back and kind of change and amend a bunch of things. That's currently the bottleneck I'm waiting for. That being said, we are moving forward. I understand Alex that you're conducting the process for SLOPE.

Alex J: We got three people that are interesting. There are two spots. I'm just going to say preliminarily, we're interviewing them tomorrow. It's highly unlikely we're going to give you two names next Monday.

Vrajesh: We're not sitting back as far as SLOPE is concerned. I don't have on my schedule any meetings with Julie at this time.

Will: I know that Tim Robertson printed out copies of the 2006 Orientation report. We can pass them out potentially to return to discussing Orientation later in the meeting. That seems to be a good way for Senate to engage in the Orientation issue.

Vrajesh: It's not a bad idea, but I would take a day to digest the report and run it by people in your living group, getting feedback from that. Kind of informally try to conduct a little bit of information. Use that to conduct a discussion over the next few weeks. I think it will capture some of the nuances that must not be captured. I just want to reiterate what I've kind of requested which was some sort of a statement with regards to Senate and by extension the undergraduate position with regards to Orientation today. And, relative to this report, that is to say...should we put a stamp on this report? This was out in 2006. Should we put 2011 on there or should they add a page to the top of it? In 2011, we read this report and it basically corrects here, and here are 2 or 3 areas we need to correct, too. Please read this page instead of, say, page 7. And another...you can say this report is completely wrong. We continue this and produce a new report on this. One of these 3 actions coming out of Senate within the next week would be beneficial as far as the UA stance on this issue goes.

Tim R: I printed out the new copies. It's a 42-page report. Digesting does take some time, as well as, commenting on some of the statistics when the report was generated. As the president said, I second that. Take some time to digest it, and highlight what you feel is most relevant to constituencies. If you want a copy, get them afterwards.

Alex J: I motion that we move on.

**Motion to close discussion passes.**

## **10. Reports from Committees**

Jonté: Responding to some feedback...I feel as though senators want to be more clued in on what committees are doing; when someone asks a question, they want to be able to answer those questions. As a result, I think we're going to have this section right after the Exec Update; so, we ask a few committees to come in and report on that process. I asked the Committee on Student Life and Housing to report on what they've done this past semester and any challenges that they've encountered throughout this process; so, we can kind of figure out maybe what we want this to look like in the future. Senate, under committees, Number 1 says that Senate maintains its prime jurisdiction of the committees. We are



responsible for the proper functioning of the committees, as opposed to the president. Even though it's less of a day to day, we should still be in the loop of what we're doing over the course of at least 3 weeks or so. With that said, I'm going to ask Richard to address the assembly. I asked both of them to prepare a 3 minute or so presentation on, like I said before, what they accomplished this past semester.

Richard: CSL at a glance. From Fall 2010 to Spring 2011, first of all, let's get some perspective. Last year in CSL, they did about 3 things in the Fall semester and 3 things in the Spring semester. The past year, we went all out; we want to accomplish these things. Unfortunately, we only got to 3 or 4 of them, so 50%. You can read these later on, if you want to see the specific accomplishments and failures.

The main reasons why they happened is because, first, there were certain circumstances that were very successful in the past years, but the company went out of business. That's the second thing; we had not so good projects.

The second type of things was internal to the committee. First, we worked on so many projects as a whole, rather than trying to accomplish a smaller set of them, and got like that much accomplished. The second thing, which Radhika made a really good point on, although we planned on it, we didn't actually do it well of having individual committee members take ownership of specific projects. I think we're going to do a much better job of that this semester. Moving forward, how are we going to go from 50% success rate to 100%?

As I have already said, we are going to make people have individual ownership of specific projects. We're going to split the organization on who we're going to get to accomplish our tasks. We're splitting the semester into two parts, done before spring break and done after spring break. We have a few tasks for this first half, of course. Just to be clear, people still have weekly assignments, but we want concrete specific goals by the end of the first half.

For PLUS, we want to get the mentees started on leadership projects. We also are doing this really cool FSILG+D community service competition, basically a competition where each living group constitutes a team. 5 living groups at least are participating. We have Rate your Driver now, as you guys in Senate have told us to do. Clearly our concrete goal for that, for the first half, is to have 3 very detailed reports. By very detailed reports, I mean every single comment is condensed down.

