

## 1. Quote of the Night

Rachel Meyer, ASA President and Off-Campus Senator: “You’re not allowed to suspend the bylaws to amend the bylaws.”

## 2. Summary

The UA President gave a detailed presentation on the state of UA restructuring and the process that the current Restructuring Committee has taken to categorize key problems and issues, identify stakeholders and collect iterative feedback, and finally develop solutions, both structural and behavioral, to address UA inefficiencies. Bills to end Senate approval of Vice Chairs and to cap the length of Senate meetings were discussed but not yet passed. Fall 2011 Finboard allocations for student groups were approved. More positions were approved, including a new Chair of the Alumni Relations Committee.

## 3. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 pm.

## 4. Roll Call

The following members were absent: Victor Pontis (Baker), Diego Giraldez (Baker), Yixin Li (Burton Conner), Yihua Li (Burton Conner), Andy Jiahao Liang (MacGregor), Taleen Afeyan (Sororities)

The following members were late: Regina Cho (Maseeh Hall), Katy Gero (Senior House)

## 5. Chief of Staff Nominations

Will: Let’s have the Chief of Staff start so that the nominated representative can leave early.

David Chang: So as you know, Kerri Mills, who was the SAO Financial Director, is leaving slash is gone. We’re looking for a replacement. SAO has traditionally had one or two students on each search committee. They asked me to find a student who is well versed and has worked with Keri Mills in the past and would have strong opinions about the next person to fill the next SAO finance person role. Greg can say a little more about himself. He’s the Business Officer of The Tech, has worked closely with Kerri, and is in general a good individual to work with.

Greg: Hi, everyone. I’m the Business Officer of The Tech, and I was the Advertising Manager freshman spring, so I’ve been in the Business Manager role for a year and a half, and was in charge of advertising before that. Both of these involve working with SAO upstairs, fixing mistakes they make, and working through the RFP process. I have strong opinions about the person who should fill this role. I think they should be an advocate for student groups, and fight for them, not with them. I’m looking for someone who trusts and respects students and shows that they’re competent. That’s what I have to say.

Will: We can have some open discussion and then we’ll have closed discussion when you leave the room, and then find out if you were approved or not. Questions?

Leonid: Will you make this person make SAPweb go away?

Greg: That’s VPF.

Leah: I wish it went away, too.

Ryan: Since there seem to be no more questions, motion to enter closed discussion.

Janet: Second.

Will: Any objections? Technically only Senators are supposed to be here. Do you care?

Allan: No.

**Greg Steinbrecher is approved as the student representative on the SAO Financial Director Search Committee.**

## 6. Exec Update

Will: Is there any other new business we want to present? We also have an exec update, but we'll do that. This is an opportunity to have new business and then put it on the agenda. Now let's do the exec update, if that's ok, which is not on the agenda, but the president should be allowed to do so.

Allan: CJAC is meeting next Wednesday. That's the Corporation Joint Advisory Board. MIT has President Hockfield, and the Corporation hires and fires her. They're the supreme power of MIT. They really look at student issues on campus. Ex post facto, I sit on CJAC, as well as Paul Kominers and Cameron McCord, who isn't here right now. Also relevant to Senate is the meeting of the UA Faculty Advisory Board. This was new last year. We have a bunch of faculty who are very knowledgeable about getting things done at MIT, and how we operate, and they care about us. One of them is the former Secretary of the Air Force; she's been with MIT since the '50s. They're really cool people and great to talk to. We'll email you about the times. They're not worked out yet, but for half hour to an hour there will be time for Senate to come in and have discussion with these people. Before that, we'll have administrators come talk to them about their interactions with us. Exec comes after you guys. TyShaun and I will also present to them. They give us feedback and will want to hear what you want to say. Also you guys get dinner. Exec gets dessert so it sucks to be you guys!

Retreat: if you want to go, you should fill out the form. You should really go. We have some good programming for the day; I'm looking forward to it. Those are the major topics now. Any questions?

