



# 42 U.A.S. 11

Minutes from February 28, 2011

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

## **1. Guest Speaker: John Reed '61, SM '65 – Chairman of the MIT Corporation**

Jonté: Tonight, we have a very special guest. We have Mr. John Reed, who's the chairman of the MIT Corporation. He was an undergraduate here and then came back for Master's at Sloan, and, since then, he has done a number of things like become the Chairman of CityGroup, Chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, and spent some time working with the Army Corps of Ideas. I'll let you get to it!

Reed: Thank you very much. Let me tell you that it's fun to get to talk to you. I have nothing on my agenda. Obviously, I'm going to be curious about what you're curious about. On the other hand, if anybody wants to make a speech you think I should listen to, you should feel free to do so. I was invited to come and join you, and frankly, if I have a chance to meet with students and leaders of this student organization, I would try to do so to get a better sense of what's going on at MIT – to get a better sense of what you guys are thinking about. The Corporation – we have a responsibility for the Institute.

150 years ago, April 10<sup>th</sup> I am told, there were 21 people, who on our charter are not listed alphabetically; so, they must have had some internal rank ordering that went to the State of Massachusetts. They said, "Hey, we'd like to form this school," if you'd call it that. The State said, "You 21 are the Corporation of the school that will be called the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The 75 of us who are on the Corporation today are the elected successors of that original group of 21; so we're responsible to the State of Massachusetts, and presumably to the community, to make sure that we fulfill the charter – namely that we create an institution and we perform our functions. The charter... you wouldn't want to read... it talks about agriculture and all sort of strange things I don't think we are engaged in.

We have the responsibility for the proper functioning of the institution at some level; we choose the administration. If there's a new President, it's the Corporation that chooses, nominates, and elects. If it ever happened that the Corporation wants to make a change, the Corporation has the power to do that. Ultimately, we're responsible for the proper functioning of the Institution, and we do that obviously through the Administration.

It is our responsibility to have some sense of what's going on, and the visiting committees are probably the best mechanism we have for finding that out. We do have reports from the administration, and, as Chair of the Corporation, which is about a half-time job, I just try and make sure that we, the Corporation, can fulfill those responsibilities.

So, when I first took this job, I wrote on a piece of paper what our responsibilities were as I understood it, and, I said, how could I be reasonably sure that we, as a group, were in a position to fulfill those responsibilities? And, that has been basically how I've approached the job and what determines what I'm interested in. Obviously, I know the President, Provost, and so forth, run the place, and there are some things that they get engaged in that the Corporation has no interest in. A good example is the meal plan. We don't discuss in the Corporation what you guys eat. That's something the admin work on. We have



very little to do with coursework. That's the Provost and the academic side of the school. But, major appointments come to the Corporation, such as the Engineering Dean, Chancellor, etc. And, if you want to create a new program, that comes to the Corporation, too. If you want to eliminate something, it comes to us, too.

I'm here basically to respond to your questions; so, I think you should take control of this time. I would ask you why you bothered to invite me. You must be curious about something; so, maybe somebody should tell us why you would want to know what the Corporation does.

Vrajesh: Can you explain how do you stay in touch with what's going on, not just with students, but also in departments – beyond visiting committees.

Reed: Visiting committees – it's the primary way of communication. Every department has visiting committee. They meet. I get to see every department prior to the meeting. I talk about what's going on and what he or she is trying to cover to the visiting committees. I use the instance as an excuse to talk to them. I do talk to Deans, too.

For example, I wrote to the new Dean of Engineering, "Congrats, you've got the best job," which I do think is true, and "After you get your feet wet, I'd love for you to stop by my office." I give him a list of 4-5 questions, and I reach out and ask questions. As I've said to you before, one of my jobs is to see if we can talk about the right subjects. I have great confidence that, if MIT talks about a subject, they're going to come up with a pretty decent answer for it, but if you fail to talk about it at all, it's not very likely they're going to come up with it. I try to make sure I ask questions that are proactive that force people to think about things. That puts me in touch with what's going on. They're coming and giving me examples.

For example, right now, I ask the Vice President of Research, to tell me about output. I know all about how much research we do. We don't publish anything that gives a summary of what the outputs of that research is, and it seems to me we want to have some understanding of outputs. We're doing a lot of research on energy; what's it going to produce? From a scale point of view, is it important or are we making such a small piece it won't make any difference? They're going wild trying to figure out how they're going to describe the outputs. It's going to take some time to get a decent idea. We've hired a bunch of students for the month of January, and they're trying to hire a bunch of people to figure out what the heck the research does.

Will: So, you mentioned the visiting the committees are an important way to connect with departments and students, but, unfortunately, we're not able to provide a list of questions. There's not a case of dialogue. Students can present to visiting committee, but we don't see the report afterwards; so, we can't see how our input is taken into account. Clearly student input is important; so, is there a way we can see the effect of the student input?

Reed: That's a very interesting question that I never thought about. I know the department heads hear what happens. We have visiting committees that meet with students; then, they give a verbal report. Then, there's a written report; it comes to me. If I okay it, it goes to Exec. Then, it goes to the full Corporation. Sometimes, we ask them to rewrite it because it's un-understandable. I believe almost all department heads share the visiting committee reports with the faculty. I'm going to ask if any departments have shared it with graduate students and undergrads, or at least the parts that deal with student issues. I personally wouldn't have any problem publishing it, but I wouldn't want to say that my



opinion would be shared by others. Obviously, visiting committee reports are critical. You don't want a bunch of superlatives. What you want to do is identify where issues can be improved. But, that's an interesting question. I will see if I can talk to them. We have a visiting committees in political science, I think, Wednesday and Thursday, and I'll ask during that process if they ever get back to the students and give them some feedback on should they or not.

Will: Also, we were kind of researching the visiting committees. We realized...there was a note on a Report from the President to the Corporation. We were looking online, and we realized it only goes up to 2008; so, is there a reason for this?

Reed: You've given me new information. I will have to find out. Do you keep notes?

Vrajesh: I can send you all the notes.

Tim R: So, you were mentioning that you'd like us to ask a proactive question; sort of the proactive question for us is student engagement. We're kind of concerned about our voice and our voice being heard from the middle to upper administration. We're kind of curious what voice can be heard.

Reed: I think you all are pushing on it, and I read the piece, the newsletter. It was the in the faculty newsletter. You have a new chancellor, and that's the conduit. You have a dean for student affairs; you have a chancellor whose job is primarily interacting with the students, but there's no question in my mind that this is one of those things I do worry about. I don't care what the communication is, but I do care that there is communication – that there are open channels; so, the administration isn't operating in a vacuum. The admin are there permanently, and the students change 25% each year. After a while the admin sort of get fixed in their ways, and the students change a lot. Because of the turnover of the students, there's an inherent communication problem there. But clearly, students should have channels of communication. I think those channels exist, and I think they haven't worked as well as they should've. It seems to me you're pressing on those, and I would hope our new Chancellor is going to help make that happen.

Tim J: So, the energy initiative has been very successful in its research component. I think it's a pretty good example of how we can use research to spin off, and I've taken a couple classes it that, and it's been great. And, I kind of see the 3<sup>rd</sup> prong in implementing some of those things...the world class research we are trying to produce. The deferred maintenance is something that I'm concerned about. I know it is renovating, but it seems like, for the amount of hype that they are making on energy, we're not walking the talk. We spend a little on deferred maintenance. It will cost us in the future while costing us a lot of money now.

Reed: We did publish and share with the Corporation. The administration created what is called a 2030 plan. It takes a stop at 2020, and it goes on to 20-30. We have deferred maintenance which is about 2.3 million dollars. It is correct we are not, today, spending enough to keep that stable. It is going up; we're not spending enough to keep it at 2.1. We should get it down. It will never be 0, but it should be some sort of number. The rule of thumb, I am told, is you should spend about 4% of the value of your real estate. It is something that has been brought up the Corporation. We are trying to force the administration to put into the budget enough money. We do have a plan, but we're going to have to raise 4.5 million dollars to get the campus to a state that we'd be content with. That is a problem that has been defined and has been talked about, and I do think it'll get resolved; but, it is a problem that will take us 20 years. In those 20 years, we have some new buildings as well. Apparently there's some great need for



some time of micromanagement, and that's something new I'll probably build sooner rather than later. I do think you're correct, that we don't walk the talk as much as we should with regards to this. On the other hand, I would challenge students. It is rare to see a student that goes through a revolving door. They all go through the door on the side that says: "Energy inefficient; don't use!" I don't know why, if you all are the energy conscious generation, but you're correct; it is a problem we've got to run on. It's not one that's been properly solved yet.

