



42 U.A.S. 12

Minutes from March 07, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 pm.

1. Opening Remarks

Jonté: Thank you guys for coming tonight. I think last week we had a great speaker. Hopefully you guys could talk to your constituents about the topics then and any other topics we had at the last meeting. The one announcement I have is: we are going to have three guest speakers for the next two meetings. The first at 42 U.A.S. 13, we're going to have Chancellor Grimson; immediately after his visit, we're going to have Henry Humphreys, the Senior Associate Dean in Residential Life and Dining, and he's going to come in asking for some feedback in designing a process to evaluate and replace kitchens in cook-for-yourself communities. The week after that, we have Terry Stone, the VP and Treasurer; she'll be our guest to speak about MIT finances. For both of those, we're going to have a Pre-Senate dinner. They've agreed to come in starting at 6 and meet with a few senators, committee chairs, and a couple of officers beforehand. It's a really great way to get to know them a lot better and hopefully get some face time with some really great people. I think, in an email I send out to senators, you guys were in the loop in terms of this; so, you guys need to send me your names if you're interested.

In addition to that, and the thing we have put on the agenda this week, I would like to introduce the new Senate staff assistants. These are 3 very talented people who have proven themselves over the course of the last semester. I've asked them to step up to the plate to guide Senate throughout the rest of the semester. As the policy coordinator, Almas is going to be our coordinator there. For our program coordinator, we have Jessica Chen.

Jessica: Hi guys.

And Benjamin Shaibu is going to be our information and intelligence coordinator. This will be our group for Senate Officers. In the bylaws, they're called the Senate Principal Officers, in addition to myself and Janet. I hope you will see us as an avenue for hopefully getting a discussion started about how Senate is operating. If you're running into any issues, hopefully you'll approach one of us. With that said, there are a few updates to Senate lists. ua-senate-officers now includes all 3 of the staff assistants and coordinators. We have ua-senate-admin which has myself and Janet. We'll encourage you to use officers as often as possible; though if it's really sensitive, feel free to use admin or email either of us directly. That's all I have in opening remarks. I think what we want to try and do is figure out how we can engage new Senators and keep the ball rolling as the semester kind of continues to unfold. This will be our 4th meeting of the semester, and we have only a few more to go. I think we have a lot of things we still want to get accomplished; so, I hope you guys will all be in with us in trying to get it accomplished.

2. Exec Update

Sammi: So, in the course of last week, one of the big things was NomComm. Alix, Ben, Almas, and I also went to BILC where we met with student government reps from a bunch of Boston schools. If you want to know more about it, you can talk to any that attended. The last was the advisory committee which a lot attended. Thank you guys who showed up and came to that. One of the things they



mentioned to us is to take a look at the structure and make changes. We'll be brainstorming. If you have any thoughts, talk to us, and we might reach out to you to get you involved in that process as well.

3. Guidelines for Professors from Students – “Top 10 Things Students Want Professors to Know”

Radhika: So, SCEP, as a project, is working with the Chair of the Faculty to publish in the Faculty Newsletter and on the Faculty Website 10 guidelines from students to advisors. It's just the top 10 things that students want professors to know. It can range from anything; for example, classes start 5 min after the hour and end 5 min before the hour, or try not to keep tests on Thursday of CPW and Monday after CPW. So, 10 main things that are uncontroversial (so unanimous among all students). We don't want something like: no classes in the evening. We want something unanimously supported by all students and will enhance the experience. It's a fatalistic project; it has promised to have a lot of feedback. Faculty really want student feedback. This is a really informal way of us getting professors to do what we really want them to do. The reason this is up here in Senate is we're trying to get student input. As a committee, SCEP has already brainstormed things that we think we want students to know. One way of getting student input is to get senators to talk to their constituents. I think, about few minutes back, I sent you guys a list, and I can read it out. So I'll read out everything we have. ***Reads the following policies.***

1. Classes should start 5 minutes after the hour and end 5 minutes before the hour.
2. Try not to keep problem sets due during the week of a test.
3. Return problem sets in time to get feedback before a test.
4. In problem sets, only include questions on material covered before the due date.
5. Post problem sets at least one week before the due date.
6. Avoid making changes to problem sets very close to the deadline.
7. Try to clarify grading policies including grade distributions as well as grade cutoffs at the beginning of the semester.
8. Try to ensure that class work on average takes time close to the appropriate units for the class (for example 12 unit classes should on average have about 12 hours of work every week).
9. Grade assignments and tests soon so that students can keep track of how they're doing in the class.
10. Try to be more approachable, and hold regular office hours. Office hours during busy hours such as afternoons or on Friday evenings are not very useful.
11. Encourage class participation during lecture.
12. Try not to schedule tests right before or right after CPW

Any comments about these? Please throw everything out there.