Weekend Boston Daytime shuttles. By the end of the spring break, we want to meet with the appropriate administrators with a report of usage; when we started this, this is going to take 3 semesters, before the administration is going to consider it. I think we can shorten that to one semester of course. Wellness Week. That's something we're going to continue to do. By the end of spring break, we want to have the entire schedule, including all reservations. That's a lot of work. We're going to content to half a semester. Finally, we're going to do 2-3 events. One of them has already happened; it was a great success. That's basically what's going on, what happened last semester, and how we're moving forward.

My question is: we CSL report to you guys; we always are looking for new suggestions to problems in Student Life that need to be addressed or policy issues...really any process whatsoever. So, if you have any suggestions, please tell me.

Tim J: Did you say how much for the power outlets?

Richard: There are some parts of the Stata center, in the Family Café. Theirs are about \$5000 to add; in the other areas, they're only \$1700 or \$700-\$800.





There are six items in the final slide. Those are things that we 100% want to accomplish. At the beginning of this Senate meeting, I talked to Will, and we want to get the power outlets; we want to get that down – even put a water fountain on the fourth floor of the Student Center. If we come at the end of the semester, and we didn't accomplish these six things, you can come and slap my wrist.

Shuang: For the Rate Your Drive rating, is there any advertisement of the rating system on the shuttle?

Richard: That's a really good point.

Shuang: Maybe stickers: are you angry or unsatisfied? Go to here, and rate them 1.

Richard: I thank you for these suggestions.

Almas: For suggestions, some people, actually over IAP, because of the whole dining plan, asked me whether there will be any sort of, since they want to move into non-dining dorms, any sort of ways they can learn how to cook. I was thinking it affects quite a few students. Do you think your committee can do anything about it or facilitate it?

Richard: Let me just say that as CSL, Student Life as a whole is a very broad topic. I think that should be addressed, whether we do it or dining does it. But, the best solution is we should work on it together.

Will: I know East Campus was thinking of doing classes; you can talk to them.

James: The cooking classes at East Campus are really good; so, you should talk to our dining chair.

Allan: are we still adjusting just this one question. I just wanted to thank you for putting this together, and I think this is more what senate needs,.

Tim R: Are you open to working with student groups that want to do something? What I'm proposing more is someone with CSL that would like to get involved with campus-wide activities. They can use, as kind of a point to advertise themselves, it to also spend a point on students. Students, as a whole, are not restricted; students as a whole should benefit.

Richard: Definitely, I'm guessing sort of co-funding. It's up to you guys as Senate.

Betsy: The specifics of CSL, more about CSL in general. I think that students need to be first under the committees anyways. How much do you put into the purpose of CSL? It's like a party committee; we do fund things. I was kind of wondering how incredibly useful it's going to be. In terms of like...it would be very difficult as a senator to give policy to this committee.

Richard: I think that definitely is a fundamental question: where does CSL fit in? One role of CSL is to actually help other committees with their jobs. To address the point, though, there are no purely student life issues that don't fit into any other committee. Like this whole Athena printing, CSL worked on that. Then, Senate thought: this is an important issue; we need a committee for it. Hawkins was working on it last year. Don't think we're working on policy issues, but, if you have ideas for policy issues specific to student life, let us know.

Rachel M: I guess I was going to reiterate that point. Form a historical perspective, CSL sort of slides on the administrating events scale. I think its outlay is relatively balanced this year. I know this is a bit of stretch. It's another one of the, if Senate tasks them with policy, type groups.

Hawkins: So, Housing has a new committee. It was recreated last semester. We were anticipating there would be one coming online; that was our main focus for awhile. We also tried to figure out what else might fit under housing – the REX/Rush agreement maybe. We decided to stay away from that one. I



met with the president of the phoenix group; we exchanged emails a couple of times, and eventually he started asking questions. I met people in the Housing office. It seemed like the phoenix group was okay with the amount of involvement they had in. I kept asking for answers, but I didn't ask questions very hard.

I also emailed the president of PBE to see if we can help them. Basically they said: I'll get back to you.

I've been tracking the waitlist numbers from the housing website because housing doesn't relay kept historical data at all, which is bad. I figured it might be useful.

You've probably noticed, I've kept saying "I" and not "we." It's because I've been a pretty bad chair. I didn't communicate very well with my committee, and I didn't task them with much. I'm determined to change that over next semester. Please task the housing committee with things you think are useful. I'm always at Senate.

