



# 42 U.A.S. 10

Minutes from February 14, 2011

**The meeting was called to order at 7:41 pm.**

## 1. Opening Remarks

Jonté: We had the caucus this past Saturday, I guess you guys saw, out on the mailing list, we have a bill that's going to be coming out tonight; we also released some notes and a summary that went out to the caucus and that went out to ua-senate-members. For those of you who attended, did you think that it was useful at all?

Alright, we'll probably try another one of those again sometime soon. I think it gives us a really great opportunity to sit down and talk in specifics about a topic or issue we should be talking about specifically in Senate. I'm not sure I have anything else; most of the things we will be discussing will come up over time.

## 2. Nominations for Vice Speaker of the Senate

Jonté: We'll follow through with the same process as last time.

Allan: I nominate Karan.

Karan: I accept.

Almas: I would like to decline mine.

Will: Point of information – can the Speaker also be Vice Speaker?

Jonté: No. For my well being as a person and student at the Institute, it would not be good for me to not be both.

Tim R: I move to commit.

Sivakami: How do we proceed if Jessica isn't here?

Jonté: She is still a nominee; she can still be voted for, even if she's not here.

Allan: I feel like we should have multiple candidates already if many wanted to run. I also think we're running out of time. So, we might want to just do it now.

Vrajesh: I motion to postpone this until next meeting.

Anika: Can't we just talk about this now?

**\*Some confusion about postponement.\***

Allan: I call the question.

Jonté: Did you guys talk at all?

Rachel M: Would people be interested in an amendment to the bylaws that allows non-voting members or old members to run?



Alec: I think it would be improper to open it up before we consider the two candidates in front of us that are voting members and fit those requirements.

Will: Do we want to do it at all, though? It needs to be postponed for a week. We can just get it ready now if we need it next week.

**Motion to postpone nominations/elections of the Vice Speaker of the Senate to 42 UAS 11 passes.**

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

**(Postponed again in conjunction with nominations.)**

### **4. Exec Update**

Alex J: If you guys care about libraries, you should email me because the visiting committee is visiting and there are other things we can do. There's also a leadership program thing, if you're interested in being a leader. You can email me, or you can also talk to Leah there.

Betsy: Any progress on REX/Orientation in the past week?

Sammi: No, not really. I had a meeting with a bunch of concerned faculty members in which these faculty members expressed that they'll be very involved. Some faculty members seemed reluctant to do that but they're working on getting involved.

Alex J: We were unable to find representatives to SLOPE. If you're interested or you know someone that should be interested, you should do it. I'm going to go for now, but I don't have enough time.

Rachel M: Do you want to provide the charge for SLOPE?

Alex J: The charge for SLOPE is what it's always been. Basically, it's to schedule programs for orientation. They deal with the Tuesday night event, Friday night event, etc.

Chris: What was the faculty's viewpoint on it?

Sammi: One of the faculty members thought it was a concern for students; the other faculty members thought it was a process issue. They didn't have specific ideas about what should go where but more that they thought it was important to see more involvement.

Chris: Did any hint at students being tired on the first day?

Sammi: Actually, no. The issue didn't really come up. The issue was more that there was too much downtime during Orientation.

Alix: This is mostly for the senators. I have some posters I need put up in dorm laundry rooms. They encourage people to use the bright color and cold wash cycles; it actually saves a lot of energy to use the cold cycle. If you could come find me and grab a few for your dorms, that would be great.

Shuang: How well does it clean compared to hot cycles?

Alix: It's better for your clothes, and it makes them last longer. There are special detergents available, and there's no difference in price.

### **5. Reports from Committees**

Will: So, what we've been working on...we've mostly been working on Walker. That is a big issue that's been happening this year. Do people feel up to date? Should I have a summary?



Tim R: I'd like a summary for today.

Will: There was a community meeting. It was from 5 to 6. For the first part of the meeting, they fielded questions, and a lot of people spoke up. There are two major users: there's all the student groups that use the space and a bunch of groups that use Morss Hall. There's a bunch of groups, like the materials science community, too. In general, basically, this is run by Marty Schmidt who is the Associate Provost and will be making decisions. He pointed out that their information on the database was maintained by CAC. They did make the promise that all student groups will have space in the future.

Rachel M: I have the wording in my minutes that he acknowledge the institute's obligation to space for student groups.

Will: He acknowledge their concerns.

Betsy: I met this girl, and she was absolutely thrilled about what Marty Schmidt has said. All groups that lost space will be fine.

Will: I disagree because he hasn't made a commitment.

Rachel M: He can't make a commitment, but he made a commitment to try his best to find lots of space.