Tim J: One of the things you've mentioned was, in terms of funding, you said we'd have to raise 4 million dollars. I'm wondering what the view of the corporation is for soliciting donations for raising money versus allocating money to other parts of the institution.

Reed: I can prove to you we're about 5 million dollars short of what it should be to operate as it is today. Just round numbers. We have round numbers. Not actually 10 billion dollars in our endowment; it's actually 9.2, just call it 10 billion dollars. Last year, we used 667 million dollars from these funds to support our operations. That's 6.67%. Drawing 6.67% from capital is more than you should draw. Economist today would say 4% is probably good; historically, we'd say 5%, but it has never been 6.67%. We are, today, eating out historical gifts. We could eat further into it; we could do 800 million instead of 667. In other words, how much money do we need to have so our draw is reasonable?

Another thing that I didn't say is, the difference between the depreciation on our buildings, and the market value of the space that we occupy is 314 million dollars a year. In addition, the 667 we're drawing from historical gifts...we're draining another 314 million from investments. In other words, buildings there have been fully depreciated. We pretend they're free, but they're not. That's about a billion dollars. We're draining a lot of money. Could we reallocate? Are there efficiencies to be had? Yes. Are they big to these numbers? Probably not. I could point out to you places where we might save some important money, but they don't scale anything like our need. I would take the position (and what I'm trying to convince the Corporation of) that we should raise the 4.5 billion dollars to clean up the maintenance and build the new buildings we need to build; because, I don't think we can steal 4.5 billion dollars from our resources.

Betsy: You've talked a bit about MIT's inefficiencies – both monetary and time; do you think that's inherent to being a school, or MIT's admin structure, or the structure of MIT that makes it an inefficient institution.

Reed: I agree with your characterization. I'm new; so, much of what I experience here is different. So, I think that part of it is just being a school. You know, our job is to attract the best faculty that we can. The faculty attracts the students. If you hear we have a great faculty, you'll have a great student body, too. At the grad level, people come specifically for professors, but even at the undergrad level, too. And, all the research we do greatly stems from the fact that we have faculty that attract these research contracts. So, we have to create an environment that attracts the best faculty. That's not necessarily an efficient environment. If you're too efficient, it's just not as warm or fuzzy of a place.

We could carry that to extremes. So, I'm on a committee of – the national research council of big communities, and they're about places like Stanford, Johns Hopkins, etc. We're all on this committee, and we're talking whom we've met a week ago. We can only have meetings on weekends because everybody's so busy. We were talking about exactly that question: how efficient is the university? Given the fiscal situation, can we continue to be this inefficient? And, it's a culture, history, and the consensus view. The research universities as a group are going to have to, if they're going to continue to have the



support of the population. They're going to have to be more efficient than we currently are. And, that will have an impact on the culture.

Adam: As far as raising money goes, you suggested we need 5 billion. Given our endowment is only 10 billion, that seems like an astronomical figure. How long will that take to raise and where would you begin to look for it?

Reed: Typically, campaigns are 5 years. I will point out Stanford raised 4 billion dollars twice over the past 12 years. They've had 2 campaigns of approximately that magnitude. You've got to get how much is incremental money and how much is money otherwise; so, there are some subtleties. I would guess you're talking about 4-5 year campaigning. You might have to do it twice, and you might have to do 4 and 4. The real equipment increment will be less than 4. The first group you'd go is people that are attached to MIT, either the school or some sort of activity. We raise about 300 million dollars a year right now that way. People who went to school here, alumni, etc. We probably are going to have to reach beyond that group because this number is large compared to the capability. Though, if you look at the graduate level, people that are listed as big billionaires, there are about 9 people who are reputed to be billionaires and graduated from MIT. There's a fair amount of money in the hands of alumni, but I think we are also going to have to broaden our appeal. We do things that large sets of people are going to support. Our research on cancer...the number of people willing to support cancer research is large compared to the number that came to MIT. We're really at the forefront. Energy is another one. The number of people that would like to see us develop new energy technologies. There's a set of people who are worried about global warming, there's another set of people who'd like to do it because they'd like energy independence. They'd like to not import oil. There are large bodies whose energy research would have acclaim. There are smaller groups that would be attractive in the Media Lab. We do some astounding things with regards to artificial limbs. An awful amount of people in our country have strokes or are otherwise impaired, and these sort developments are very much important developments for that set of people. We're doing fascinating stuff with autism, and that's another disease group that attracts a lot of funding not from MIT particularly; so there does exist sets of things one could make become appealing for people. So, our problem is, it's a marketing problem. How do you motivate people to want to support these efforts? First of all, we're going to have to describe them in a convenient way. This is one of the reasons I'd like to know what our research outputs are; then, you're going to have to identify those communities of people that are interested in the subjects. We don't know that today. In other words, we know our alumni, but we don't have a good research plan to find inputs for who's interested in environment, energy, etc. So, we're going to have to develop that. That's one of the things for some of us who spend our lives in the private sector that can help because this is a classical marketing problem. My belief is if we work it, we'll have a change in the ability to raise money and support.

Plaz: Thank you for coming. I want to talk for a minute about real estates. Kendall Square is being set aside for investment purposes, the last large chunk of land sort of close to the main group. You felt that would be a judicial route?

Reed: The answer is yes. We have a plan which is, as I said, I don't know how broadly it's been disseminated to. I know that students shared it with the Deans. I don't know how much further, but we have identified that a lot of the land we own and could potentially own. We've identified those things that are most important to us for academic reasons, and the academic reasons obviously get priority. We hold land that we own in different budgets. If we hold it for investment or help for particular investment.



We think it's extremely important for MIT to host these private companies because there's a lot of interaction between our faculty and graduate students and the companies. There are a lot of jobs produced. Typically, what we are going to do is we'll lease lands for 50 years. They'll pay us during that period, and they build whatever they want. But, in the end, we own the land and the building. We recapture that for the Institute. The Kendall square development is being talked about. North Cambridge...they may or may not become enthused. The idea there is to improve Kendall Square.

It's a hell of a lot better. People say it's a lot better. There's a proposal that's being talked about to the city council which we've developed for Kendal Square, and we have some space. It's not particularly hospitable to restaurants, coffeeshops, movie theaters, etc., so there's a plan that's being discussed. That's all in property we don't believe have any particular academic use.

Will: So, you mentioned ways we can stay competitive in looking forward in terms of widening our appeal. In terms of education, how can we stay competitive as a goal?

Reed: You do specialize in interesting questions. Quality is everything here. There are very few institutions that you can honestly associate with the word like excellent, but MIT is one of them. My own sense is that we give a quality education. I'm not saying we're singular, but there are few sets of institutions. I don't think that...we all know that how people learn may well change as we discover more and more how the brain works. There may be other ways of learning. Everybody understands how the internet may change the mode where people interact and learn, and we have various faculty committees actively working on trying to understand what the potential of this very thing along this line might be. I don't doubt for a second that we will maintain quality and excellence; and so, even if we might change modes over the next 20 years, the real question is size and scope. The number of people who could reasonably be at MIT either as professors or as students is clearly growing and is getting larger. Also, we're all losing market share. If the potential people who could be on the faculty or students are getting larger, you're losing market share, and one of the questions...obviously we have a financial constraint, and we're undercapitalized. The real question is scale and scope. Should we be larger? Should we be larger in Cambridge? Should we try to create a campus? If you tried to create one you'd start with research in graduate education not in undergraduates. There are questions that we've really gotten our minds on; so, I don't doubt for a second that at our current scale, we will be able to maintain over an extended period of time.

The process of renewal is very good. The first thing I looked at was young parenting. The key is faculty renewal. Can we maintain that the faculty or the young faculty are as good as the faculty here? Everything I can discern suggests that faulty renewal is pretty good, and the tenure process is pretty effective. I think this is the core. If you don't have that...I think that students are attracted to faculty, but the scale issues are much more complex. There are some members of the Corporation who think we should be 3 times larger; we owe it to society to keep up with the growth of people who are capable of coming. And, the country is short engineers and short scientists. We have some obligation to try and help that. That is a hard question in my mind; we have not gotten a clear image.

Allan: So, as a student, I step back, and I look at all these things from this student perspective. I see a lot of forces and a lot of things that play in; starting at the top is money – 2 billion for maintenance, 6.67% from endowment, this is obviously putting a lot of strain on things. I've been recently touring the dorms and talking to students. One thing I've heard again and again with the dorms: why aren't they listening? This also comes at the heels and the corporatization. We're becoming more of a traditional factory. It's



starting to worry students. Do you think the urgent methods like CJAC or what not, do you think those are sufficient? Do you think they are being adequately heard? Do you think there are academic constraints? Do you think this is going to start stifling our uniqueness and our ability innovate?