## 7. Approval of 43 UAS 1 Minutes

Will: Moving on to approving 43 UAS 1 minutes. You all had a chance to look at this. Unless there are objections, I'm going to motion to approve them.

Ryan: Second.

Will: Any objections to approving the minutes?

**43 UAS 1 Minutes are approved.**

## 8. 43 UAS 2.1: Bill to End Senate Approval of Vice Chairs

Will: Let's move on to the Bill to End Senate Approval of Vice Chairs. I will hand this over to Ryan Normandin and a co-author who's not here.

Ryan: Do you want me to read it?

Will: I don't think that's necessary; people can read it on their laptops.

Ryan: Senate for a long time has approved vice-chairs. Senators have complained about why we do this, as they're generally always approved, and are shoo-ins. I don't think Senate should do this anymore. It takes up time. The committee chairs are closer to their committees than we are. The vice chair is also different; each committee uses their vice chair differently. It's hard for Senate to know exactly what the

differences are and to say someone is good or bad for that committee. I think it's micro managing and not necessary on our part. This bill would require a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority and would have to be voted on next week, not this week, but would allow us to no longer approve vice chairs.

Will: Yes, it would take two weeks.

Leonid: I think this is a wonderful idea. I didn't realize this actually wasn't in the constitution. I motion to amend it to say we are amending the constitution actually.

Will: I would suggest that since we are meeting next week, to figure it out in the interim week.

Leonid: I thought we could amend now?

Will: This has to appear on two consecutive agendas so people are aware of exactly what's going on.

David: I'm wondering about your opinion on how the vice chair is approved for chair almost de facto. How does this bill affect that?

Ryan: I like that process; I think that's a good thing. When Senate approves chairs, we tend to approve them unless there's a glaring problem. I think it's excellent for the chair to bring the vice-chair in as the new chair because they know exactly who would be excellent for that position.

Will: Does anyone else want to make a comment?

Rachel: Another piece of the bill could be allowing for the president and vice president to approve them as well.

Ryan: I personally would not like that, because I think Senate should be approving them, not Exec. It's a checks and balance thing.

Allan: So are we not taking amendments to the bill right now?

Will: I was recommending that because we can't vote on it until next week.

Allan: Because I was just going to say that some of the phrasing is a little unclear. For example, one clause...

Rachel: You're probably not looking at the amended copy.

Allan: I do want to see the constitution mentioned in there. For checks and balances from Senate to Exec, not approving vice chairs just removes the power altogether and just to committee chairs. The committees are a part of Exec. I would not be opposed to having to approve the vice chairs as well. There should be some kind of check.

Will: I think we should limit the amount of time for this discussion. We shouldn't discuss the inner workings of Senate for so long. I'm going to allow five minutes more and then move to the next agenda item. Consider letting other people speak or talking on the mailing lists.

Rachel: It might be good to hold off on this until the Committee on Restructuring comes back with some proposal, and not considering the internal functioning of Senate until we figure it out.

Ryan: I think it should be done before restructuring, because they're looking at how Senate operates. Us doing this now will suggest to the restructuring committee that we want this new policy to continue.

Allan: Point of information, who is the other co-signer?

Ryan: Andy Liang.

Allan: The other MacGregor senator?

Ryan: Yeah, he's not here now, though.

Will: I would suggest we table this to the next meeting.

Ryan: Second.

Will: This is non-amendable. Any objections to closing debate?

**43 UAS 2.1 has been tabled until the next meeting.**

### **9. 43 UAS 4.2 Bill to Cap Length of Senate Meetings (1/2)**

Will: Now we're on to the Bill to Cap Length of Senate Meetings. In light of the discussion with UA restructuring, I was going to say we could postpone this to after talking about UA restructuring. How do you feel about that? If you feel strongly, you should say something. Ryan, you have the floor initially.

Ryan: We've had really long meetings in the past. Will has done a good job keeping them at a reasonable amount of time. I just wanted a cap because we may not always have a Speaker who limits that. As with restructuring, I think they may suggest a cap on meetings as well. But this is a good band-aid measure until restructuring, and it's a strong suggestion that that's what we want to see.