Betsy: What are the chances that rooms actually will get space?

Will: In reality, there are spaces around that are either not well used, or there also are spaces that could be used. Therefore, administrative space could be moved elsewhere. That said, there's also the risk that students may end up with the space elsewhere. Space could be created, but it might not match the needs of student groups.

Betsy: Marty Schmidt has also said that there's just too much student group concern...

Will: That is a legitimate concern. I cannot speak to that. It factors into their considerations. As I should say, the GSC is also heavily involved; they're also very much interested in Walker. There is a working committee of 3 members: Schmidt, Dunbar, and Walsh. They are kind of in charge of looking over the evaluation that includes the architectural side and also the student engagement side. The UA has been negotiating to add student members to this group. He has acknowledged the group; they have not actually come up with an exact proposal. If a decision is going to be made from Walker, right now? If we use all the space or part of the space? It's important to find this out ahead of time; so, we can do stuff.

Other issues...I'm working with Richard Dahan to do some things in the Student Center. In particular, water fountains. Other kinds of things in the past...we worked on bike racks. The other main issue is...the room in the Student Center, on the first floor, the Game Room. I met people over last semester trying to get a food vendor, particularly a smoothie vendor. I was told by dining that it is unlikely to have an outside vendor. If we wanted a food vendor, it has to be someone on campus; it could be LaVerde's, Simmons Late Night, etc. Last semester, some students came up with the idea of running smoothies. Students are also interested in reviving the idea of an arcade game room. I do know that it will be an exhibit for MIT 150<sup>th</sup>. Otherwise, I don't expect anything to happen to that space before the end of the semester. On the note of LaVerde's, Allan and I had a meeting with the advisory board. Students were not happy with LaVerde's. They're going to have a meeting on March 19<sup>th</sup>. We could provide feedback to students. So, I'll be interested in what Senate has to say. We can bring this up later, or, if you want to talk to me, I can have stuff to say.



Allan: Closer to this date, you'll probably see legislation asking Senate to gather opinions on what students want.

Rachel M: Couldn't you just ask them to do so?

Allan: Sure, I don't really care about the implementation as long as it gets done.

Betsy: What do people not like about LaVerde's?

Allan: That's what you're supposed to ask, right?

Almas: After I talked to my constituents, it's mostly because everything costs more.

Karan: In terms of Space Planning, what do you know about the stuff happening at Kendall?

Will: Moore is representative to Kendall. He will meet with them. I don't think there are any updates, but we can come to you if there are.

Jonté: How strong is your committee? How many people do you have, or do you need more?

Will: I have three people on my committee. I'm focusing on walker; so it's unlikely there will be small things. If there are people that are interested, I'm more than happy to have them work on my committee. Otherwise it's working okay – not strong, but okay.

Ashley: I didn't know I'll be talking today. Sorry if I forget stuff. I guess...things that are happening, Student Alumni Dinners are going to happen. So, I've been talking with the Alumni Association. They agreed to give us money. We haven't figured out the exact amount. Once I've figured that out, I'll promote student engagement and actions with alumni. I'd like to provide funding for dorm events where they can interact with other alumni. My group's first meeting this semester is next week. Does anyone have any specific questions?

Jonté: I think I would probably ask the same question on the committee.

Ashley: A lot. I think 8 or 9. People keep applying. I can accept anybody. There are some people that aren't good, but it's hard to be bad at this. I can't imagine student controversy over alumni relations. As long as they aren't going to admin and being rude. If they have a big meeting, anyways, I'll go with them. I'll pretty much accept anyone, assuming they're actually a student.

Betsy: What are some projects you plan on doing this semester?

Ashley: One of the things we did is we had an event for dorms to learn about certain alumni resources – dorm presidents and historian. We're going to try to do another one for student groups in March. This is to help them think of ways of getting money donated to groups or dorms. When alumni think about money, they have a lot of reason to think about groups that they are involved in.

We want to also look into networking opportunities. When I went to career sections and there were alumni there, there was definitely some common ground. Maybe course open houses as well – you could talk to sophomores, juniors, etc., and you can kind of see where they are. We thought that would be another cool way.

Karan: In terms of the different mentorship programs, is there a level of alumni involvement? Is there some room for more involvement in those programs?

Ashley: One of my members expressed interest in that. Looking at the current mentorship programs, that's something I can talk to the alumni office about. I haven't personally thought about it.



Abel: So, for club sports, now that they're no longer varsity, they're not funded by the school. They're seeking alumni donations to be functional.

Ashley: I've talked to wrestling, and they've been pretty successful in reassigning money.

Rachel M: That's an understatement. They have like 1.7 million dollars.