Reed: With regards to the last question, one of my jobs is to make sure that doesn't happen. The reason I talk with energy to help raise money is the Corporation has to help raise money to deal with constraints. Like typical MIT students, when you identify a problem, you also want to start it. It's not just to describe it. One of the things I'm actively working on is to get the Corporation to understand the financial situation; then, we take the next step. Let's have a 5 year or a 10 year plan that will resolve it, and I have every reason to believe we will do that and should to that. My impression is the mechanisms and channels for student interactions exist, and CJAC and the Dean of Student Affairs and Chancellor all exist. The impression I get by talking to students is they aren't necessarily working as well. You can have a perfectly good process, but it doesn't guarantee it will work. It just has the opportunity to work.

There are a whole lot of topics where student input is important. There are some topics where it frankly isn't if you want to change 18.01. I'm not sure you'd ask the students about that. You might hear if the problem sets were crazy, or you know the design of the course was simply horrible. You'd want to hear the students. My sense it's the chancellor is there. I get the sense that there is some frustration that they aren't working well. I would hope we will address that, after tonight's meeting and after we have an Exec Comm. Meeting on Thursday, but I assure you I'll tell Susan and Rafael bright and early, and I'll say: "Gee, I went to a meeting with you all, and this is my overall impression." I'll share with them. It's not my job from a corporate level to get in the administration, and I have to maintain a distance. You can't have everybody doing the same job. We have reps, the Provost, and the Chancellor. They are supposed to cause the place to operate. I will share impressions, and I'll say, "Hey, I get the impression there are some frustrations there, and you guys should pay attention."

Charles: I think you have the experience in being the Chairman to see something that plies throughout the institution. You're supposed to be a Chairman of a body that is all incredibly talented and used to being leaders in their careers and lives; so, I was wondering in a more administrative sense what experiences you had in getting a team of people like that to function effectively and solve some points you've been talking about.

Reed: I've had a lot of experience during that kind of thing. During my business career, I ran small units. You won't believe this, but, back in mid 60s, we were fussing with computers. We created a little company out in California, and we hired engineers. We had the right machine language code because the processors were so low you couldn't afford to have a compiler or operated in any sort of higher language. You don't have enough cycle time. If the guy sits by a cash machine and you wait 5 minutes to get your money, it doesn't work. I had a lot of experience. We built up a team of people, and we created what became cash machines; and then when I ran the whole corporation. One of the few things we did really well was hire talented people. We didn't care if the people moved; we just said anyone who was bright and had energy. If they're pianists...fine, hire them, and we'll teach them finance. You know, there's nothing more fun and better than putting together a bunch of bright, highly energetic, and creative people and creating the kind of environments which they were. One of the structural problems about universities is those qualities that cause you to get tenure and have your papers published in all the right places don't necessarily have much to do with your ability to reach people, run organization, and so on; so, you



inevitably pick your department heads, deans, and professors, from the set of people who earn their credibility and then took on these other jobs. It's an imprecise business.

MIT over the years has been pretty good. You know, we average out over time. Trouble with you is you're a student for a period of time, but all you see is the school at the present. The class graduating 50 years ago and I can see the floor across 50 years. We've had some pretty creative administrations. We've done some open courseware things like this. When I was here, biology didn't exist. Now I know we have things in the life sciences. You know, brain sciences...you know there were administrations that said, "Hey, this is going to be an intellectual frontier where we can really make a difference." They put the money in, and, in that sense, this place is more creative than quite a few others. There are lots of that that just sort of stayed in their niche. We've added importantly in the life sciences and brain sciences. All of that was during the last 3 years. There were administrative decisions to create them; so, I'm not concerned about our ability to continue to innovate further, but it's certainly true that herding a bunch of people is an art form. If you ask me what did I most enjoy most during my life, that was it; it was building things. It was building things and building things with people, and one of the things I like the most about my own career is I can point to people who are running lots of companies who weren't with me.

I learn more off of your questions than anything I can ask you. Please ask more.

Anika: So, I understand that the Corporation is involved in all of the academic programs they want to establish. We've heard a bit about the new 6/7 major. Do you know what other programs the institute is looking to kind of bring in academically, or is there information about the 6/7 major that you know?

Reed: No, I don't; we hear about these things late in the process. I'd love to hear about things early in the process because I'd sort of join in the excitement, but that's not the role of the Corporation. Things flutter around within the faculty; I happen because I know some faculty members to know that there's some ideas to create some new things, but the Corporation doesn't get engaged until it becomes serious enough. They were thinking of this; so, we're pretty late in the process, as I say it would only be by chance if it happened. It would not be representative, since I don't have a good measure. I know some professors. I'm more likely to know what's going on in those areas because the one thing I'm sure of is we're constantly evolving. I was on the energy advising board, well before I became the Chairman. Right from the beginning they said this has to have an impact; they created some new courses, and they said we had to have a minor. That's the kind of thing that we're good at. And, I'm sure they're talking about lots of things I have anything about.

Betsy: So, a question that comes up a lot when talking about student life issues and whether MIT should be imitating other schools. Looking towards peer institutions for ideas, a conclusion that's often drawn by students is MIT is super special and unique. Maybe we can imitate other schools, but MIT's a different place. It's always been different, and we like it that way. So, I'm wondering if you think MIT is unique, if that's positive, and how you think we can improve MIT by looking at other schools.

Reed: My personal preference is you're talking to someone who went here (and my father went to MIT); so, I have a lot of biases. I think we're unique and wonderful; I don't think there are many schools of this quality. On the other hand, I had 4 children, none of whom came here because it would not have been the right place for them. I had one son that went for University of Chicago. I think it was right off what he was interested in, and it has some qualities similar to MIT. So, I'm probably swayed by prejudice, not by thoughtfulness. We should just be really good at what we want to be and to pay a hell of a lot of attention





at what others want to be. That does not mean we should change, but we should try to optimize from within. The fact that we went out and hired a president from Yale...we have not often brought presidents from outside. It wasn't by chance; it was because the search committee thought it would be good. Not surprisingly, Susan who came from Yale brings a lot of thought processes which come from those experiences. There are some other ideas that do creep in the other things we do for students. We do keep track of students that have been accepted at Harvard and Stanford and what percentage of them choose to come here as opposed to going to one of these other places. You know, some of it is financial. We do better with those that are less well off and not as well with people that come from families that are sort of better off because we provide more aid for people that are poorer and less student aid for people who come from families who are better off. At some point, money does come in.

But we do care, and if I had been running this school, you all would be living quanceducts[?]. You may not know; it's a steel building that the army uses to house. This is because I really care about the education, but that's not the modern world. I mean, we now build dorms that are just as nice as the dorms on any other campus. We just built what we never would've done for this new building for the Sloan School. You can learn in buildings that are less elaborate, but the point is we do compete a little bit with the other schools because you can't be widely out of wack with regards to dorms and athletics space and so forth. We listen to the people who come to interview here and they give you feedback; so, we do in fact compare with others schools. The biggest change that I noticed in the 50 years since I was here does have to do with student life. I don't think the academic world has changed much. The building is the same old building. The one thing that was clear is: you know all these dorms, the playing fields, the swimming pool, etc.? This building wasn't here when I was here; that's all dramatically different, and it reflects competition.

Alex J: Mine's not a simple question; I don't want to take more of your time.

Reed: I appreciate the courtesy.

Jonté: Thanks a lot. I appreciate you coming here, and I thank you for your time.

**Recess Begins: 8:33 pm; Recess Ends: 8:42 pm.**

## **2. Opening Remarks and Senator Update**

Jonté: I think we just had a very productive conversation with John Reed. I really don't know what else to say about that. Moving on, opening remarks. Well, we had a week off. We did two caucuses between the time that we last met and now. The first was on dining, and the second was on what just happened a few minutes ago. I think, for the dining one, we got a lot of good information out of. The second caucus that we had on Saturday...I think we seemed even more productive. It had not been my intent to do these every week, but, if you find them useful, I will certainly be on board to running one. We need to come up with what has been happening with that. Everything we can address later on in the meeting. I sent an email. We're going to go down the senator update. I'm going to ask you guys, in 15 seconds, on what committee you're thinking of joining and what project ideas you have. Hopefully, real quick. We'll have everything on record, and we can go back to use this to check on everyone. Starting with:

Samuel: I plan to join the housing committee to help with W1.

Yi: I'm on the events committee, and we're planning the Spring Concert and stuff. Yeah, that's it.

Abel: I'm on the PR committee; we're planning study breaks. That's it.



Shambu: Hi, I'm representing Burton Conner, and I'm new to UA. I hope I learn a lot.

Betsy: I'm on the printing committee. We're working on getting feedback on the pharos system.

Leonid: I'm Leonid, proxy for Tim Robertson.