Will: Andy also cosigned this? This also amends the bylaws, which say that we can't amend the bylaws until a week passes. But we could suspend the bylaws to amend the bylaws, but that requires a 2/3 majority.

Rachel: You're not allowed to suspend the bylaws to amend the bylaws. Because then we could suspend them and do whatever.

Will: I suppose. Ok, I think that's the most conservative reading of the intention of the people.

Paul: Where's Judcomm?

Will: I'm willing to go with that since I think it was set up with that intent. If people are objecting to that, we should follow the safer margin. So we can't pass this until next week. That said, I think debate should proceed.

Katy: I was wondering what real correlation there was between attrition rate and long meetings.

Ryan: Last year specifically, we had a lot of people resign. I spoke with a lot of them, and the reason for that and why they didn't want to run for reelection was because for the length of time you put into Senate meetings, you don't get much out of it. Senate is inefficient. Hopefully restructuring will address some of these problems. But if we have shorter meetings with a definite end time, people will be more prepared. We can have more discussion on the mailing list, then just briefly come in, discuss bills... it just becomes more efficient.

Betsy: What's your reasoning behind the 1½-hour cap?

Ryan: We have so far done that. I know we haven't had that much legislation. Based on what I've seen, that just seems like a good time. 2 hours is perhaps acceptable but perhaps unnecessary; I think you can fit Senate into 1½ hours.

Betsy: Do you think there should be Q&A, or the focus groups aspect of Senate? Because that would take more time.

Ryan: I believe in the past, it hasn't been mandatory. I wouldn't include that in the 1½ hours. That would be just for the agenda and legislation, not the administrators talking.

Will: For clarification, this Senate does meet in parliamentary/legislative mode, and you might want to clarify that that is what the 1½ hours cover. Also, I will let more people speak up instead of doing Q&A.

Betsy: I'm doing that now.

Allan: So to break down a couple things: I'm the UA President and you guys are senate. You guys should run yourselves and decide the policies that affect yourselves. I'm not going to veto this because you have the prerogative to govern yourselves. However, you should not tie your hands to anything. Will has done a phenomenal job of keeping Senate short and to the point. There will be times especially since we cut meetings to every other week, where we don't know how much business is going to pile up every other week. And we will probably have to go over 1½ hours. I would consider 2 over 1½ hours and we will probably go over that as well. Especially the meetings at the end when we approve all the committee chairs, you need to be thorough otherwise you'll suck at your job. Senate shouldn't tie its hands; it should rely on the leadership of the Speaker and its own leadership.

Rachel: I'll hold off on speaking. Was going to make a motion.

Will: I would like to limit debate. Already five minutes have passed. Let's have five more minutes. According to Roberts' Rules, if the body wants to meet longer, it should be able to. Certainly if there's universal consent, the meeting should proceed. Under a similar reading, if this is part of the bylaws, technically you could suspend the bylaws to meet longer, which requires a 2/3 vote. I don't know if people consider that a valid use of that. Rachel is the de facto parliamentarian for now. The other thing I was going to point out is that there is a motion to adjourn. It's undebateable, takes precedence over every other motion, requires a majority to pass, and will end the meeting immediately. It requires the majority, so one debate would be whether or not it'd be needed to have this.

Leonid: It seems heavy-handed to tie yourself down, especially with the fact that you need a majority vote to adjourn. Also given that we are meeting every other week. It's treating the symptom, not the problem. I hope restructuring fixes Senate to being efficient. This will just help us do less things. There's a balance between being efficient and doing things. I'm worried that we'll have useless 1½ hour meetings every other week.

Katy: I understand this is a motivation to become more efficient. This is not the best solution. Is there something else we can do to make Senate more efficient than just the time limit? It seems very heavy handed. Because Senate is being inefficient over just having a lot to do.

Will: Does anyone else want to speak?

Rachel: I move to table further discussion until after restructuring.