Ashley: I guess one thing, I don't know, sometimes I liked getting problem sets earlier during the week; so, it gives me one more chance to consider the material or what type of questions we think are important – how we're going to go about solving them.



Emily: To add to the office hour note, one thing I really hate is when people hold office hours right after when problem sets are due or exams have passed, like I really get started that early.

Adam: This is stated in the rules of the faculty; so, they theoretically should know it. Office hours and review sessions are not allowed during the athletics window. It really bothers me when people are like, "Oh, does anyone have any problem with that," and 1 or 2 have problems with it; they're like, "You can make special arrangements." Also, end-of-term guidelines; they might forget those.

Radhika: Do you think it might be useful to put rules in there as well?

Adam: I think you can put a reference to where they are.

Alix: This is more regarding submission of papers during weekends. If they do make those kinds of deadline, they should be at a time that could be a deadline; so, if people had a paper that was due Sunday evening of a 3 day weekend, which I think is unfair, they could make it due Monday morning. That would help a lot.

Radhika: For the office hours one, I would recommend not starting it. That's more subjective. That comes off more like "you're doing it wrong" instead of being "this is what we like."

Janet: I guess one thing that I feel like might be useful is if professors work together more, especially classes like GIRs or majors, to not have them all have test the same week or the same day. I feel like that happens a lot and shouldn't.

Ashley: One more thing, make sure they actually reserve the appropriate room when they want to have a test. 300 people show for 26-100, and they're like, "Crap, we don't have chairs."

Hawkins: Don't take off points on a test for not explaining answers, if it's not explicit that you're supposed to.

Rachel M: I think in general, be clear about instructions.

Hawkins: Be clear about expectations on exams.

Alix: Some professors don't outline what their late policy is; that should be required to be outlined.

Adam: #8, the way it's worded right now, it sounds like, "make them assign 12 hours of work," but that's not right. It's 12 hours after counting class time.

Janet: You think commitment?

Ashley: It should be like class + lab + work.

Tim J: When are you planning on sending this out?

Radhika: Once we're done, we'll send it to Chair of the Faculty. Hopefully it will be done soon, since he's hoping to publish it in the next Faculty Newsletter.

Emily: I just had a comment I'll note. In Course 6, all classes are 12 units. One of the reasons is there's a maximum number of units that a major is allowed to consume. There are definitely classes that they can't make 12 units. That's not so much the professor but the department.

Adam: My follow up is, will these be published on a semesterly basis to remind them?

Radhika: This is the first time we're doing it. If it's useful enough, we'll be doing it every semester. We'll update it based on student response and faculty response.



Karan: Has the Chair of the Faculty seen the current state of the guidelines? Has it been shown, or has it been, “We have an idea.”

Radhika: It’s the latter right now. Before we publish it out, we’ll take his input.

Tim J: We can come up with more stuff when we have time to email constituencies.

4. Confirmation of Vice Chair for the UA Finance Board

Emily: I just want to outline the Vice-Chair duties. For the most part, the Vice Chair is there to assist the Chair with Chair duties. Some of the Chair duties are to arrange a meeting with FinBoard, to meet with SAO, and to meet with all the liaisons; because all of these jobs are closely intertwined I want it to be someone that I’m used to working closely with. This shift currently ends in May, and the incoming P/VP will chose the new one. I think it’s important that it’s somebody I’m familiar with.

I wanted to highlight something with Edan. He expressed willingness to lead FinBoard. It think that’s important for it’s much harder to find than people who can execute.