Abel: Other groups are still working on it. Is there any plan to start working on it?

Ashley: We're kind of limited in ways we can get money. Most of what I'm doing is using existing interfaces. Making sure its current. Dorms have places to put information; I'm not sure something like that has to do with works.

Sammi: I think this has to do with donations for student groups

Ashley: I don't have information on that right now, but I can get back to you.

Will: One, if you're interested in joining Space Planning, our first meeting is Wed at 9 pm. One project we're working on is a lighted pathway on Briggs field; it came up in an exec meeting.

Alec: Also, I'd encourage everyone to please check the committee updates for more information. Committee chairs, please remember to submit such updates.

## **6. Approval of Minutes**

Anika: Alec is amazing at taking minutes.

Rachel: I haven't read them, yet, considering they were sent a few hours ago.

Alex J: I agree with Rachel.

Adam: Motion to do this next time.

Alec: I call the question.

**Approval of minutes postponed to 42 U.A.S. 11.**

## **7. Nominees to Institute Committees**

Alex J: So, we have two nominees to approve today. The first is Ravi Sharan to the CUP, Committee on the Undergraduate Program. The second is Mari Miyachi; she's going to be on the Library System Committee. That seat has been vacant for awhile now. If you have questions you can direct them to me.

Betsy: I didn't Google stalk these people. I get a little confused as to how we're supposed to evaluate them.

Alex J: I can tell you. I interviewed both people. Rachel interviewed Mari with me. Sammi interviewed Ravi. And we interviewed Ravi in the fall, but we didn't have any space on CUP at that time; so, we chose him for a committee that didn't end up existing. It was a subcommittee of CoC and CUP that didn't end up getting made, but we nominated him for that committee. We like Ravi. He's competent; he's a freshman, and he's on SCEP which is a very good. Mari is also a freshman. She worked in the library all through high school, and she is very interested in community interactions. She mentioned doing more to like community gathering like things in libraries, and she's also aware of some of the recent patterns. The hours are really shortened, especially during holiday periods.

Rachel M: She's also worked with the mentoring program. She's familiar with it.



Janet: Motion to approve.

**Institute representatives are approved.**

## **8. 42 U.A.S. 9.1: Bill to Create the Assistant Secretary on Information Management – Presidential Veto**

Vrajesh: I think people can read it; so maybe we should take like a minute for that to happen, and I can take any questions. But, I think I tried to explain the reason for the veto in the veto.

Alec: So, originally I just wanted someone to be able to handle this. Since then, within a few days, Bockelie has set up an amazing system that tracks over 30 websites for small updates. I've received some of these emails, and they're very informative – especially with the weekly summaries. I think he's taken over the job, and, unless there are objections, as the original author of this bill, I would like to close discussion.

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

Rachel M: The bylaws are what I presented last week, if you could bring up the notes. So, if any of you have looked these over. Well, if not, don't tell me. I'll highlight the major changes we made to the old bylaws, which are highly reflected and are outlined in the report. I think I went over most everything last time; so, I'm going to mostly yield to questions. Let me know if you have something specific you want to know.

Karan: I guess this question may not pertain directly to the bylaws. I guess it doesn't directly pertain, but, with regards to the email of the resignation of FinBoard, how does the government structure work.

Rachel M: So, that government is mostly superseded by UA governing documents. The FinBoard bylaws do outline the process, but it's in line with the general process. In Section 6 of the report, er...Section 5, it says that the recently vacated chair position shall be filled by the outlined process. The new chair needs to be found in the next cycles. A yearlong chair will be found.

I guess one thing, not contradicted by the report; I just want to clarify any funding allocated by Spring I will stay through Spring II. So, if the group got the funding, they're not go into lose it. That is inherent to the system; if anybody thinks it will be very important to say that, I can add a bullet.

Betsy: At the end of Spring II. If there's unspent money, that will go...

Rachel M: A lot go for it. Some groups ask for events in May. They asked for funding in December. They're not going to lose that; they don't have to risk. That's just a function of the fact that things were new this year. There's going to be some ongoing stuff. I think the way it's stated in the policy and bylaws. If you wish to, for some reason, request coming early, you just need to explain somewhere in the application and in your defense why it's okay to receiving funding in the start as opposed to the second. My intent is that we can approve bylaws, policies, etc. They're sort of intertwined; so, I don't think we can take it one item at a time.

Jonté: One question that I have about the report. How much of the recommendations came from the committee, and how much were determined after the committee finished their assigned task?



Rachel M: Allan can correct me if I'm wrong. A lot of the major recommendations came from the committee, and a lot of the details were things I did personally. The way the operating procedures were written out is that something made it into the recommendations of the committee.