Charles: I'm on the UA Committee on Athletics; I don't yet have a project. I just joined.

Tim J: I'm on the Institute Committee on Educational Opportunities. I'm wrapping that up this semester. I'm probably going to apply to some more Institute Committees.

Cameron: I'm also on the Athletics Committee. Some of the projects...we're doing some more concrete things like getting attendance up at sporting events, advertising better, sending out undergraduate-wide emails, etc. Some of the larger more ambitious things...getting PE credits for club sports and things like that.

Alana: I'm Alan Miranda, a freshman. I'm new to Senate as well. I'll be representing fraternities.

Sandra: I'm Sandra. I'm a junior; I'll be representing ILGs. I'm new so...

Rachel C: I'm on the Committee on Student Life.

Jessica: I'm on the PR Committee, and like Abel said, we've been doing study breaks and working on the Friday food events.

Almas: I just applied to SCEP, and I've been working on dining in my dorm.

Ben: I'm currently on the Athena Printing Committee. I'm working on getting more feedback. I'm trying to work on the printing system in New House.

Suan: I'm on the Housing Committee, and we're working on student-run interim dorm switching.

Samuel: I'm on the Athletics Committee. We're trying to get concessions to get people to come to games; we're trying to organize Athletic Weekend.

Rachel M: I'm the current ASA president. I'm also on the Housing and Nominations Committees.

Allan: I'm the Chair of the Printing Committee. I sit on the Nominations Committee. I'm the Senate Rep to Exec, and I'm also part of the Online Study Group. I'm also on CACAB.

Will: I'm the Chair of the Space Planning Committee, and I'm dealing with Walker.

Shuang: I am part of the PR committee, and we are catching people off guard during lunch hours in the student center to bombard them.

Bobby: I was hoping to join the Athletics Committee to work on club sports.

Sivakami: I'm the FinBoard rep from Senate.

Kathy: Right now, I'm an alternate to the Institute Committee on Student Information Policy.

Alec: I'm Karan's proxy. I'm Alec Lai.

Jonté: If you haven't joined a committee, yet, please email your committee name and copy me on that email; so, I can email the chair. Almost all of the committee meetings are open to the public; so if there is a committee you're interested in joining, please just drop by and see what they're working on.

### **3. Exec Update**



Alex J: You've probably gotten at least 2 emails from me, but if you don't want to join a UA committee, you can join an Institute Committee. Technically, the deadline to apply was 52 minutes ago, but if you want to send it to me during Senate, I'll be okay. There are 8 vacancies. Two are new. The first is the new Orientation Committee that will be looking on Orientation Policy Change; we get 6 on that committee. The second is SAO is looking for a new Assistant Director; they would like someone with more experience. The third is the FYE Committee. We're going to have Rep on that. They're going to look at general changes for the first year. The other vacancies we have are on the Institute Committee on Student Life, the Committee on Discipline, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, and the subcommittee on soccer. Oh, and SLOPE. If you're interested, you can respond to my email.

#### **4. New Faces in the Student Activities Office (SAO)**

Leah: So, a couple things I'll tell you about in the SAO world. First, I want to let you know that currently Danielle serves as a temporary administrative assistance. That's the face you see. Daniel Watts will be starting next Wednesday. He took that position as full time, and he'll be a new face. He'll be sitting at the desk Danielle sits at right now. The second thing is, as Alex mentioned, we are looking for an Assistant Director of Student Activities. That's going to focus on event management. This is replacing Paul Spangles; so, we are looking for Student Representatives on that search committee, and we have gotten quite a number of applications. We have well over 100 now. The deadline for applications is April 1<sup>st</sup>, and I know that Alicia who is heading the Search Committee, she's looking at it to pull the search together herself. Hopefully, that person will start by June 1<sup>st</sup>, but that also depends on what job they're leaving (grad school, etc.).

Another new position which has yet to be posted...I've just been going around to different student groups. This position is also a Student Directors. It's focusing on multicultural programs. It will work with BSU, student union, multicultural union, etc., and they'll be overseeing it. They'll be organizing MC<sup>2</sup> and working on other diversity initiatives that fall under SAO. This position does not take away from what OME does and other offices that work with diversity. This is to work in collaboration and meant to work with students. This is under DSL. They were able to redirect some resources to get this position, before I even got here it was kind of in the works to get this moving along. We're really excited that this person will be joining our staff, and we'll be also looking for student input. There will be a student lunch. There will be another opportunity for more students to get to either and met the candidates. How multicultural programs will be helpful in groups that you work with...in particular, they'll be working with core groups; so, I'll really be looking forward to hearing your feedback on that. But, we're really excited to add them to our staff.

Jessica: You said that there's another Assistant Director to focus on diversity; so, the first director, is that focused on anything?

Leah: It's focused on Event Management, working with Class Councils, things of that manner. Alicia will focus on Emerging Leaders Conference, etc. This person will more be like an event management program person.

Ben: When you said you received 100 applications, was that for the position or to help select?

Leah: For the position, but this is also a time when people in student affairs are also looking for jobs and are ready to move on. We've hit it right at the right time, I think, too.



## 5. Q&A with the Committee on Race and Diversity (CRD)

Jonté: Do we have just one rep here today? If you want to come on up, you can have a seat and you can ask your questions. If you want to go ahead and introduce yourself too.

Diversity: Hi. I'm the representative on CRD. Basically, what we want to do is hold a discussion that would help us collect input on what MIT can do to increase cohesion and increase diversity at MIT. As the CRD, we do a lot of different projects to increase knowledge and diversity. We fund different events that increase diversity and heritage. BSU puts on something every year. We also bring in speakers from other schools to talk about research and development. This forum is for me to collect input from students and bring it back to the committee. I can then work to make some changes; so, I just wanted to start the discussions on some questions; first one would be: are you satisfied with diversity in the student body or faculty?

Tim J: Yes. After looking at the numbers, Latinos are the only underrepresented minorities. Everyone else is either represented or overrepresented compared to the underrepresented minorities in the country.

Almas: Women aren't.

Tim J: They're not an underrepresented minority.

Almas: But that's still.

Tim J: I looked at the statistics that come out every year on the student body.

Alex K: You're saying it's proportional to the population of the United States.

Tim J: Except for Hispanic Latinos.

Hawkins: I think the last faculty meeting I was at, they were talking about diversity in the faculty, and they were not currently satisfied with that yet.

Diversity: Right, that's true. Currently to improve females and definitely more Latinos. Any more comments?

Do you feel like the minority student community is supported by the majority of the students?

Will: In my experience, yes. I think we have an interesting variety of people; we all seem to get along well. I think it also depends on living groups.

Jonté: Are there any indicators you are looking for? If I'm a random student, what would be a way to say, "Yes, I feel like diversity is supported." Is it that I'm seeing these groups and I'm interacting with these groups. Is it I'm seeing advertisements? Is it I'm involved?

Diversity: I would say mostly, do you see advertisements, and are you involved? Mostly like do you see any advertisements to the events; do you see something about black students? Do you see that? It's not whether you go or not. It's whether you actually see this on campus. We notice 15 cultural groups have different shows on campus every week.

Adam B: I would say that the largest events get advertised across campus; so, I know there are various things going on, but I feel like the friends I have who are active members of the community are always doing a whole lot more than I hear about. That's not a bad thing because you don't want to bombard everyone with email, but I'll imagine people really interested in going will like becoming a member



without a message. But, I would say, for the big events, they were fairly well publicized. People who are interested have the opportunity.

Diversity: Do you feel satisfied with the current offerings and subjects on diversity?

Anika: The MLK class over IAP is one of the most popular offerings.

Diversity: Do you feel like it's because people want to learn or because the class is a fairly easy to class?

Will: I have a friend; she likes taking it.

Anika: I've seen people come out of the class, and it's effective in what it's supposed to do.

Alex J: In some ways, we have an entire minor about the Asian Diaspora. I think it's kind of unusual for this type of school. We also have an entire minor for Russian things. I don't know if they're very well publicized; so, I think it's a niche thing. If you're already interested, you'll find the classes, rather than those specific parts. I don't know if they reach out to other students. Like the Women and Gender Studies is really active, and they also get involved with a lot of the minority and ethnic classes. They're course registered under Women and Gender students because they put a lot of effort advertising their program. Other than that, I would say we have the offerings, and I don't think they're that well advertised.

Diversity: How can MIT better help facilitate or create a cohesive diversity community?

Tim J: I think it's great we have a lot of living groups that have a certain characteristic. That's kind of good, but I feel like I don't have a specific solution to this. If there was more interaction, then that would be awesome. I just don't have a very good idea of how that can happen. Once the people get to know the 20-30 people, they just get comfortable with that and hard to reach out.