Will: Table or postpone until that time? Ok, postpone until after restructuring. This requires a majority to pass, just to make you aware. This is a debatable motion. It requires a second to be valid.

Betsy: Second.

Will: The question is debating whether we should postpone discussion until after discussing restructuring the UA. Discussion on this? Objections to moving to after discussing restructuring the UA?

Leonid: Let me just point out that the confirmation wouldn't take that long and in case people want to leave, maybe we should do that first.

Will: Motion to close discussion until after restructuring. Any objections? Ok, motion to postpone discussion. Any objections?

**43 UAS 2.2 is postponed to after discussion on UA restructuring.**

## 10. Committee Nominations

Will: I'll hand it off to Allan for nominations.

Allan: I'll go through this in order they are on the board. First, Laura Royden as CAR chair. Last semester I wasn't able to find someone I was comfortable with. This year, we had three people apply and I found

Laura to be the perfect fit. She's the EC person who deals with alumni. She did that job phenomenally. She has connections to alumni groups, has experience working with alumni from an organizational standpoint, and has good ideas. I found her to be a wonderful choice. She can say a few words and then we'll take more questions.

Laura: Hi, I'm Laura. I'm a junior in course 11. I'm on the alumni committee in EC, and am the prime person in contact with 3000 alums. I'm responsible for emailing them and telling them what's been going on in EC. They usually contact me if they want something. I've dealt with a range of issues they've brought up. For instance, in February, for the Dollar Pledge with orientation, I worked with them and EC Exec. Also, last week, someone wanted me to find a person's picture on a wall, so I scanned things in Hayden. I'm also responsible for organizing alumni facts. There's a weekly thing where we eat together. Alumni facts are once a semester where we have dinner and invite our alums to eat dinner and share stories. We tell them what's going on now, and they tell us the history. We have our fourth ones in a couple weeks. They've been getting larger. I have experience. Last time we had an alum from 1957 come which was great.

Will: 30 more seconds.

Laura: I would love to continue doing this at a larger level. Something that separates us from other schools is the culture we've developed. And alums are key because they are what have created this so I'd love to do more with that.

Ryan: Do you have ideas for what to do this semester?

Laura: I know student-alumni dinners were started last year. I think they could be better implemented. For instance, getting more alums involved, because before it was just students who contacted alums. More departments or living groups could get involved, versus just students contacting alums they already know. There are also departments and organizations and student groups that don't have as much of strong alumni connection as living groups currently do, so I want to do more with that.

Will: Other questions?

Ben: Will you be able to balance being on the EC Alumni Comm with the UA?

Laura: Yes because they're both similar, and require doing similar things, but they don't overlap that much. EC doesn't require that much time.

Ryan: Motion to enter closed discussion.

Tyshaun: second.

*Closed discussion.*

**Laura Royden is confirmed as the Chair of the Executive Committee on Alumni Relations.**

Will: The next person is Catherine Fan. Allan?

Allan: Moving right along. We are nominating Catherine Fan as CIT, who deals with our website and our internal technology issues. This is not for technology policy, that's Leonid. Catherine had already been approved by Exec over the summer to get working as soon as possible. She's New House's webmaster; their website looks pretty spiffy. She also has skills as a graphic designer, which the UA really needs. I'm moving to approve her now because Exec isn't allowed to make permanent appointments like that.

Catherine: Hi, I'm a sophomore in course 20. I'm also involved in ATS—the Association of Taiwanese Students. I've worked more with graphics stuff versus backend stuff. Redesigning vote.mit.edu is my primary goal.

Allan: For those of you who are oblivious, it looks like geocities page.

Will: I will point out that you were all elected through that.

**Catherine Fan is confirmed as the Assistant Vice President of Information Technology.**

Allan: Last but not least, we are confirming Emily Zhao as the Vice Chair of SCEP. She was the Finboard Chair last year and did a phenomenal job, and helped restructure Finboard with invaluable input. She was specifically selected by Paul Kominers. I gladly endorse her to this body.

Emily: Do I have to talk about myself?