He’s been a board member of FinBoard for over a year now. He has experience going through allocations, and he definitely cares about student groups. This Saturday, he spearheaded the policy discussion at the meeting, and he spearheaded this long list of things that we had talked about. He has experience with the a cappella group projects, and it’s something I’m not very familiar with.

Edan is on great terms with Kerri Mills. You’ve told me about times where you’d just drop by.

Finally, Edan is cheerful, funny, and just a great person to work with. Anyways that’s my pitch for Edan. I’m guessing you guys will want to ask him some questions; so, I’ll open the floor for that.

Jonté: Do you have anything you want to add? Why are you interested?

Edan: I think for all the reasons Emily discussed. When FinBoard was transitioning, we discussed who would be interested. I was just interested to lead it kind of help with those policies and process.

Ben: What additional responsibilities were you thinking about as Vice Chair, aside from the job description?

Edan: I think the Vice Chair doesn’t deal as much with the liaisons to student groups. I think that would be the only downsizer, because I like talking to student groups. I think that, as one of the more higher ups in the organization, I can make sure people are contacting their student groups frequently and know how to use their money well, just recognizing overall strategies. Just making sure that all the new people that are coming in...they understand how to help their groups. In terms of new things, I guess just the overall. The projects – make sure they are seen to completion. FinBoard is actually generating ideas to save money, as opposed to just generating ideas to cut costs. Not to limit the amount we’re giving groups, but to suggest ways that groups are working together and still have things they want.

Ben: Motion to move into closed discussion.

Senate is in closed session.

Edan is confirmed as Vice Chair of FinBoard.

Emily: I wanted to also ask, in this allocation that’s going to be happening this week, since Edan is currently a liaison, would it be okay for Edan to continue to do this?

Tim J: I see no problem with that.



5. Reports from Committees: Sustainability

Alix: Hey everyone. I'm Alix, and I'm the Chair of the Committee on Sustainability. This semester, we've made some good progress on several projects. The first one is Recyclemania. It will be happening; it's an ongoing program. We're going to combine that with an inter-dorm competition. Jarrel agreed to help count recycling. There will be a prize to the winning dorm. We agreed to do funding. I talked to him [?] and he said it would be fine.

Another big project we had is working with Green Bean recycling. It's a company that builds a reverse vending machine. What it does is, you bring in cans and bottles, and it will credit an account for 5 cents a bottle. Last week we had a meeting to bring the machine to the Student Center. We signed a contract. We'll actually be meeting this Thursday. We'll work with CAC, the Campus Activities Complex, to set a location and lunch dates. We're really excited about this because we think it will help encourage students to recycle more.

Other projects. So, we're also working on a script for Orientation. This will be for Orientation Leaders; it sort of includes topics that need to be discussed. It sort of explains how things work in the Infinite because there is some confusion about that, getting freshmen to know what things work during Orientation.

Now that we're approaching the close of one of our two above big projects, we're kind of transitioning a new project. A couple ideas we had: one of them was to address the revolving doors. Several of the buildings have those, and no one uses those. We sort of came up with a system that has a voice. Basically, whenever you open it, the door will yell at you or something; so, depending on how we bring this up to the administration, there are obviously a couple things we want to take into account. If 5 people open the door, and it yells at you 5 times, having it to maybe talk occasionally in quirky ways will help them sort of notice that they are using a door. A couple other projects: we'll look into getting recycling bins for a couple other dorms.

Also, I'm ready to take any suggestions for sustainability issues.

Karan: Just a question on the Green Bean: is there a plan to go forward and put it in dorms and frats?

Alix: Right now, this is just a pilot program. First we want to see how it works. We're actually going to launch a pretty big campaign; you're going to see email, fliers, etc.

Jessica: Would it be an issue that people will be taking cans from the dorms?

Alix: How it is: first you have to register with the machines. You can set up a PayPal account. If you don't want to set up a PayPal account, you can actually choose to donate money to a charity of your choice.

Adam: Can you make it put money on the TechCash account?

Alix: That's something we're working on. As of now, it will not be a functionality, but yes, we really want it.

Alan: If I recall correctly, doesn't PayPal charge you account money?

Alix: Even if you only accumulate 5 cents, you'll only be able to withdraw after you've accumulated a dollars' worth.