Adam: I have a question about the bylaws and that bill. I think it makes the most sense to put the FinBoard bylaws in everything else. Then, they're all formatted the same way, and they won't be lost easy.

Rachel M: I move to amend 10.1 to read "be amended to include the text of the FinBoard bylaws."

Vrajesh: I move to close discussion.

**Motion to amend passes.**

Jonté: Okay, that's what it will read. We're now discussing the bill itself as a whole.

Adam: I think this bill is entirely necessary; so, I move to approve the bill...

Rachel M: Can we approve the bylaws before we add them?

Adam: Okay.

Jonté: Are you motioning to approve it or suggesting it?

Rachel M: It's the same discussion.

Alec: I motion to approve it.

**Objections to closing discussion.**

Rachel M: Just to note, there's a section on guidelines and amendments.

Sivakami: I have a question on not allowing members to automatically continue. If there's gross negligence, they'd be removed anyways.

Rachel M: That was consensus of the committee. The idea is if they've done a fine job, there's no reason they won't be selected again, but making them reinterview is sort of like incumbent senators being reelected. It requires that they still be responsible in some cases to their constituents.

Samuel R: What is going to be the purpose of the purpose of the whole cycle spending?

Rachel M: So the current issue is, with the amount of oversight by the RFP system, we're assuming you're taking funding by the right category. There's no oversight on if you are spending on the right line item. Hypothetically, if I were a group and I got 1000 dollars to travel to, and we say we weren't going, I could spend \$1000 on things that aren't allowed on FinBoard. This is to put more checks and balances. We minimized the work, so, it wouldn't be an unnecessary burden. This would be a benefit so money isn't spent.

Samuel R: If they spend money other than what is on the thing. Would there be any actions taken?

Rachel M: Yeah, the bylaws don't explicitly state it, as far as I recall. The idea was that it would affect their ability to have more money. This is under the philosophy of historical spending. The general idea is that if they completely misspend their money one cycle, they won't get money the next cycle. That's not explicitly stated. If people want I can word something in. At this point I think it's more important to have something approved and in place; then, we can increase it later. The current funding cycle ends in



roughly 6 weeks. We need to give a chance to structure applications and reach out to groups to apply. We can add that to the report.

Sivakami: When you say you lock it in for two cycles, then that means FinBoard would not be able to,

Rachel M: So, the bill that created the ad hoc committee is that they approve some set of policies that, combined with that clause in the bylaws, says that FinBoard without approval would be unable to amend policies until fall.

Sivakami: Which two?

Rachel M: Starting in March and July, they could be amended for the first set of application in the fall.

Sivakami: Why did you decide two vs. one?

Rachel M: That was a call on my part. My figure is that one cycle is not enough time to tell if the policy is having an indented affect. Setting the guideline on, it's mostly guidelines and not caps, but a lot of those changes aren't going to change in a span of 6 months. 6 Months. I saw low enough barriers that we shouldn't run into issues. Senate can still amend them. FinBoard is approved, but they need Senate approval.

Ben: Will Senate be made aware of any FinBoard improvements?

Rachel M: In theory, yes. In practice, it's not specifically required.

Allan: In theory, we'd have a senate repo on FinBoard, so...

Rachel M: In the bylaws, there are two reps. If your reps are doing the job, they should know.

**The bylaws are approved.**

Rachel M: Can we consider the policy next? This is what I presented last week in my sort of outline, restricted items, various requirements, guidelines, explicitly not caps, and then other general expenses. And, this is the document that can be amended with the majority of FinBoard or Senate. One major change is food in operations is moved from restricted to guidelines.

Hawkins: Motion to approve.

**The funding policies are approved.**

Rachel M: Now we can consider the bylaws bill. It would be a little counterintuitive if you did not approve this, since you just approved the bylaws.

Janet: I call the question.

**42 U.A.S. 10.1 is approved.**

Rachel M: The report. Further review outlines those are things we want people in particular to consider. We aren't qualified to make decisions on it until the end of the fiscal year. Regular review is to review to changes we made.

It will transition into a new report over the next few cycles. As a reminder to Senate, when we pass a report, it becomes a standing policy of Undergraduate Association.

Sivakami: I motion to call the question.

**Report on the Ad Hoc Committee on FinBoard policy is approved.**





Rachel M: Does anyone have anything else for the committee? In accordance with 8.10, I move to dissolve the committee.

**The Ad Hoc Committee on FinBoard Policy is dissolved.**

## **10. New Business and Discussion**

Rachel M: I'm working on a bill that has to do with what was discussed. Can we do it after discussion?

Will: I should've sent you a bill on orientation.