Things for this year: a topic that came up last semester was the possibility of students taking on dorm transfers. I thought that was a really good idea. This semester, I'm hoping to meet with former and current RACs from dorms to figure out if that was feasible and maybe come up with some form of proposal for it. Obviously, REX and Orientation have been big topics recently. I don't really know what housing should be doing about that. It definitely falls under our purview. I'd love to hear from everyone about summer housing.

Alex J: On summer housing, Bexley hated last year. They wanted it to go back to how it was. A lot of people were forced to move their stuff off-site. We talked about it, and a lot of people were angry that they couldn't come back to the dorm if they had early return.

Hawkins: That Exec meeting was at Senior House. A lot of people were there, and they were coming up with new ideas. I was like: oh, I'll go to housing office. But, it turns out the president and Will were already doing that.

Tim J: Can you poke around the housing office and see how they decide when freshmen can come back on campus if they're not in an FPOP? I feel like that would be helpful for the whole Orientation thing.

Rachel M: That may also be a UAAP decision.

Tim J: If we can get information on how much it actually affects them...

Alex J: It might be a liability issue.

Jessica: I was wondering if you can review on summer housing.

Hawkins: In the past, in the summer, a lot of the dorms have been open, and, if you live in the dorm, you can stay there during the summer; you keep all your stuff there. Everything is fine. MIT decided to optimize the use of space or whatever other terms they wanted to use. They decided to close a lot of dorms and only have three of them over the summer. If you love your room, and they're closed, you can't live in it during the summer. You have to move your stuff, and it gets complicated. They don't help you. There were a lot of problems last year. We need to figure out how to fix them. I don't think there's going to be an opinion to go back to the way it was. We have to make the best of what we have.

Jessica: In the past when they were open, was there a separate additional price you pay for housing? And, I guess, what was there as to not have closed the dorms?

Hawkins: They had several people spread out through a lot of space.



Rachel M: They were running into conferences. To give an example of that, they used one of the McCormick towers for housing the high school students. Closing the entire dorm gives some optimal use for housing; it also gets people that will pay more. My understanding is to get people that will pay more. They will use solid floors. Some conferences are more likely to choose MIT.

Betsy: Did you also poke around to see exactly how long is needed for the Readjustment Lottery? That seems like a lot of time to run a computer program.

Rachel M: It's not a computer. It's a first run by a computer.

James: The run through a computer takes about an hour; they run through for a couple of hours. Probably takes 6 hours. Right now, you put your name on a waitlist, and you can see on the housing website how many people are on that waitlist. That basically takes all the information you have.

Hawkins: If you talk to someone, they can give you some information. Hopefully, students are able to run that processes that would be able to, we could...I don't want to say, bend the rules, but we can try to come up with something that is the best for everyone.

Betsy: But would that involve students? We still can't give the waitlist a process.

Hawkins: It's possible it could be a mutual selection process.

Betsy: On the housing data, can you elaborate more on that?

Hawkins: On the housing website, there's a table of how many people can get into what dorm.

Betsy: Did anything come out of that, or are you just reporting on what can happen?

Allan: So, it sounds like you have a bit of a plan for next semester. A lot of it is going to depend on what happens the next week or two. Is there anything you need from Senate? Guidelines, more people?

Hawkins: More people would be good. Anything we just talked about, please email me at ua-housing-chairs. Our email list isn't functional yet, though, Martin Holmes still owns it.

Jessica: Could you keep us updated on how summer housing will work?

Hawkins: I did. I talked to them about the actual numbers like cost vs. revenue. There are some actual costs. I wonder if they balanced it out. We ran the numbers. They did spend a couple thousand dollars.

Rachel M: I guess further giving it to offices...it's not because I have inside information. I think you should work with HSG about how any decision could be made.

Vrajesh: It's a good idea.

Hawkins: I'll try it.

Jonté: I hope we can move onto something easier now.

Alec: Point of Personal Privilege – can I motion to recess because my hands are about to die?

**Recess Begins: 10:47 pm; Recess Ends: 10:52 pm.**

## **11. Approval of Minutes**

**Minutes for 42 U.A.S. 8 are approved.**

**Minutes for 42 U.A.S. E2 are approved.**



## 12. 42 U.A.S. 9.1: Bill to Create the Assistant Secretary on Information Management

Alec: **\*Authors bill.\*** So, essentially, many things have been coming from the administration this past semester, and I think it's important for the information to get passed down in a timely efficient manner. The vision is that, once new information gets put out, the assistant secretary would immediately summarize it and post it to senate lists, saying you should pay attention to page 3 or 7, or warning certain committees of upcoming changes that may affect them. This way, we can lower that time gap between

Adam: I think this bill is what history does. I generally object to the idea of adding more positions because I don't think it will get the job done any better.