Suan: What happens in New House is we have a bunch of cultural groups. They're very tight in there, but there's no cultural house to cultural house interactions; so, we're trying to change that. So, it's good that we're diverse, that we have different cultures; so, it would also help for them to interact. One of the things that was useful during my orientation...we had a diversity forum. Most people didn't think it would be useful. When we actually did it, it was a fun experience. They randomly shoved us around, and you got to talk to people. You ended up having deep conversation with other people; so, I feel like things like that are useful.

Jonté: Would it be useful to break that down in terms of living groups, classes, and student groups, and, in general, look at interactions there?

Diversity: I would say more interactions between MIT and students because our committee is between MIT diversity and events that we should hold that would increase it. If student groups wanted to have an event between each other, they can apply for funding. As for an event we can pull off, I don't know what we can do. An event we can do is a diversity forum; we could totally do it if people found that really helped.

Jonté: Or you're looking more at things that can be targeted.

Kathy: I think something that would be cool is (my high school did it) they had a challenge day where you bond with a lot of people you don't know, but it would be cool to have the entire campus participate.

Jonté: Could you be more specific?



Kathy: I went to the biggest high school in Michigan; so, we had 3000 people, about the size of MIT. You basically go in and they split you up into little groups. You talk about your background, and you get to meet a lot of people you don't normally interact with.

Diversity: What are...what I mean by that is if you can change things in MIT to increase diversity, what would you change? This is anything at MIT?

Alex J: I think it would be interesting to have slightly more interaction between international student orientation and actually orientation. There are people from all over the world. There are far fewer, I think they make up 8% of each class. I think it would be interesting to make more of a concerted effort to encourage people from different countries to interact with each other. There's a lot of diversity that many people don't end up seeing.

Almas: I agree with that, I think there's a lot of different cultural groups, religious groups, and international groups. All of them have to stick together. Even the events that were publicized, there's not really an interaction that's a rich diverse atmosphere.

Diversity: So, that's it. Thanks for having me.

Jonté: What is your committee planning on doing; are you working on events this semester or next semester?

Diversity: Most will be next semester. We're going to take it back; we're going to decide on events we can hold to help the student population increase diversity. Events between the student groups was what people want, and probably start these vents next semester.

Alex J: Not everybody gets to be an institute committee. If you have anything else you want this committee to hear, you should say it now. I'm going to encourage other ones. It would be great if you're more interactive.

Suan: I'd go by like, the outside people use. The definition of the minority thing in the MIT community. There will be like 2-3 students from a certain country. Would they be considered a minority? Do you mean like the Latinos?

Diversity: Our committee works on race and diversity, not necessarily minorities, but when you do talk about minorities, I'm pretty sure it's the MIT definition. We work with mostly people; we don't work with just minorities, we have events for all.

Suan: I understand the institution composes about 8% within international students. There are people from different countries; from Malaysia there's only like 1. So, what do you do for those people because they're more minorities than Blacks or Latinos here?

Diversity: Since there's not that many people, there's not much we can do. There's only 1 from that country.

Suan: That's what makes them a minority.

Diversity: Yeah, but we do have speakers, and we do fund events from many different races and minorities. So, if they were to apply for financials, I don't know how many events we'll have targeted just at them.

Jessica: So for these events, do you guys work with students groups or is this under the CRD? What are these events? Do you guys put them on or sponsor them?



Diversity: We do both. We have events we put on, and we have events that we cosponsor with other groups. We have an event with CLE. There are also events we give money to.

Jessica: For the events that you guys put on for students, are they targeted at a certain minority, or is it just you guys. Do you guys alternate, or is it just you guys find like a minority?

Diversity: The events you put on are not targeted. It would be an event where some come and talk about diversity. We publicize it to everyone, and that's why. Minority groups, we just bring in speakers. We'll talk to anyone who will listen. That kind of thing.

Jonté: Does your committee have a website, so we can talk more?

Diversity: It's <http://diversity.mit.edu/crd>.

Jonté: Thanks. Any more questions, comments, or feedback?

Betsy: I'm just wondering how your committee gets feedback. I don't feel like I have an authoritative voice on diversity on campus mostly because I speak to dorms on the committee. Do you conduct surveys, talk to people, etc? What's the process?

Diversity: This would be one of the events we do to collect feedback; we haven't had many events like this this year. Us, as student representatives, should get our information. The committees are made of mostly faculty, and so how they get their information is a lot of different methods; they actually don't collect much student information.

Betsy: On the committee, do they focus mostly on faculty issues then or are they more interested in increasing student awareness and diversity?

Diversity: The focus on a nice range. They have events for both. For example, one of the things we recently talked about was a magazine sent out to MIT alumni, and in the magazine, it was talking about intentional wisdom. There weren't many minorities and in the magazine and what we talked about...we sent a letter to Hockfield, and we made some changes so that minorities would be represented. But, mainly those are the issues.

Betsy: And, as a student rep, do you feel like your voice is being heard?

Diversity: I definitely feel like my voice is heard. They definitely encourage me, and the other student reps, to bring up ideas and to talk about their student rep ideas.

Will: I was going to thank you for coming. I think we have a lot to do tonight, too; so, we should move on.

Rachel M: I was going to ask: if people get more, should they email you personally?

Alex J: There's an address: [ua-crd-reps](mailto:ua-crd-reps), and it will go to him.

## **6. Focus Group on Community Cohesion/Diversity**

(Item skipped on agenda.)

## **7. Confirmation of Nominees for UA FinBoard**

Vrajesh: Emily is currently serving as the interim chair since Cynthia stepped down and Emily's the Vice Chair. Since then, she's helped out with the functions of FinBoard. She and I interviewed all the



candidates. I won't say the process has been perfect because it hasn't been. I think she definitely has stepped into that goal. I'm nominating her as chair to finish off the semester.

Emily: My name is Emily. I am a junior right now in course 6. I live in Bexley, and I've been on FinBoard since my freshman year – freshman spring; so, that's 2 years now. I don't know if you guys want to know details. I think it's better if you ask questions, and I can answer them.

Allan: Could you outline time commitments for the coming semester? Also, more in depth, I know you were at the reforms. How do you feel about the recent change and how they'll help the job?

Emily: Commitments. I'm the president of the newly founded SBC Sloan business club, co-presidents. I'm going to be working on my UAP. I'll be UROP-ing 6-15 hours a week depending on how that goes. I'm sort of moving out of my role as the president of TechFair. We're going to run elections, and I'll be done with that. As for what I think on the new policies, I think we outlined some pretty good bylaws for how FinBoard should be run. I think there's a lot of policy on a day-to-day sort of operations.

Rachel M: I was curious if either Vrajesh or you could speak to the last two weeks and could speak to the Senate approval on the committee report.

Jonté: Could you be more specific?

Rachel M: I'd rather not be; it's intentionally open.

Well, for example, a committee outlined a schedule for FinBoard member selection which by the fact of the agenda item obviously didn't happen according to what was outlined.

Anika: Rachel, could you be louder please?

Rachel M: I guess to lay it out slightly differently: the report that was created by the committee and approved by Senate outlined for the FinBoard Committee selection for the following cycle, but by the looks of the agenda, that has happened in the last two weeks instead. I was wondering if Vrajesh and Emily could explain why they decided to go and do this.

Emily: I can certainly say, we needed to get new people on FinBoard. If we didn't get new people on FinBoard, we wouldn't have enough people to make quorum or the upcoming cycle. A lot of seniors were already showing little attendance. They had sort of been promised that their term would end in February and March. We're sort of adopting these new policies gradually; so, next time it will be transitioned after Spring II.

Will: I feel like the general gist of the reports is we want FinBoard to give more money to student groups; does that happen?

Emily: In terms of quantitative methods, there's a lot we can do in terms of percentage spent and allocated. Stuff like that.

Alex J: Are you part of the secret cult in Bexley prepared to take over the UA?

Emily: Yeah.

**\*Senate is in closed session.\***

**Emily Zhao is approved at Chair of FinBoard.**

Betsy: How many actively empty seats are there, not effectively?





Emily: Composition has changed under the new bylaws. What we have right now is we have a UA Treasurer, we have an ASA Treasurer, and if Sivakami comes, a Senate rep. Then, we have a chair. We need a vice chair, and we have 5 members at large.

Betsy: Is that to meet minimum or maximum?

Emily: Maximum.

Alex J: Are there preexisting members at large?

Emily: Yes, we reinterviewed them, and then we added one of them.

Alex J: Was there a discussion where people were told to leave FinBoard or asked to leave, or are there people that have chosen to leave who have already submitted some form of resignation?

Emily: Everybody was a senior, and they all expected their term to end February and March; they weren't to do another allocation after the last one. We reinterviewed, and we decided to do this. I guess this person is being replaced without consent.