Jonté: Any objections to this?

Karan: \*Authors bill\*

Betsy: I don't know if you read Hawkins' email. I think the change on the RBA section should also be made. I move to amend the on RBA section to say "whether housing assignments to that dormitory will be binding."

**The amendment passes.**

Adam: I move to amend "dorm-centric events" to "living group-centric events."

Betsy: Is it effective for Senate to encourage Deans to do things?

Rachel M: If it's a resolution, we can say whatever we want.

Betsy: Would it be a member of Exec to force deans to do things?

Vrajesh: I think it's fine that it's written. I will make sure that relevant deans or assistants receive a copy of the summary of the report, the extent, and a copy of the resolution.

Tim R: Can you print it out on nice paper?

Vrajesh: It will be printed out on ordinary paper.

Betsy: I'm wondering about the Boston T party. It's out of date, so...

Karan: In addition it's a little bit out of date and out of context with the rest of the material in the resolution.

Almas: When this bill says that this bill is going to be the UA's position again, is the report going to be written again?

Jonté: So, that's up to the assembly.

Almas: I don't have specific things, but it's definitely out of response.

Shuang: Given the time sensitively of this issue, rewriting a report is not too feasible. I think it's not too feasible.

Will: I talked to my constituents; they're mostly interested in the issues put forward. The caucus discussed this. I would recommend focusing on this and putting it forward rather than going through all details.

Rachel M: I think we're not necessarily just changing the date on it; we're saying we're reiterating these points. We're saying, we the 2011 Senate, particularly agree with these points.



Almas: I was saying that I agree. My constituents have discussed this. They mostly agree with the point of this report. I'm saying that we'll put something in this legislation saying that someone will.

Karan: I think that's not pertinent to this resolution. The point of this is also Vrajesh or Sammi, someone from UA Exec is in a meeting. We have this position. It's like these are things we don't want to see changed.

Vrajesh: If the Senate wishes to commission a new report, it would be appropriate in future legislation to call for the creation for an ad hoc committee that would collect data during the upcoming orientation to condition the recommendations going into a new report. I don't think it would be right to use data from 2006.

Karan: Given the data that we have, and the amount of effort that I estimate this body is willing to put into this, I estimate this is the best. I think there's two sets of timelines. One is the immediate as the UA position; the second one is going into the future with proposed legislation and such. That's when an update would be useful. In this instance, we're just outlining our position. I don't think introducing language will serve any purpose.

Betsy: I motion to approve this legislation.

#### **42 UAS 10.2 is passes.**

Allan: I do have some new business that I would like to handle. I'm updating some changes. **\*Authors Bill\*** This thing calls for some pretty large steps. It calls for things like Presidents and Vice Presidents to be made full members of Academic Council, which is huge. We wouldn't have as many issues if we had this power. Institute Committees, if we have someone on all of them, it encourages administrators to actually talk to us instead of pretending they know what students think. It does a pretty good job of highlighting the state of student engagement; student engagement is the underlying cause of all of the problems we've faced. Not just this year. It's time the UA fixes this problem, and I think it highlights what needs to be done to fix it.

Rachel M: This doesn't have to be a popular opinion. I think it's counterproductive to add a ton of sponsors; I would rather not go there.

Adam: When you get voting, I'm going to call for a roll call vote to show the list of the people who vote yes or no.

Jonté: Can I put a footnote on this? Can I affix this to the bill?

Allan: If you want to just tack that on, I'm not going to complain about it.

Tim R: Can I still be added if it's friendly to the authors? I don't see why not.

Allan: I'm going to comment: if the UA fights for anything this semester and next year, this should be what we're fighting for.

Karan: It is imperative. It is a good idea to communicate the contents of this letter in some format to our constituents.

Alex J: I think you should do that. I sent it to Bexley, and I got a bunch of replies from people thanking me; and, it's Bexley.

Vrajesh: I just wanted to make a comment on the bill but on student engagement. So, maybe you have probably come to realize this year that, we're not really having a say in a lot of the different matters that



are going on. The letter, as far as this resolution, seeks to address this problem. As a friendly reminder, a lot of us pay tuition; the alums that donate money were formerly students. So, aside from that, in kind of more philosophical terms, half of MIT's mission is educating students, the other half being a research piece. It makes sense that the students would have said in the oppression of the institution when half is related to the students. That's kind of the motivation for writing the letter along with the corresponding lack of student engagement that I and the other four authors observed during our time as UA President.