Alex J: I agree with Adam a lot, and I also want to know why all of these seemingly irrelevant people are signing this bill. Not that you're not relevant or anything. It's just odd when most of them aren't pertinent to what this bill asked for.

Alec: Well, this idea came up, and I discussed it with a few people and wrote a bill. A few of the authors have been around longer than I have, more seniority, so I wanted an opinion of if this is an ongoing problem. Then, there's another one or two that was just sitting around and decided to join on the bill.

Sammi: I want to add that. Not only, as Adam says, not only does this fall under history, he's done a really, really good job this semester. If you guys remember, from his midterm reviews, he usually won. If you guys think something that should be coming out of the history committee isn't, I think the first task would be to give this to this history committee given that he's done a good job.

Tim J: While it is kind of a problem, and everybody's on the same page, that is a lot better on the history committee. I don't like bringing more people to do stuff, in my opinion.

Hawkins: The reason my name is down there...I kind of feel like this is relevant for me, specifically, and everyone else actually. When new information is out, I need to know about it quickly to decide what I need to do about it. To me, having been on the history committee, it wasn't clear what this has to do with the history committee. It seems to me that this is on current events and internal communications. It seems like something that has to be done, so I supported it.

Betsy: Yes, I agree that it's a history thing. I don't think we can do it. I also, for senators that may not know this, I know one of the documents is the DUE reports to the President. There aren't actually that many reports to the President. So, if you as a senator want to be more up to date, you probably don't need a new position to tell you where they are.

Jessica: I guess my concern is that, it's not that we as a Senate can't find documents, I just feel like a lot of us aren't as inclined to read them. I was hoping, with these summaries, they will hopefully read them more.

Tim R: It was my impression that the history committee has been focused on past documents and bringing back documents that pertain to current events from the bulks. It is, in my opinion, that having that position focus on bringing on past events to current events, having someone data mining and for current release on the position are kind of separate. I think someone getting a task for the future and past history is a bit much. If you think it's better to give it to Adam and the history committee then go ahead. From



the standpoint of Alec, he is getting a lot on his plate with very little help. This is my way of trying to support him in doing his job.

Alex J: Did you consult the history committee at all; have they been asked to do this; did you look to see?

Alec: I apologize that I did not consult this history committee early enough, that is my fault. I did talk to him before this Senate meeting, and we ended without reaching a compromise or a solution; so, I decided that it would be best to put it in Senate and have Senate decide. But, yes, I should've brought it to the history committee earlier, and that is my fault.

Almas: I think that definitely something like that will be beneficial for a lot of Senate members, for someone is responsible for gathering the information. I don't know if we need a new position for that. I think we should definitely keep that part of the bill or make a new bill saying that such updates should be done.

Tim J: I just want to hear what Adam's response to those conversations were. Would you be willing to share this?

Adam: Alec asked me at some point this week; we met to talk about it before Senate. I don't think this bill is necessary, and it duplicates the work of the history committee. If you want me to watch for these types of documents to be posted and for changes to the website to be made, I can do that, and I would be happy to forward the information for you. To be honest, I'm not entirely sure it's worth the effort because I don't think most of you would read it. If at least a few of you would benefit from it, I'll do it.

Jonté: I'm trying to look up an email that Alec sent to me when he initially sent the bill. Initially, he sent this bill out; he submitted it to me for inclusion on this agenda. I put it on the agenda, and it's been kind of living in that folder ever since. What I'm telling this for is, this bill predates the report to the president. I just wanted to provide some history there.

Vrajesh: I wanted to make a general statement and then a specific one. My general statement is sort of a response to what Almas said. If the Senate feels like things of this sort are necessary, a great time to bring it up is during Exec Update. Sure, if you want you can write a bill to do it. I agree this is a good thing to have. We can simply just task the committee to do things. It might not be necessary. My more specific comment: on a thing like this, that might fall under a particularly purview, the only signature I want to see is Adam's if Adam wishes to do it. Otherwise, I move to call the question.