Paul: She's on CUP, and I'm not. The more people on CUP on SCEP, the better.

Allan: CUP is the Committee on the Undergraduate Program. They parallel SCEP, working on academic stuff. It makes sense that they work closely.

Jennifer: What's SCEP?

Allan: The Student Committee on Educational Policy.

Paul: Our primary visible work is end-of-term violations and student-faculty dinners. You've been positively affected by a bunch of things that we've done but probably haven't known about it. That's us.

Ryan: Motion to close discussion.

Regina: Second.

Paul: Do I get kicked out during closed discussion?

Hawkins: Motion to kick Paul out.

Will: That's not in order.

**Emily Zhao is confirmed as the Vice Chair of the Student Committee on Educational Policy.**

David: I nominate Jonathan Liu to be on RAC. DAPER, which runs athletics, has a variety of committees. Some are for varsity sports and some are for clubs. They have one for recreational use, for people who use the Z center but for other things. He's in EC and organizes himself and other people to do pickup games, not just intramurals. He really uses the Z Center facilities really well. And works out regularly. So he's good. He's someone who's well acquainted with the Z Center and will do well with the committee.

Will: He's not here, right? So any questions should be directed to you?

David: Yes.

Will: This is a rather informal committee, right?

David: Yes.

Will: Any objections to closing discussion? Seeing none, the question is approving Jonathan Liu as the student rep on the Recreational Advisory Committee.

**Jonathan Liu is confirmed as the student representative to the Recreational Advisory Committee.**

## **11. Approval of 2011 Fall Finboard Allocations**

Will: Now we should spend some time on this. Finboard allocations that come out to around \$150,000.

Rachel: \$100,000.

Will: Go ahead and lead discussion—either Rachel, as ASA president, or Alex as Finboard Chair?

Rachel: You can't really read any of this. Let's look at the picture, not the PDF. Basically we're allocating about \$100,000 on top of the \$50,000 we did over the summer. There is \$10,000 left for appeals. We reviewed all of the applications. The ones in gray were approved by a formal meeting of Finboard. The other ones were approved by a combination of a technical quorum of Finboard in consultation with notes and recommendations online with other members. It's probably easier to answer questions than talk about it overall since it's 100 groups.

Will: Did you send this to ua-senate? Any questions?

Katy: I was wondering why the Logarithms get more money than all the other a cappella groups combined.

Rachel: Most of the money is for A/V equipment in Kresge. The other A/V equipment that everyone else uses doesn't work in Kresge. They have to pay \$1500 instead of \$200 for MIT A/V.

Will: So this is the picture? I'll scroll slowly.

Rachel: Blue is what they got, and above that is what they asked for.

Will: The number of dollars is at the top? Any other questions?

Trevor: What is Alpha Phi Alpha? What is it? How come they received 0% of what they asked for? Membership issues?

Rachel: They're a multicultural fraternity and they list only having two members. They're up for review on whether they should be a group at all, much less funding.

Will: You need five members to be a group, right?

Rachel: Five student members. The other groups that were zeroed are a group that's making income on an event they're hosting, and another one that applied for an event that will be handled by LEF/Arcade instead.

Ryan: Motion to close discussion.

Betsy: Second.

Will: Objections to closing discussion? Seeing none, the question is whether or not to approve this as the Fall 2011 Finboard allocations.

**Fall 2011 Finboard Allocations are approved.**

Betsy: While we're on the discussion of Finboard... I was the impromptu Senate rep to Finboard last year. It would help Finboard if we had actual Senate reps to Finboard. Senate should figure that out.

Rachel: So currently we do have two Senate reps. One has been unresponsive, and I'm the other.

Will: Senate has the power to remove that person and appoint a new person.

Betsy: I don't have enough experience, and it's ridiculous for me to be the one on it. We should be able to get someone who is interested.

Will: I don't think the Senate rep to Finboard has to be a member of Senate, though it is encouraged because they should be accountable to Senate. Seeing no further discussion, I'll move to UA restructuring.