Alex J: Was this part of the new policy?

Emily: Yes, the new policy is to look over everyone.

Betsy: Is it this year or next year?

Adam: It's the policy that's in the bylaws now.

**\*Some confusion on that policy.\***

Rachel M: It is true that the process is for normal selection. It is in line with the process for selection, but the timing is different.

Allan: I just need to make sure I'm understanding this right. We're currently proposing nominating a new slate that would replace the terms of the people that are currently on. But, we're axing them now.

Emily: I wouldn't phrase it that way.

Allan: Is it true?

Vrajesh: They wouldn't have been in Spring II.

Jessica: About the 6 nominees, you said 5 of them are 5 members at large.

Emily: Six is 5 members at large and 1 vice-chair.

Will: How are we going to approve them? Are we going to approve them 1 by 1?

Jonté: I think we'll ask each of them to introduce themselves individually.

**\*Some procedural discussion.\***

Jonté: My recommendation is that we consider each person individually. Another option is to put the slate before the assembly and then have the assembly to approve the slate. If there's an objection, we can deal with them appropriately.

Rachel M: What we did two years ago...they introduce themselves. We took questions from each of them. We do a nominations committee slate, and we can separate them. But, in general, we're approving the set of people. It's hard to consider them completely individually. We don't have to fill all the seats.



Jonté: I will accept a motion phrased either way.

Will: I motion that they come up and introduce themselves 1 by 1, and after they're done, we'll introduce the slate. If there's not a majority, we'll do it 1 by 1.

Emily: Danielle will be the first to introduce yourself.

Danielle: I'm Danielle Mormon, junior in East Campus. I'm on the debate team, and I do some writing in the Tech. I've recently become more interested in the campus as a whole and how student groups as a whole function as a result of recent events – specifically Walker Memorial will be interested in student groups and need funding to succeed and do well in the future. That's why I'm interested in this – to have more as a whole and introduce more student groups as a process.

Will: In the past, FinBoard holds whole weekends around the allocations thing. Is that a time commitment issue?

Danielle: That's not a problem. I normally can choose between 2-5 days, even though that's normally the schedule for FinBoard. I would choose based around FinBoard.

Rachel M: Will we have a chance to ask all of them a question at once?

**\*Some more confusion on procedure\***

**Motion to have a Q and A afterwards passes.**

Emily: I also sent you another email on some more information.

Jonté: When was it sent?

Emily: Right now.

Leonid: I'm course 14 and 17. I'm on the Exec committee. I'm the DormCon Treasurer. All of these things are annual except for Spark on March 12. Otherwise, I care a lot about student government. And so, I want to see other groups that exist and help them, and that's it.

Adam: Do you see any potential conflict of interest between your responsibilities as DormCon treasurer and serving on FinBoard?

Leonid: No, because FinBoard doesn't deal with residential communities.

Vlad: Guess I'll start off by reading up that information. I'm a freshman in Baker House, planning on studying courses in 18 and either 14 or 6-3. I'm involved in Traders@MIT and a treasurer at Pi Kappa Alpha.

Emily: Edan actually has a class at this time; it ends at 10:30.

Matthew: I'm Matt. I'm a freshman Burton Conner, but I'm also in PKT. I'm also a social chair. I'm also Course 2A. My main extracurriculars aren't too much. It's pretty much a UROP. Course 2A and 15. I also want to get more involved in campus in general. So, I want to sort of get your hands on what's going on.

Jonté: What do you think you bring to FinBoard?

Matt: I feel like I have the dedication. UROP is my only thing. I've already went ahead and followed through with whatever Emily wanted me to do and not going too far ahead. It's a matter of following though, and I don't like letting people down.



Nathan: Hi, I'm Nathan Roberts. I'm a brother at Phi Sigma Kappa, and I'm course 2. I'm a sophomore. I play varsity soccer. I'm currently the director of the logs, and I'm applying to FLP also. The reason I wanted to do FinBoard is because I wanted to get more involved in student government. I just thought I would be very interested in learning about how money is funded. How do you fund 120 different groups? How many are divided up? And, I'm really excited to be a cutting edge and transition to new FinBoard policies.

Jonté: I'm going to pose the same question to you, then.

Nathan: I think I'm very good at analyzing all the information. I think I'll be good at gathering all the recommendations. Looking at the group events, I'm excited for the position.

Jessica: Who's the Vice Chair candidate?

Emily: We don't have it. It's in our bylaws; that's going to be approved. Unless Senate wants to nominate a Vice Chair.

Jonté: A motion was to put forth by to have a separate question and answer session, and we're asking everyone at once.

Betsy: Can you just say yes or no? You've read the report and new bylaws?

All FinBoard Nominees: Yes.

Alec: Point of personal privilege – when you respond, could you please state your names again; so, I can make sure I have it right on the record?

Rachel M: How many RFPs have you processed?

Leonid: 3.

Danielle: 10. I am a financial signatory.

Nate: Not many.

Vlad: Haven't been in any. I've done some funding internally for Traders.

Matt: Haven't done any.

Alex D: Can you elaborate on what you mean by Traders and funds internally?

Vlad: The question was whether you have submitted funding requests. It gets its funding from sponsors, and we do funding internally.

Adam: So, we have a candidate who's not here right now to answer these questions; so, I don't think it's entirely appropriate to be doing this.

Rachel M: He's a current member. He has answered the questions before.

Will: I motion that we want to approve them now. He can't answer them, but that shouldn't be held against them.

Alex D: Please explain what an RFP is.

Danielle: An RFP is when you make a personal reimbursement request, and it is approved through your group by a financial signatory.

Vlad: In that case, I haven't had any personal ones.



Tim J: Motion to go into closed discussion and vote.

**\*Senate is in closed session.\***

**Motion to divide and to postpone the question for Edan Korelewicz passes.**

**Motion to amend by severing the slate into individual nominations passes.**

**Danielle is approved as a member of FinBoard.**

**Motion to reconsider Danielle as a member of FinBoard passes.**

**Motion to postpone reconsideration of Danielle as a member until after further questioning passes.**

**Motion to bring them back into open session passes.**

Edan: I'm a member of DKE, and I'm course 15. I'm a junior, and I'm really excited for this FinBoard stuff. I apologize for being a little late. I have class from 9:00-10:30 PM. I came, because that's what she told me I should do as soon as I'm done with class.

Tim J: Why do you want to be on FinBoard?

Edan: I really like the idea of understanding student groups and help maximize their efficiency with funds. FinBoard can be a tough process to understand. For me, it would be to be able to make it easier to do what they're going to do.

Jessica: How do you feel about the new bylaws we set forth?

Edan: I was talking to Vrajesh about them during the interviews. I think they're going to help the groups and FinBoard of course to be more transparent, especially having two funding cycles per semester. That's going to make it a lot easier for groups to apply. They can apply for the second one. Also, early applications, that's another way FinBoard can kind of directly talk to members and we can kind of give them feedback on how their application looks. They're kind of rushing at the end.

Rachel M: What do you think of the recent changes to FinBoard funding policies, addressed at everyone?

Matt: Being a freshman, there's only so much of hearing what's going on; it's definitely a much better policy. Having two cycles per semester, and beyond that, that's mostly little changes. The only thing is a major change is the early application process. That makes it more flexible for groups to become a part of it.

Vlad: I think it's an evolving policy. Student groups will benefit, since it is implemented to educate about changes to make the entire process more streamlined.

Nate: The purpose of FinBoard is to give more money. It's a lot easier for groups to get funding from FinBoard.

Edan: I think there are a lot of topics that FinBoard has discussed in the past. There's a lot of topics they kind of discuss. They keep coming up, like special cases for FinBoard. I think that's generally where we want to as a group just make arbitrary decisions, and I think really solidifying what our policies are, as a whole, is super important for FinBoard; so, we can make decision that is fair for the MIT community and that are voted on by Senate as legitimate policies. We can tell the groups there's something we can really understand. If they have questions, if you have a better way, please come to us and let us know. The main things: we're not arbitrarily trying to not give money to groups. We are making sure our policies are brought to Senate as quickly as possible; so, Senate can really understand that these are policies.



Danielle: I agree with what they said. I think you may have also be thinking about the new guidelines in terms of how we preference fund and guidelines for how much we're going to give. I thought that would be a simple way to be able to understand what sort of ideas we have about what funding is appropriate. In general, trying to move forward, trying to make more specific guidelines. Having more flexibility – I think that's a huge benefit. Going forward, you'd like to see more open FinBoard policy but more fair, with increased transparency, with more information available to groups. It enables groups to do more.