**42 U.A.S. 9.1 passes without Speaker Vote, 10-9.**

### **13. Report from the Ad-Hoc Committee on FinBoard Policy**

Rachel M: I guess I'm going to start by giving an overview of how the committee worked. If you want, I can answer specific issues of the policy documents. That's roughly 12 pages.

The goals of the committee were simply to increase the allocation and notification of funds. The process we went through: we formed the membership. We had one open forum with student groups. Based on the feedback we received at the open forum, I determined there was significant interest. Moving forward, I'm just finishing up drafting a new application. We drafted new bylaws. I'm also drafting a more formal report and implementation document. We may also need to make amendments to other governing documents. For timing, we're recommending staying with a few appeals, with separate allocations for policy; we're recommending removing caps. We're reducing the number of restricted items, though still restricting T-shirts. A major part of the policy is that it's clear exceptions can be made in some cases and



not in others. Some of this needs to be taken in consideration. That doesn't mean if you ask for \$450 it will work because \$450 is less than \$500.

In terms of operations, we mostly focus on the operations. Most of the members on the board are interacting with student groups. Currently that's somewhere from 2-20. Currently, they've basically only met with them and questioned. We're thinking about expanding that to regular applications on spending. In terms of oversight in that, we are recommending implementing post-cycle spending reports; so, after right now, you sum and apply, you get money, and then whatever happens after you spend the money.

For future spending, you need to get a brief report on what you should be spending. This corresponds to what line items should be from the application.

Regular meetings of FinBoard, currently they roughly meet. We're recommending weekly meetings of the whole Board, weekly meetings of contacting the Chair and Vice Chair for both UA officers and the student activities officers. In terms of governance, we're recommending the student offices. The increase was actually accomplished by adding two ex-officio seats. Another representative of Senate is included; so, they increase the number of hands on that front. In terms of Chair and Vice Chair, they currently...bylaws from 2004...they included working with how three of those were invited as a whole. This elects 3 FinBoard members, which hasn't happened for 6 or 7 years, since these bylaws were written. We've moved that restriction. There's a restriction that the Chair and Vice Chair cannot include any of those. We've removed that position. The Chair and Vice Chair are selected by the incoming document. They select them, and all of these are recommended for approval. The big reply is that all of these directly imply, if you're familiar, it's essential that FinBoard decides, with the exception of one person, and Senate rubber stamps it. It's to loosen up. One of the issues we're trying to address: currently, officers see something wrong with FinBoard. This is to create some responsibility to FinBoard as a whole.

We are looking into the issue of roll over. As far as overallocation goes, that is ultimately a decision of Senate. But, I think the wording in the FinBoard bylaws is that it's not FinBoard's decision, regardless of how much they should be overallocating.

In terms of implementation, Spring II, the special cycle this semester, will be special because we're sort of transitioning in policy. We may be transitioning a new Board which may be affecting how allocations were handled. Part of our report for further action and implementation is outlining a schedule for further review. There's some need that we can pick real numbers. Some guidelines for real caps is how the money should be spent between two quality schedules between the semester. The current thought is after two years; policy reform as a whole can be completed in two years.

Jonté: So, what's your schedule for getting the changes in?

Rachel M: The current changes are to approve a draft and get it approved at the next Senate meeting. I have read to close it for consistency. Do you want the policies on that document or a separate document? I hope to have those approved at the next meeting. Within those next couple of days, I should have a formal write-up and an implementation plan both for this semester being special and a transition into a new system.

Allan: So, I served on this committee as well I guess. She did a great job of explaining what we did. I just wanted to rehighlight, at least for me, what this was about. Previously, we have not put all the money



into student hands. I think we've gone a long way, more cycles, etc. The other thought about this is more oversight. There's more transparency between the two groups. For me, I am happy with this draft.

Rachel M: The one question I have for you guys is: do you want me to write up and highlight the changes for this document?

A Lot of People: Yes.

Betsy: Can you speak to our money and the FinBoard reserve accounts?

Rachel M: It came up really briefly. I spoke to the chair in the committee. It's still unclear how much money we actually have in the accounts. I've talked to Vrajesh a fair amount on this. Further actions may be taken on this matter outside the scope of this committee. I don't think we currently have a decided course of action. It's an ongoing issue that will be addressed. Nobody's going to forget about that large amount of money. I've heard a figure of \$30000. If any of you have heard the number, it's not \$30000. I don't feel comfortable giving guesses on the numbers. I have like 25% accuracy on the numbers I have.