Tim R: I'd also like to make a comment. This year, I kind of got started thinking that student engagement would be one of those issues that I'd tackle as a first thing. I really wanted to reiterate that the administration is not listening, but we got sidelined. We got sidelined by dining and orientation. These are kind of big moments. It's kind of distracting from the bigger issue. Before I leave, I would like to instill this idea that you have a longer timeline than what's happening next year. Really, this 4 year institution memory isn't going to do it for us. The institute makes plans 4-5 years in advance. You've got to look beyond, which is why one of the recommendations to make committee for orientation would be pivotal for us. We need to have data to back up any suggestions we have in the future. Think longer than 6 months.

Allan: I motion to approve.

**Unanimous approval from:**

Samuel Rodarte, Senator from Ashdown/NW35

Abel Chiao, Senator from Burton Conner

Betsy Riley, Senator from East Campus

Tim Robertson, Senator for East Campus

Rachel Chuen, Senator for MacGregor House

Almas Abdullah, Senator for McCormick Hall

Benjamin Shaibu, Senator for New House

Karan Takhar, Senator for Next House

Samuel Acquah, Senator for Next House

Allan Miramonti, Senator for Random Hall

Will Steadman, Senator for Senior House

Shuang Chen, Senator for Simmons Hall

Bobby Weber, Senator for Simmons Hall

Cameron McCord, Senator for Fraternities

Michael Walsh, Senator for Fraternities

Charles Bernstein, Senator for Fraternities

Katherine Fang, Senator for Sororities

Sivakami Sambasviam, Senator for Sororities

Alex Dehnert, Senator for ILGs

Rachel Meyer, Senator for Off-Campus Students

**\*Some further discussion on enclosures\***

**Motion to include a list of approving senators attached to the bill is approved.**

Rachel M: **\*Authors 10.4\***

Will: Since we can't talk about it until it's on the table for a week, I move to postpone it definitely.



**Motion to postpone 10.4 until the next meeting passes.**

Shuang: Wasn't DormCon supposed to propose a schedule?

Jonté: Can anyone speak to this?

Alec: DormCon did commit it to a subcommittee. I am unsure when we are talking about it, and if we have results public yet. We'll have to wait till the meeting this Thursday.

Allan: I few did anything at all, we should make sure it is flexible and takes into account DormCon, etc.

Vrajesh: It would be appropriate for our legislation in SLOPE to do stuff on this. It would be less appropriate for all of Senate to do it. It's probably not the most appropriate use of Senate's time. One of the challenges is the lack of interest for Alex to find someone. I'm going got ask the senators who have interest to apply to NomComm. The alternative is to put someone on the committee who won't be here next year. That's probably not beneficial for undergraduates. If this issue isn't important, or if we have an objection with the process the administration is proposing, to have a schedule created through SLOPE, we should address that as an issue.

Rachel M: My impression is SLOPE is not involved in the creation of the schedule. It's going to be in charge of events. But my understanding is that some combinations of administrators or the FYE committee will handle it.

Anika: As a representative of the FYE committee, I can say it is not FYE coming up with the schedule. I can say that FYE is on the impression, currently, that it is being charged with the task of charging SLOPE. It is not going got be coming up with the schedule, and that is what I know.

Alex J: As the UA person dealing with committees, right now the UA doesn't recognize FYE, since we just found out a week ago.

Tim R: Has any of the executive members met with any admins? Has any new information come out in the last week, or has any senators met with anybody?

Anika: Sort of, I'm not sure. As I said, FYE, has a meeting last Wednesday. What I learned from that is, I understand the UA doesn't recognize it, but FYE is almost like SLOPE; it doesn't have much say in what the orientation schedule does or doesn't look like. More so, it views orientation as a small part of its entire charge as a whole in terms of accommodating the freshman class, and its role in orientation is specifically with regards to those events occurring, it views itself as charging SLOPE in that matter.

Regardless of whether not we recognize them, they have no decision on this matter. It was made very clear that FYE would receive the schedule from the administration.

Tim R: If that's all the new information.

Vrajesh: I've taken it as an action item, and as to what the role of FYE is, I think it's fair to say there's ambiguity on this point. Discussing it when none of them know the right answer...if SLOPE happens to be the group that makes this decision, what do we do about the fact that there's this very small group of students that want to be on it?

Allan: I generally agree with the process; if SLOPE is going to handle it, they'll handle it. I'm also afraid the that admiin is just going got run us around.



Rachel M: If SLOPE is a committee to be addressing this issue, I don't think it's currently structured in a way to effectively recognize students on this issue. For those of you that don't know, it's two reps from UA, IFC, DormCon, Panhel, LGC, ASA, and Save TFP.

Will: We could say: here now, we want a particular person or committee. We want someone on the scheduling of orientation.