## 12. Discussion on UA Restructuring



Will: I'll let Allan take charge since he was the one who brought this to the agenda.

Allan: I need to use the projector.

Will: Ok, it will take a second. While they're working on that, I'll give an introduction. Last year, as you may or may not know, the UA took a large look at restructuring the UA. One part was looking at Senate. There were a series of committees. This is the most recent one, the Restructuring Committee, headed by the former Chair of the Faculty. It also contains people from other student governments.

Allan: This is looking at the issue of restructuring. You have maybe seen at the past couple of meetings why we're working on restructuring, and the inefficiencies of Senate and inefficiencies of the UA as a whole. Some of this will be slow for the people who already know, but I want the new members to understand.

Why restructure? There are a few reasons. First is the groups trying to represent students at MIT. We have the UA, GSC, Post-Doc Association, IFC, Panhel, DormCon, LGC, individual dorm governments... we are all governments of students representing students. That's a lot of voices in the room, a lot of vices trying to represent students. There's the Baker Foundation that's not representative... DSL, DUE, the Chancellor, The Tech, CFS, which is a more informal, less polite student advocacy group.

Will: For background information, they had their peak three years ago.

Allan: They make protests. They protested the issue of student engagement, and still exist. The point is that there are so many groups trying to represent students. It's great but it creates a lot of clutter. The right voices aren't always heard. For instance, with dining. Dining was a big issue last year. The administrators thought they had the right view of student opinion. We said that we had the right view. We had a referendum last year that proved that we had the right opinion, just saying.

Senior administration: Israel Ruiz is replacing Terry Stone soon. Chancellor Grimson was appointed last year; he's the former head of course 6, and is sort of a renowned student advocate at MIT. He is charged by the President for being in charge of all things student. The people below him are DUE, DGE, the Dean of Student Life. Everything that the UA works on gets sent through his department. 90%. Some go through the Provost and Theresa Stone. Grimson has a very different leadership style than former chancellor Philip Clay. He values a diverse array of opinions, a broad spectrum, and data driven analysis on things. Currently we think that the UA provides a single point of view. We need more options for a spectrum of views, for a data analysis of views, in order to work more closely with the chancellor and work better.

Here's the bit I'm ashamed of. Seniors take a survey on their way out every year. I cut out three or four questions. Do people feel things are adequate about student life? Security, athletic opportunities, sense of community. Everything is above 80%. Student government is the lowest. It's a shameful thing that we're so dang low. Everything we do is for the students and if we're not meeting their needs, we need to do something. Hopefully this conveys that we need to take a look at what we're doing and how we're operating.

We made a committee. We actually made three; this is the third one. The committee, as Will said, is facilitated by the former Chair of the Faculty, Tom Kochan, who will speak to us at the retreat about how to do things better. The UA has never put a faculty person as the head of our committee. It was an unprecedented move but needed to happen. Other representation – there's me, IFC, the Panhel president... there are people who come out of the kindness of their hearts. Jonte Craighead shows up. Janet sometimes shows up. Dorm presidents, especially from Simmons, BC, Maseeh. There's a good swathe of Dormcon to talk from a dorm president perspective.

As for the process that this committee has taken and is continuing to take... first, we stepped back and identified key issues. Why. Then we identified the key stakeholders, the people that the UA interacts with and are important to. Then we developed some solutions. Now we're in the process of getting iterative feedback from the stakeholders. You are one of them, which is why I'm here talking to you guys now. I'm not expecting you to have a decision tonight; we'll get to the timeline. After we get feedback,

we'll draft a constitution and then implement it. That's the process we've been following.

As for high level issues: increased efficiency. That includes reducing turnover and increasing experience within the UA. A lot of you guys are new. Increasing the reaction time of the UA: we should be able to react much faster when an issue arises. We're students and don't sleep; we should be able to get out with policy fast. Approving vice-chairs came up as issue; how many checks and balances should we have versus how efficient should we be? These are sometimes at odds with each other. Reducing apathy within the UA and within the community – captive audience. Only 15% of your population will give a crap about you at any time.