Betsy: Looking at the draft, it seems like maybe you can include the philosophy of the bylaws. It seems more formal because the policy was the last question I've written.

Rachel M: This is partly due to my timing, and the policy hasn't been written up. It has been put into question. It is a legitimate question. Currently, they are separate. I guess the main effect is we have the ability to amend them. Currently we have the ability to amend them.

Betsy: I don't care where the philosophy goes; I think policy, it might be more efficient for FinBoard to just change them and sort of make sure the additional oversight will be in place. I feel like Senate will have enough contact in FinBoard that it won't be an issue.

Rachel: Would you want a document that can be amended slowly by FinBoard? The way the bylaws are controlled, it can take either a 2/3 vote of FinBoard or a majority vote or a 2/3 vote of Senate. We could do something similar, or it can be something completely controlled by FinBoard.

Betsy: Are there 3 senate reps?

Rachel: 2

Betsy: 2 and UA Treasurer? I think that's enough transparency, although I wouldn't have an issue of Senate voting on it.

Tim R: Can we take an appropriate step to make sure that we don't run into a similar problem and suddenly an account gets created.

Rachel M: To elaborate on that, the issue is that, it's not a normal account in any sense. It's a financial settlement account. If you look at the balance report, the account of all the money that's been ever put in it. Then, you have to run various financial reports as opposed to historical money. It's a lot of dealing with what's real money and what's fake money.

Tim R: I was wondering is there at least one representative that can peek into the FinBoard account. It's like, okay, we haven't heard from you guys in a month.

Rachel M: Do you mean, in terms of like the settlement account in terms of FinBoard activity. All of their allocations should come to us. There should be a certain amount of funds without senator approval.



In fact, I gave a student amount, required that they shouldn't be approve. In theory, there shouldn't be any change in allocations.

Tim R: I motion to end discussion.

**Motion to close discussion passes.**

## 14. New Business and Discussion

Rachel M: I haven't written the bill, but I can write it up really quickly. ASA would like to recommend a Fresh Fund allocation of \$3000 because, if you remember, we passed a bill in the last meeting of the fall semester to give us the ability to allocate with our approval. That did not happen with regards to various extenuating circumstances. We had told them explicitly to wait for Fresh Fund. They had only to wait for \$30. Is it okay for me to write the bill while people discuss things?

Anika: For clarification, did you want to add \$300 or take \$300 from Fresh Fund?

Rachel M: The latter.

Jonté: We'll take it up; just let me know. I sent you guys an email. The current policy is the 2006 UA Orientation Report in moving on with this, since the UA doesn't have a current position. We, as Senate, need to take a look at it and decide whether or not we're going to support it. If we're not going to support it, we need to figure out what our position is. I think, if the Senate doesn't have particular issues, it's more difficult to bring people to administrators. I would like to put this on Senate as something with a high priority. The, it's a 42 page report, but it's got wide margins. To be honest, once you get stated, it will be really interesting to see all the policies that get the point across. I would encourage you guys to go speak with people from the living groups to think about some of the ideas that are going to be raised in the report. Over the weekend, come together in some form and fashion with our personal list of things we want to support or need to be removed from our position. Make a decision on whether legislation will come before Senate on Monday in terms of defining the UA position. I'm not sure what kind of discussion you guys were expecting to have tonight. I think it would be useful to come up with an action plan on the report and issues on how we can engage other stakeholders on campus. Lastly, maybe discuss some of the implementation.

Allan: Largely, I think we're playing an information game; so, those of you who haven't yet, I almost demand that you at least read the report. I would also advise highly that you make sure that your constituents understand that changes are happening. If they haven't now, I'd be really surprised. You need to get the right facts in your mind. More importantly, you also need to understand what your stake in this is. As for what we should be doing, I would like to see, put forth, some sort of legislation that we propose – a specific plan or proposal for REX that Vrajesh and Sammi can take to specific administrators and work with them about this specific plan. I assume some people have suggested writing the plan before, and the idea was to meet before this as a large group. I highly advise we take a stance of diplomacy. If they do not perceive an attack or a threat from us, they're probably going to be a lot more open to us. Those are, I guess, my initial thoughts here.

Tim J: After putting out my information, what do you guys think about that? Is that a viable solution?

Allan: Could you reiterate it again?