Sammi: This is slightly...well, hypothetically, if an orientation schedule were to have a same number of total person hours for REX, and they were structured differently, how would they feel about that? During REX, there has always been the case that things were scheduled. All of things during orientation were not really a valid suggestion, that you subtract those hours out for all the freshmen, and there are certain number of hours left if the total number of person hours were preserved. How do people feel about that?

Rachel M: I guess one of the issues to consider is you could increase the number a lot. The 5 days of FPOPs...from 6 to midnight are REX. That doesn't accurately represent the situation. I know a lot of FPOPs end at 9 or are off campus, and that doesn't accommodate the other 25%.

Betsy: I think it's a dangerous thing to agree to. It's not just do REX for X number of hours.

Tim R: Getting back to the definition things. There is a lot of ambiguity. It shocked me to see Julie Norman be so defensive as to start giving up a blockhead, but that's what I feel needs to happen. I haven't thought this through enough on how to get admins at the table, but honestly that seems like the only solution.

Jonté: I think we should wait till the next meeting. If we believe that our report is useful, we should probably start a committee to get the groundwork started; so we have stuff in space to run a survey next fall. Do we need a committee now to figure out what the best schedule is going to be that we can propose for orientation?

Rachel M: I don't think a committee is good at this time. I think we can have officers address this issue. I think at this point, forming a committee to come up with schedules are a little preemptive. In terms of a committee moving forward, if we're looking at something to review any changes, I think we should wait until we know what we can charge a committee to review certain aspects. Right now we're charging a committee to review orientation 2011.

Karan: I want to say that we don't lose sight of the larger picture, going to 2012 and beyond. What we may see is a series of decisions, and REX is a subset. What may happen is, we only get small shifts right now, and the big changes happen at a later date or next year in applying to 2012. If we just focus our efforts on that's going to happen this fall, we're going to lose sight of that in the near future.

Jonté: I don't want this kind of situation. We had things decided, and we didn't have a really defined structure on how we were going to organize ourselves to do things, how we're going to discuss some topics. I'm sure you guys all know, the Senate floor is very limited in terms of having very limited discussion. We had some difficulty doing much more in getting point by point in getting general ideas out for discussion. While I agree that, just this second, we may not have something to take action on, I want you guys to have on the back of your mind that this may be something new we have to look at within the next couple of days. Floor's still open for discussion.

Tim R: I like to reurge Vrajesh and Sammi to look into the actual mechanisms.



Jonté: With that, we'll move into the next discussion topic. I'll try to separate it out from student engagement. We haven't had a dining committee in a long time. Aside from the dining plan, there's still a few other topics I remember as a member on the dining committee. Spring semester, my freshman year, we covered many topics, one of which is the vacant space in the Z-Center where Au Bon Pain used to be. That was the one committee that the committee last year has been waiting on. Other things, I think we started to do... Adam was a chair of the committee last year, so he might be able to talk about this more, but we also tried to reach out for the dorm dining chairs, especially in dorms without dining halls, whether there's anything to assist with kitchens. With this said, I think Sammi and Vrajesh have been overwhelmed. The question is are we doing anything to find a new dining chair, to work on these topics separately?

Vrajesh: I think those senators who participated did a terrific job. I don't think you guys know how much value you've added by reviewing the Orientation report, it will make a big difference if anything will. What I would like to charge you guys to do would be to do the same thing with the DPC report. It might be potentially equally useful. It allows us to plan for where dining is going to be next year, if it continues to be Senate's policy that the UA should be supporting the recommendations. I think that we ought to reevaluate the report. Basically, currently, it's impossible for us to have a conversation on the implementation of the HDAG dining plan because of how vastly different their recommendations we should be pushing for are. Again that's not something wrong with what we should be asking for, and then endorse it again or then say, we actually feel differently about the issue.

Speaking to your remarks, quite frankly, it would be very difficult at this point in the year to have a conversation about these other dining related issues, as we saw with the smoothie thing. I think right now, on their agenda, it's implementing the HDAG dining plan. To approach them and say, have you considered this ABP position this year...they'll say we'll worry about it next year. But I think, it's a much more serious issue as to our policy on the entire dining issue...and it is much more important in my perspective than creating a small dining committee that goes and does kind of very small projects. I also don't think the timing is right, although I haven't experimented with it.

Jonté: On the dining plan then, you're suggesting that Senate review the DPC report. I would encourage Senate to do exactly what it did with the orientation report or to have a caucus or some sort of subcommittee review the DPC report and reevaluate it in light of where MIT dining is and is headed. Then, make a recommendation, a policy recommendation, on how the UA should proceed.

Allan: I would support the idea that it's worthwhile to reevaluate the DPC report.