Will: You started a little late, but it's 8:35 now just FYI.

Allan: I'm going to keep going since this is important. Size and shape of the UA, the roles of Senate and Exec, the roles of senate bills. What is the correct size of the UA? These were topics we identified to look at and consider when considering what the issues are.

Stakeholders: the committee has broken up to talk to different people. I'm not talking to all these people. I'm talking to Senate and Exec since I'm the UA president. The key stakeholders are Senate, Exec, DormCon, IFC, Panhel, LGC, DSL, DUE, MIT Corporation, SAO, the Faculty Chair, the Advisory Committee, President, Chancellor, Provost, housemasters, The Tech, dorm execs, and undergrads—obviously and perhaps most importantly. All of the stakeholders we identified as needing to talk to.

The solution: this took the longest amount of time to flesh out. This is the initial proposal. Two categories: behavioral categories and solutions—interpersonal things we need to do better, then structural things we need to apply. Behavioral: emphasizing committee work, trust within committees, willingness for chairs to delegate to members; respecting thoughts and opinions of committees on their issues. Early team-building for new members, better transitions for leadership from year to year, encouraging more involvement. For example, it's good to have people still in the UA, like Jonte. Improving communication: having a better precedent for sharing information among ourselves. Also better channels for administrations. Communicating our positives and accomplishments: we should announce it, to improve morale. Documenting our best practices. There's a document of Senate best practices that hasn't been updated in a while. It's good for historical memory.

The structural changes: strengthening the role and use of the Advisory Committee. They've given us solid advice in the past, and we want to continue looking to them for support and help. Exhaustive representation in a smaller body of bringing everyone into one group. Senate is too big; it takes a while to say anything. I forgive you guys for not talking as much. If you guys get upset about bills, the 2 minutes per person start adding up. Representing every student group is the exhaustive part. Bringing the UA under one group is trying to do away with the division between Senate and Exec. We shouldn't look at it as two branches. We don't have to do the same thing as the federal government. One leadership, not two separate ones, is what we need. Portraying a spectrum of views instead of just one single view. For instance, instead of focusing on: "We don't like dining, dining is bad." Saying 70-80% in certain dorms are not ok with dining... etc. Accurately representing ourselves. Also using our experience and having presidents or close designees represent their constituencies. To be honest, when the administration thinks about Senate or talks to me about Senate, they more often see the dorm president as the legitimate spokesperson over the Senator. That's not your fault; it's just because they're older and usually voted on by a higher percentage of the dorm, for dorms and fraternities specifically. That's kind of just how it is.

Before I get to what's next, what does this mean? Am I suggesting that Senate dissolve itself? This proposal is for a UA council with representatives from dorms, IFC, Panhel (2 or 3), ILGs, and an off campus representative. The point is to bring people into the room together, rather than running a body that passes legislation and bills and whatnot and bickers continuously. It would be a collaborative group that would develop policy and take stances on collectiveness. Not passing bills, just representing that these people in the council feel this way about issues, these other people feel this way, this is how the community feels. There is room for this body to pass a budget and do other key things like that. I'll post out other documents to Senate that more define this role.

Now you may be asking yourselves why on earth I would ask a body to dissolve itself. It's not

now and not soon. But I want you to think back to that graph about seniors leaving MIT. I want you to remember that the lowest bar was us. We are the ineffective weak link. We have proved ineffective at advocating for students. We have to artificially limit time and cut meetings in half. The administration laughs at Senate when they pass a bill because they look to dorm presidents and the IFC president when they want something. I ask you not to take it personally. We started working on this before you knew anything. I'm not asking you to leave the UA. In fact, you few were the ones who proved yourselves and proved yourselves competent and interested in the UA. And I would not feel comfortable losing you in the UA. So you should continue to be leaders, and get involved in committees. I want to see each and every one of you continue. Next is the timeline.

In Spring '11, we identified the issues, stakeholders, and solutions. Now we are gathering feedback. From mid October to the end of October, we'll be getting iterative feedback. Condensing it and in parallel drafting constitution. From early to mid November, we'll finish the constitution. By mid to end November, we should approve the constitution. Over IAP, we cleanup. In February, we will implement.