Tim J: What I proposed is you keep the date that freshmen are allowed to arrive on-campus the same as the previous; so, if they want to participate in X number of REX, it's fine. You leave it up to a student. If





a student doesn't really want to get on campus until a day before convocation, whatever the latest day they can check in is, they can do that. If you keep those two, the earliest they can do that at the same time, the earliest they can let REX happen, it should be fine.

James: So the problem I see is that these students that are in FPOPs, which their timing is going to be about 75% of them are in their FPOPs until noon Sundays or Mondays. That would mean 75% of freshmen would either have a single day of REX or two days of REX. I'm pretty certain that that's the proposed schedule she's brought to us. Now with all the backpedalling, I don't know if that's the proposed schedule at all.

Betsy: I think, I've heard actually, the people from FPOPs completely ditch their FPOPs. They are a little more clingy in their FPOP activities; that's for FPOP coordinators to deal with. I don't think FPOPs are very good on being over the weekend. The idea of giving freshmen more choice...as long as we have enough information...

Vrajesh: I agree with Jonté's earlier point that it's a very important issue and it would be a good idea for as many Senators as possible to be informed. I think, given the time, this discussion is timed to be better suited for next week, but if other people feel differently they should continue.

Allan: I was just going to advocate that Tim made a valid point that should be explored. I agreed with Vrajesh that we should look at this report and move forward at a later date. So I move to move forward unless someone has an objection.

Jonté: I object.

Allan: I retract my motion, then.

Karan: I think we should synthesize the 2006 documents and figure out what are the deviations from said policy, what are the rationales for these deviations from said policy. Then, we can move forward with what position the UA wants to take in their forms. I feel like a lot of us haven't really parsed down and synthesized it in full.

Jonté: I think something that we ran into at the end of the last emergency meeting is that we had a discussion and that we didn't commit to doing anything. What I want us to discuss is what we want to do over the next week. We talked about doing the report. Are we going to meet some time over the weekend, or are people individually going to meet? We need some concrete answers before we close discussion.

Tim R: I believe on Sunday, when we were in the UA Office speaking, we had the idea of meeting on Saturday night to hash this out. We'd have Saturday to get out the idea and Sunday to finalize it and get it in printed form on the agenda and Monday to get it approved. That's what a few of us had come to as a tentative schedule. If other people in Senate are okay with it, if people had other ideas, by all means.

Betsy: We have caucus planned for Saturday. It seems like the most important thing to talk about; so, I think we should talk there.

Karan: I was just going to say, in the case of doing prep work for Saturday, just for the sense of so we don't have to be in data calculation mode. I'd be more than willing to participate in that, if we can do some of that now. That would make Saturday go back much more smoothly.



Rachel M: My concern with having a legislation draft at that point is it won't be sent out for view of the members in time. Granted we're assured of most of the members, but we won't have time to consult with constituency members.

Betsy: I think the idea was like, in the ideal world, everyone would come to the meeting. Everyone would talk to their constituents, etc. We think all that data is necessary. That seems like beyond unlikely that people will actually respond which then will come to the constituents. They have something concrete to look at. I'm sort of hoping people can pull it off. Everyone needs time to talk to the constituencies. We don't have a good grasp of what's going on.

Allan: Initially, first off, a question. Do we have the power to create subcommittees right now, cause we don't have a Vice Speaker and they're chaired by the Vice Speaker... I can add to the motion that we decide a chair. So, what I would suggest, I guess, well, this is open for discussion. I agree with the point that it isn't optimal to have this thing emailed out Sunday night. We don't have fair time for people to read this thing. If we have a subcommittee formed, we get some commitment to work on this in the next few days. We have a working draft. Finalized submission can still be made Saturday or Sunday. Reasonably, the ideas have been forming all week. I'll let comments flow before motions.

Tim R: My suggestion would be people read documents tonight and then go around to constituents on their free time this week. Then, on Saturday, you can come to the table knowing what your constituents think, knowing what the documents are. In that way, we have your student representation. We can get a written bill. It really doesn't help to have 8 dorms. They're going to look at us and be like, what about the other minority? If East Campus and Simmons are the only ones that show up, or East Campus and Burton Conner, you're misrepresenting the student body. Please do your best; talk to you constituencies, and come on Saturday.

Karan: One thing when I think about this is, doing this on Saturday, things tend to look a lot better in hindsight. It won't be perfect. I feel like at least having a preprocess will smooth out those problems. All those little things that come back to haunt us next week won't appear on the bill.