Vrajesh: How many people have read the DPC report? Can someone recap it really quickly?

Allan: We had a plan; it's better than their plan.

Jonté: DPC was created after some information was leaked – mainly some information from a consultant report that perhaps what MIT needed was a mandatory dining plan. Obviously students were upset. If there was a question of student engagement, we had students on this Blue Ribbon Dining Committee. This report had been released to administrators first. Furthermore, all his data that students were looking at did not support the recommendation that consultants. There was a big UA Senate emergency meeting called at which the Senate essentially said we think the position of this committee is wrong. If there are recommendations, we would like to recreate our own to review the dining system at MIT and provide a proposal for how to move forward.



Tim R: Wasn't the situation that they had released and filed the formal report a number of days before they said they were actually going into compiling recommendations? It was literally created, and we had a week to respond or something.

Jonté: When the blue ribbon dining committee released its report and said that students were going to have two weeks to review it, they actually had 6 days.

The DPC essentially said it would have really long hours, not be mandatory, and would have high quality food. In the shorter term, it recommends things such as closing the dining hall in McCormick. There were certain recommendations that were made. There was some benchmarking that was done at Harvard Yale or Princeton. It's a pretty fast read. The issue here is, MIT dining is currently a system that is mandatory for certain people, a system where there will be dining halls – 5 different instead of one central one.

Vrajesh: It's very difficult to send a representative to a meeting where they're trying to hash out details on how this is implemented, especially if the person is told that you need to argue for a nonmandatory centralized dining hall type of plan. So, what I would encourage is, given that, hopefully it makes a little bit more sense as to why I want Senate to look at policy. When Senate passes a report, it becomes UA policy. This has somewhat iced our hand. That's not to say we should not have our opinion and be very certain what it is. The decision is one that I want the Senate to awake and look at and make sure that Senate is till comfortable with the report that has been passed and the position it has taken.

Tim R: Is there a way to say we like this report, but we understand the need for some reevaluation?

Vrajesh: Suggestion: something like that has implications on a whole set of ohe issues; this needs to be thought out and discussed, and then a decision needs to be made.

Tim R: Can I suggest we have a caucus on Saturday?

Jonté: We can do one this Saturday if that's what we want. Before now and then, we should read the DPC report before then and then solicit opinions?

Adam: I'd say that if you're reviewing the DPC report, its particularly important people from McCormick and Simmons read in detail and talk to constituents. When the DPC report was written, the idea of closing McCormick and Simmons generated some controversy.

Almas: About McCormick, McCormick residents don't support closing the dining hall. I would support some changes to the existing report.

Jonté: Do we want to do the audio doodle?

Betsy: I might suggest that it starts earlier. Starting at 3 means we all have to leave.

Jonté: What things need to be done for Senate?

Will: I suggest that we end the meeting and talk about it later.

Rachel M: Even if we decide on a time, we can reflect on that.

Jonté: I'm concerned how many people are going to reflect on an email.

Rachel M: Let's decide on a time.

**\*Some discussion on time.\***

Allan: I forgot to ask, is there anything happening with nondining hall dining dorms?



Vrajesh: Residential life in dining will be approaching the Dorm Exec committees and is considering creating a parallel committee to the house dining committee

## 11. Closing Remarks

Jonté: My only thing is, please guys, the seat is empty. Please fix that.

Janet: There will be a midnight study break this Wednesday in the Coffeehouse. We'll have fondue. Please come help!

Jonté: One thing that I didn't do last week was remind everyone of the responsibilities. It was briefly touched on in the State of the UA, but this semester we have to remember to start taking things seriously. I'm going to ask, if you have not already joined a committee or submitted a proposal to me for a project, please do so by the next meeting. In addition to that, it's very important that you also attend the meetings, and tell us that you're not going to be here.

Rachel M: For the committees or projects, do you want to hear from everybody? Do you want an email from everybody saying the one I'm on.

Jonté: I think it's good to have them on the record. And please also, I think Janet sent out an email to UA senators about this, you guys should be communicating with the senators. Copy UA-senate-communication in your emails. BCC or CC which one is more comfortable for you. We need to get people excited about the UA and let them know exactly it's been said and was said last year. Getting students engaged with the UA is a two year process. This year, we've been pushing the name recognition. Next year we can start hopefully going more directly and asking people for specific feedback. Being able to expect them to say: this is what I think about this issue, this is what you should do about it

Alec: Also, if you have any material for the upcoming newsletter, please submit articles to me by this weekend.

Jonté: Thank you guys for coming. Meeting adjourned.

**The meeting was adjourned.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai  
UA Secretary General