Will: Five more minutes.

Allan: I'll give it to the floor to decide, because this is important.

This isn't a 100% guarantee. This could be this way. It's just an option. If we bring all the presidents to the council, they won't want to run DormCon. It doesn't eliminate our voice, but brings voices together to push one issue twice as hard. DormCon is similarly considering restructuring and what they think their role at MIT is. If they wanted to, they could split into representative and funding powers. A lot of what DormCon does is interdorm events and building interdorm cohesion and community. We wouldn't be any worse if a funding body existed. We could take a representative body and bring them into the UA and splice our interests together. And much more effectively represent the undergrads. Any questions?

Ryan: You said that implementation would happen over IAP. So the new government would start forming and meeting in the spring?

Allan: Yes, IAP would just be for mailing lists, moving people over, and training. February would start the new government, if the timeline goes according to plan.

Katy: Is there an official document with the official plan from the beginning?

Allan: I will forward all documents together. Our initial findings, cover letter, and attachment. Those will all be forwarded to ua-senate. Any other questions?

So I will probably be coming back in future. If you have thoughts that come later or which you don't want to say in public, I am always reachable at ua-admin@mit.edu. I will meet with you pretty quickly or converse with you over email. I want to make sure you are comfortable going forward.

Will: Now it's up to body: we can have discussion, unless you want to think more about the presentation and talk more on the mailing list. I will wait for a motion of what people want to do, otherwise we could move on.

Ryan: To reiterate: Senate has been inefficient in the past few years. A lot of you are new and may feel weird eliminating yourselves. But you should.

Will: Ok then, five more minutes for discussion.

Katy: I motion to not debate, since I haven't read the documents fully and want more time. Motion to move to the next agenda item.

Will: This may be the most important thing Senate does this year. Ok, back to the Bill to Cap Senate Meetings.

### **13. 43 UAS 2. 2 Bill to Cap Length of Senate Meetings (2/2)**

Will: Ryan, you can have the floor.

Ryan: In spirit of the bill, we could discuss this over the mailing list and we can move to the next item on the agenda.

Leonid: What is that?

Will: Announcements and then closing roll.

### **14. Announcements**

Will: Announcements: committee assignments. You should all be on a committee. That is one of the responsibilities of Senators. One of the points about Senate – we are tied to the rest of the student governments, the rest of the UA. You must be on one of the student committees or an institute rep. Email me that by midnight, otherwise I could consider you a derelict of duty. If you don't do this, I can suspend you or remove you from power for not fulfilling your Senatorial duties. We also need a Vice Speaker. Our past one, he has to work on a lot of other things. He doesn't have time. The role is that I put in two hours so you all save 20-30 minutes. It's a net save of time because I do more work. If you like Senate and you want to make Senate more efficient, I would be happy to have you as Vice Speaker. You sit here the same amount of time and just make it more efficient. At the next meeting, the Class Council budgets will be up for approval. One thing to do during Senate is instead of meeting formally every time, there will be an Exec meeting next Monday at 7, and after that, I'll have a voluntary senate meeting. The idea is that it's my office hours. You can figure out what you want to do and what you want to make happen. It's a better setting than Senate. We also need a Senate Rep to Finboard. The Senate Retreat is this Saturday. Remember that the Senate Faculty Advisory Committee—actually, for the UA in general—is coming up next week. Constituency events – you have money for it. Students don't have a great opinion of the UA, and we have money to help students. And to help make Senate more effective is to go meet with students. So do that, that's all I have.

Caroline: Can you give an example of a constituency event from the past?

Allan: Last year I bought ice cream for the dorm and we talked about student issues.

Will: I made ice cream. People have done Wings over Somerville. Food is not required.

Janet: But it usually makes people come.

### **15. Closing Roll**

The following members left early: Alex Hall (Treasurer, Finboard Chair)

### **16. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Li  
UA Secretary General