Jonté: We should read the documents first. We can have a piece of legislation sent out, appear on the agenda, and then Monday, everybody can have a chance to say something on it, discuss it, etc.; by that point everyone will have had a chance to see it. With that said, if you want to refer to a subcommittee, that would be good, too. If you want to set the agenda for the caucus on Saturday, those would be two very good motions I can see people doing at this time.

Tim R: Motion to change the agenda of the caucus to reflect the changes that you just said.

**Motion to change the agenda of the caucus passes.**

Jonté: The second was to refer to a subcommittee.

**\*Some confusion on the necessity of a subcommittee.\***

Jonté: Are you guys saying we shouldn't create a subcommittee?

Betsy: Senators should be gathering information separately. Based on what I got, I think the bill should look like this...begin to gather ideas, look at what other dorms think, etc. Just come in Saturday more informed.



Jonté: So okay, then. Everyone is in for making an effort this week to look at the Orientation report and to talk to constituents. Put ideas for legislation about the UA's position on senate lists. Are there any objections on that?

Allan: Please definitely use the Senate lists.

Jonté: Next on the agenda. Dining.

Alex J: Can we postpone it?

Jonté: Any discussion? Next topic caucuses. I think we should talk about this now. I really can't do straw polls, but I don't want to send out a doodle. Can we decide on a date?

### **Date and time set for 42 U.A.S. C1.**

Shuang: I hope at least one Senator from each dorm comes that day. If you only have one Senator for your dorm, then you better be there.

Jessica: Is it open?

Jonté: I think you should be able to bring people if you find it productive.

Rachel M: If they're going to be productive or constructive, sure. If they're complaining or whining, they're not helping the purpose of the meeting.

Jessica: I was going to ask if DormCon should be involved?

Jonté: My personal inclination is: we can't talk to DormCon until we know what we're doing.

Almas: I think this caucus should be kept closed. As senators, it's our job to know what our constituents want. I think we'll get more done if we keep it closed, rather than move to a solution like the emergency meeting.

Karan: I know the dorm presidents have been involved in figuring things out. I don't know if you should see if it's helpful or go around the same path.

Tim R: A lot of the actions being done by DormCon have been taken into consideration by at least myself and a few senators. DormCon has been taking a few stances. I would like to suggest an independent body. We'll make sure not to step on toes in the future.

Rachel M: I was mostly going to agree. If they want to participate, they can, but this is not to establish a student opinion on Orientation changes; so, if they want to be involved, they can, but should they be involved as members of the UA or as officers or representatives of DormCon?

Betsy: Just about DormCon, they have published a statement on the website. We should read it, and if you want us to agree with them, we can do that.

Hawkins: I just want to remind people that DormCon is focused on dorms and dorm issues. They're probably really concerned about REX whereas the UA should be concerned more about Orientation overall, including REX but the whole thing.

Alicia: If you guys are having planning or having a meeting, I think it would be nice as a member of DormCon just to be able to have someone on DormCon present. And if you do want to, Alec is also a member of DormCon as a dorm president. DormCon did discuss, not only concerned about REX, but about other issues, too.



Vrajesh: I wanted to remind Senate of the importance of openness in what we're doing. Even Senate members are open to public. I would caution you from taking unnecessary steps to close things that would otherwise be open and functional.

Alec: Point of information – should this go on the UA public calendar then?

Alex J: Yes.

Tim J: We need guest speakers on that. We need to get administrators in here and start asking them questions that are not easy.

Jonté: Alright, this is 42 U.A.S. 9.2.

Rachel M: Basically, it's to give them \$300. It's for incidental public printing, event. They're not an MIT funded group. They don't regularly apply to FinBoard. This is their ability to get some funds to them. This is in line with previous total allocations made from Fresh Fund. It's totally ASA's fault that this wasn't taken care of over IAP.

Alex J: I move to approve this bill.

**42 U.A.S. 9.2 passes.**

## **15. Closing Remarks**

Jonté: I think I did all I needed to do to close.

Vrajesh: Parts of the speech I've given are somewhat critical. I also wanted to convey appreciation for those of you that are still here. Those of you that are still here...it takes a lot to be here for so long. For those of you that are new senators, you haven't yet earned one of these, but you have earned a UA T-shirt. So, come by for one of these.

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 am.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai  
UA Secretary General