Leonid: There's this problem of: I'm talking to people. I probably shouldn't have, but various people want things that have been problems in the past. They're sort of...it's unclear what we want to fund and how much we want to fund. I don't think the policies talk beyond very broad guidelines. Going forward, I would like to address that.

Allan: In your opinion, what is the chief goal? Do you think the current bylaws meet this goal and the past bylaws met these goals?

Leonid: The goal of FinBoard is to fund student groups.

Allan: Do you think FinBoard is currently set up to adequately fund student groups?

Leonid: Yes. As for the old bylaws, I haven't actually seen them.

Allan: That's fine.

Danielle: My philosophy is: one of the things I like the best is to prioritize giving funding to activities and events that are inherently important to the group's function and success. I like that we preference that. Moving forward, setting more specific guidelines, FinBoard's chief goal is to allow students to sort of achieve. It's not necessarily to ensure groups are very sustainable. If we can't give them as much of funding, it's better directing them towards alternative sources of funding.

Edan: I don't know how we can stop that. I think what she said was pretty spot on; it's to make sure funds are allocated to student groups and are done so in a good fashion, making sure it's projected and fair.

Nate: I don't have much more to add. I think the new bylaws stress funding groups that are for the MIT public. That everyone at MIT is able to experience funding.

Vlad: I Think it's important to give groups a high area of funding and look at which have low priority, which uses of funding are appropriate, cash honorariums, cash prizes, etc.; so that, we really streamline the process. Another goal of FinBoard is to be a liaison to student groups. What exactly is the best way to plan my budget? We can maximize both our groups' happiness to use funds the best possible way.

Matt: I'd just be summarize what has been said. It comes out to maximizing student groups. We want to support that as best you can. Beyond that, it's pretty much taking FinBoard to another level. I think 190 groups are eligible for funding, and I think 112 we funded recently. There was a group that was too lazy to apply. It's something like that, little side projects we want to work on, which also leads the groups to currently funding more specifically. As far as the bylaws are concerned and the priorities.

Rachel M: How well do you think FinBoard and been communicating about this round?

**\*Some confusion on the question.\***

Rachel M: I would like to hear from the six of you on how the communication is.

Leonid: Neither of the groups that I work with get FinBoard, like ESP.



Tim J: Point of order – I want to instate a 30 second time limit to each response.

Leonid: For the last couple of days, I talked to people. I should've given a part to the nominations part. I think going forward, I'd like to be very open and frank with the problems I can see in a particular funding request.

Danielle: I think going for funding can seem like an intimidating process. I've deferred it to a treasurer. I think moving forward, I would like to educate those that don't really reach out and submit funding requests that are the sort of things we're looking for.

Edan: I guess in the past, I only I reached out to groups a few times the semester. The groups I allocated to. So, I had a very good relationship with them, and I felt, with the groups I had funding for, that I got a lot of positive feedback from those groups. So, I guess I would say that it seems like relations went well.

Matt: In groups, I was never the officer that was in charge of communicating. Out of the ones that had already responded, they seemed very appreciative that we had already responded on these.

Vlad: I've been a nominee for only several days. I have already gotten emails. I've addressed how their budgets can be approved, what we can or cannot fund, etc. They should apply to LEF, for example; so, I think FinBoard is well-positioned to work with student groups.

Matt: I don't have any established liaisons. It's a matter of taking leadership at hand. We need to make sure: 1. Money is allocated appropriately and 2. We're someone they can seek out for help.

**\*Senate is in closed session.\***

**Motion to approve 5 people, since only four at large seats are available, passes.**

**Motion to amend voting format to: discussion, then voting of seats, then candidates with the most votes get the seats passes (assuming they also had a majority vote).**

**Danielle, Edan, Vlad, and Leonid are approved as FinBoard members.**

**Motion to postpone conclusion of voting, pending reconsideration of the number of seats, passes.**

**Motion to make it 4 at large nominations passes.**

## **8. Nominations and Election for Vice Speaker of the Senate**

Tim J: Motion to postpone this until after 10.4 is discussed.

**Motion to postpone nominations and election for Vice Speaker until after 42 U.A.S. 10.4 passes.**

## **9. Approval of Minutes from 42 U.A.S. 9 and 42 U.A.S. 10**

Tim J: I love Alec's minutes. Motion to approve.

**Minutes for 42 U.A.S. 9 are approved.**

Will: Motion to postpone until the next meeting.

**Approval of minutes for 42 U.A.S. 10 is postponed until the next meeting.**

## **10. 42 U.A.S. 10.4: Bill to Amend the Senate Bylaws Restrictions on Senate Officers**

Jessica: There should be a clause so a principal officer can't do this.



Vrajesh: That's already a rule.

Jessica: Then, I call the question.

**42 UAS 10.4 passes.**

## **11. Nominations and Election for Vice Speaker of the Senate**

Tim J: I nominate Janet Li.

Janet: I accept.

Kathy: I nominate Almas.

Almas: I accept.

Adam: I motion to close nominations.

Janet: I've been PR chair; so, I care about communication, and, for some god forsaken reason, I really care about Senate, so I'm still going.

Almas: As Vice Speaker, one of my biggest goals is to engage Senators. What we've been seeing is a few people doing most of the work, and some not representing. That's what I've been doing most of the time as a senator, and that would be my priority. I would also like making it more efficient. My biggest priority is still representing people. You know I've been working on dining; so, it's definitely my priority – student engagement.

Allan: What about time commitments?

Janet: I'm the UA PR Chair. I'm also a vice president of my sorority, Phi Beta Psi, which is also not too huge.

Almas: I'm a senator; other than that, I'm doing a UROP, and that's about it. I'm on GPI.

Jonté: I have a question; do you consider...well, are you still planning to be PR Chair as Vice Speaker, or do you consider that to be a conflict of interest?

Janet: I think there are similar goals for both positions; so, I don't think it's a conflict of interest.

Vrajesh: It requires a 2/3 vote. Then, you're allowed to.

Tim J: What made you reconsider your decision?

Almas: In the beginning, I hadn't really experienced my classes. In the past two weeks, I've been spending so much time working on UA things anyways, it made me realize most of my time goes into this. Classes – I've had time to see how much it takes. At first, I didn't know I can handle the time commitment. Now, having experienced the classes and stuff, I feel that I am capable.

**\*Senate is in closed session.\***

**Janet Li has been elected as the new Vice Speaker.**

**Motion to overrule the rule on being both a committee chair and Vice Speaker passes.**

## **12. 42 U.A.S. 11.1: Bill to Introduce Referendum on Dining**

Shuang: As the author, I would like to postpone it.

**Motion to postpone 42 U.A.S. 11.1 fails.**



Betsy: Point of information – What time frame does this need to work?

Jonté: 10 days. If you guys want to have a separate vote, you should approve this now. If you want to lump it all together with the Presidential Elections and you want it on the ballot then.

Tim J: But the referendum can actually come afterwards.

Vrajesh: Motion to recess.

**Recess Begins: 12:06 am; Recess Ends: 12:09 am.**

Jonté: Before we recessed, we were deciding whether or not we wanted to postpone the consideration of this bill. All those in favor of postponing until the next meeting, please signify by raising your hand.

**Motion to postpone 42 U.A.S. 11.1 fails.**

Will: I believe that, if we intend to have a referendum on dining, it's beneficial to announce this earlier rather than later. Otherwise, we'll have to wait another week, and we'll have a bill that's less relevant.

Shuang: So, we were discussing the time to administer the referendum. I suggest that we amend the referendum to during the election time because voter turnout during the elections is going to be decent.

Vrajesh: I'm going to give the pros and cons to both options, since there isn't much to be considered. There are two possibilities. 1 is to run the referendum, not during the ordinary election, 2 is to during the actual election. In the second case, the voter turnout will be greater, but the results will be available one week later.

Rachel M: I recognize the importance of announcing a referendum on a ballot. I feel like it's premature to announce solely that. If we don't have any, what are we asking about, what are we getting out of it? We shouldn't start saying anything.

Adam: I have a question for Vrajesh, I guess. As soon as this gets passed, I assume that DSL will try and move a little quicker; and so, basically, we don't have any options once they sign a contract. So, do you see that is it possible that they will sign a contract between now and whenever the results are available?

Vrajesh: I'm not sufficiently informed with a timeline, but I do have specific recommendations for what should be on the referendum. I can suggest those if you think that's appropriate, but that's now that you asked.

The questions that I will recommend are the following. I am satisfied by the recommendations by HDAG. Strongly, somewhat, kinda, somewhat against, strongly against, and I don't know about it. Second, I am satisfied by the process in constructing those recommendations. Same questions. I would ask those two questions because I believe they are worded in a balanced way.

Rachel M: If we approve this today, can we approve it to run whenever, or does it have to run in 10 days?

Vrajesh: No.

Rachel M: So, we can decide?

Vrajesh: I would want the guidance of Senate in determining when the referendum runs.

Rachel M: I move to amend the bill to add that clauses that add, the questions on this referendum, I mean while we're waiting, to add those questions and to set a timeline. So, a that clause with the questions on the referendum be whatever task Vrajesh just read. To add a third that clause to read that the referendum be considered with UA P/VP and Class Council elections.





**Motion to amend with those that clauses passes without objection.**

Vrajesh: I move to amend the last that clause to be made as immediately as possible.

Betsy: I am not sure I can make a super informed decision. Is doing it in 10 days as soon as possible? I'm not sure I understand the full picture.

Vrajesh: The UA hasn't held a referendum in a very long time. I'm not sure what the turnout will be. It will be lower if we hold it sooner, but we'll get the results one week sooner. My understanding based on the article is that this coincides with the same general time frame.

Adam: As far as a historical referendum, I don't know any that were not held with the elections.

Liz: Just for your record, last year's elections had a higher turnout rate.

Ben: It's basically, should we sacrifice accuracy for time?

Will: I call the question.

Alec: As a representative of Next House, and as the president, I'm uncertain if this extra week will end up making a huge difference. I don't know how I can swallow it if the contract ends up being signed that one week.

Adam: Are you on the RFP committee?

Alec: I am not. The old president and dining chair are.

Hawkins: I would argue that it will be too late either way.

Adam: I think the overwhelming vote is more necessary.

Rachel M: I think we've been called into question that our representation is bad; so, not having even a third or 40% will make us never trust this for years to come.

Betsy: I'm not convinced it will do it either way.

Vrajesh: I withdraw my amendment. I move to make another amendment. I want to use the 3 whereas clauses that Allan sent out. It replaces all of that whereas dining is an issue, whereas it's the duty of the UA to reflect student opinion, etc. I feel like this set of whereas clauses more accurately represents the sentiment than what is currently there.

Liz: You realize you can be angry. I feel like this is step towards that direction. If you want to be angry, try and stay in this framework.

Almas: It's okay if we have it in the language that's written. When we're trying to talk to them, we have to show that they have failed to represent; that's the point of the referendum. I don't think we should be angry, but strong language is good.

Vrajesh: I think at this point, the data will speak for itself in whatever direction it goes, whether it be very conclusive or whether it be somewhere in between. Given that the target is the UA, I'm not going to hand it out. It really doesn't matter how strong the language is. I don't think discussing in detail will make a great problem; so, I call the question.

**Motion to amend with those whereas clauses passes.**



Liz: A thing that they might pick at. They think they already have student opinion with regards to dining. You might want to change it to proposed dining plan. They think that their surveys from before and their interpretations are hard.

Vrajesh: I think we adjust that by asserting there is a need for that, suggesting that we don't believe that it already exists; so, I call the question on the entire thing.

**42 UAS 11.1 passes.**

### **13. Changes to Institute Committee Representation**

Alex J: I would like to remove two people. The first is Akara Ambak from Institute CSL. She self reported that he missed over 50% of the meetings. She also failed to meet with me 3 times. I spoke to the Chair, Professor Slocum, who also agrees. The second is DiGiovanni. He was unable to attend any of the meetings. The committee never met at times he could make; so, he didn't even go to training. So, this is admirable for a resignation, because she realized she can't make it. Akara also agreed that he can be removed.

Jonté: Why didn't they just resign if everything was fine?

Alex J: I don't know if they know about this. Akara had many opportunities to speak with me, but she didn't. I got a lot of this from the end of semester report. So, he was generally irresponsible. I think, he could've. He recognized that he should've resigned but didn't, and honestly I think it was just laziness. Leah never said anything; she was on another committee. She never mentioned anything was wrong. She and David Kennedy, who was the staff to COD, figured out when she was going to get training in. She was playing a sport in the fall. COD meets 3 or more hours to talk about this. After some time, it wasn't an issue of her being not qualified; it was an issue of time. Now we're looking for somebody who would be willing to serve on this committee falling into next year.

Jonté: My only concern is we're actively derecognizing someone.

Alex J: That seems harsh if people read the minutes. I suppose I can ask them to remove formally with resignations. Though, I first talked to Slocum; then, I talked to Akara. He said that she wasn't meeting with him; she probably shouldn't be on this committee anymore. I didn't want to approach Akara and be like: "No, it was great." So, I told Akara, and she said yeah; so, it's fine.

Adam: I call the question.

**Motion to derecognize those representatives passes.**

Alex J: The next motion is to appoint Alix de Monts to the Walk the Talk Pres Committee. She is more qualified, and they report directly to President Hockfield on issues of sustainability on campus. Alix, in her role as sustainability chair, is qualified for this position. She will also be here next year, and she'll start serving immediately if you guys approve her. I'll take questions if you guys have them.

Allan: Does she have the time for the position?

Alex J: Vrajesh can speak to it, but it's not significant. I think it's much less than her chair duties.

Vrajesh: It's an hour and a half a month.

Alex J: I call the question

**Motion to recognize Alix de Monts passes.**



## 14. New Business, Discussion, and Closing Remarks

Jonté: So let's take up the Senate Rep for FinBoard right now. The way we did it last year, if I recall correctly, we did an election. Just like we do with Vice Speaker. Hopefully you guys can make the decision a little bit more quickly. So, I'm just going to open the floor for nominations and questions. I'm not sure that I'm exactly qualified. I might pass it off to Rachel or Vrajesh.

Vrajesh: What term are we electing this person for?

Jonté: I think we should do this until the end of the semester. That way we can reelect both positions until the end of the semester. That's my recommendation to Senate.

Rachel M: I don't remember off the top of my head. The way the seats work...it might not be the exact same as liaisons. It's probably someone for Spring II and summer allocations because there's some overlap there.

Sammi: Can we just say it's for whatever's in the bylaws. For things that would only occur this semester.

Allan: I nominate Rachel Meyer.

Rachel M: I accept.

Jessica: This is to the end of the semester at the very most right?

Jonté: Yes. Any additional nominees? I'm not sure how to do this, since we only have one nomination.

Will: What do you see as your job in the committee?

Rachel M: I'm familiar with student groups. I actually look forward to student groups. The two Senate reps are expected to work as liaisons. I'm familiar with a lot of the groups, and I'm familiar with a lot of the workings with FinBoard. I've previously been to allocations meetings as an observer.

Jonté: The first is, you're the ASA president right now, official or acting.

Rachel M: Official.

Jonté: Do you see a conflict of interest?

Rachel M: No, because I think I have the interests of senate in mind, too, especially as the previous CFP chair.

Jonté: How should Senate expect you to keep us informed?

Rachel M: My goal is to have updates at Senate. It's unclear to me how much, but I would intend to make sure that information is specific.

Leonid: Given what happened today, and I was not in the closed meeting, what is the relationship between Senate and FinBoard?

Rachel M: A lot of it is making sure Senate has events and has enough information to make an informed decision on allocations.

Jonté: Further questions from the assembly?

**\*Senate is in closed discussion, only for members and ex-officio members of Senate.\***

**Motion to remove executive principal officers from Senate passes.**

**Rachel Meyer has been approved as the Senate Representative to FinBoard.**



Jonté: Can we not do Sergeant-at-Arms unless somebody really really really really really wants to be Sergeant-at-Arms? I hope they're all there in the minutes.

Shuang: Can I just be it?

Jonté: Fine with white balloting?

**Shuang Chen is approved as Sergeant-at-Arms.**

Jonté: Thank you guys all for coming. We could've done better, but 6 hours ago, back at 7:30 we did have an awesome guest speaker. Please, I'm going to be following up with you guys about committees. If you're not on a committee, you can contact your Chair. Please keep in touch with your constituents. Other than that, we might have some interesting and more guest speakers; so, if you're interested in attending one of those dinners, please let me know. I think that's all I had.

Vrajesh: 1. MIT is looking at creating a committee as a parallel committee to dining. I met with Humphreys some time recently to talk about this issue, and I'm making a suggestion that we have him in Senate to discuss this issues on how to move forward on what is potentially is a contentious issue. I kind of want to put it out there as an agenda item for the next meeting.

Also, this is the first time in 4 years that I've seen an Exec officer kicked out of Senate. I'm going to assume there's something serious. I'll be here after Senate if there's something to discuss.

This Thursday, there's a meeting of the Advisory Committee. If concerns are that serious, you should definitely bring it up. Just a little bit, to be quite honest, I'm bothered that I haven't seen this precedence before; so, I'm particularly concerned. So, on the other hand, we did have a good guest speaker.

Alec: Hey guys. Tonight's minutes are really long. I still have that assistant secretary position vacant!

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:29 am.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai  
UA Secretary General