Tim J: Who's competing in RecycleMania?



Alix: It's actually a nationwide competition, but we're having an inter-dorm competition as well. Fraternities aren't part of it, I'm sorry. He counts the dorms by approximating how full the dumpsters are. We don't have an official tally method, but it should be enough.

Jessica: Has this started yet?

Alix: RecycleMania has started. We've been sending out numbers. We want a focused week. This will be like the week where we actually look at the numbers and compare. They tally the numbers on a weekly basis. If you want to see it, just Google.

Janet: In the future, we also could do some more kinds of interdorm electricity competitions.

Alix: There has been a past dorm electricity competition. It's run by a student group. We tried working with them. It's been a fiasco. We'll look into it again. We have a couple more.

Alan: With the revolving doors, during the day, sometimes those are the ones that are closed; so, if we can do something to ensure that they're open...

Alix: I know they close at night. If you use the ID, you can only use the regular ones.

Alan: It was like a Wednesday morning.

Alix: I know the one in 51 has been broken.

Karan: Yeah, it's broken.

Hawkins: They're all pretty heavy resistance; it's pretty slow. There may be a reason for that, like insulation, but it detracts people from using it.

Alix: The talking door – another problem is some people might find it hilarious and keep doing it. Any suggestions on how to encourage people? How much force you apply...we have low control over that.

6. Reports from Committees: History

Adam: So, you guys see most of the works I do in information management. I'm also going through governing documents. There's legislation about that. I don't know how close I am to being done. I've done some other work for committees when the Chair asks for information – like Athletics Weekend. Other than that, I answer specific requests from people that want to know more. Yeah, so, if you have questions....

Allan: Just a comment, I really like the emails you've been sending out; it's been really insightful.

Adam: I hope you saw there's been something about financial aid. I sent that out like now instead of waiting for next week, hoping you might assess it. Sorry for the pessimism.

Jonté: Could you speak a little bit more of submitting requests for you to search?

Adam: Oh yeah, send me an email for ua-history-chairs. I'll respond fairly quickly and tell you when I'll actually get the work done.

7. Reports from Committees: Athena Printing

Allan: Hi, printing, yay! So, we've been recently in the process of collecting feedback. I've had a Google form, and I got a good number of results and a good number of emails. I've very recently compiled it and sent to Oliver Thomas. We're going to meet next week and discuss feedback. The students, looking at the numbers, they're in the middle about how they feel about it. Quite a few people



like it, and some have some little suggestions. For example, at each individual printer, seeing how many are queued there. Also there has been quite a few requests for non-swipe options. A few people very specifically have been unable to print under the system. The system sort of ignores them, I don't know why; so, we're dealing with that. Other than that, any questions?

Ashley: Is your system going to be on the dorm printers as well?

Allan: Currently yes. I know Senior House is getting it, on that topic. Tsk tsk, I know you guys, you should bother with me actually, with any problems.

Janet: I think I sent you most of it.

Allan: It's currently going forward in the dorms. If the students think they really don't like that, we can do something about it.

Alan: What's the problem with the swipe options?

Allan: Some people have a card where the magnetic swipe is damaged. Some people just don't have cards with them. Some people just want to have some printers not that way.

Alan: And what's the rule with people printing out 50-80 pages at a time – who would be able to deal with that?

Allan: The sort of reason it's being implemented is to deal with 50-60 pages and not pick it up. Now, if the other person goes through the systems, hopefully they'll be able to pick it up. There's nothing in the works right now as far as a high capacity printer that only takes big jobs. It's something that can be done in the future with some more money.

Anonymous: Has anything been done to be able to see print queue?

Allan: I've heard a lot of people ask for it. That's #2 on my list, after non-swipe.

Ashley: I guess I agree with the whole people printing jobs and never coming to get them. I don't know why people would print a job and not get it.

Rachel M: It could be they forgot to grab it on the way out.

Allan: Another advantage is now you're printing to a network. So, let's say you're printing somewhere, and now you need to go somewhere else. You can pick it up by printing at the new place. It's certainly worth talking about because you do have a valid point.

Anonymous: Do you work with quickprint@mit.edu?

Allan: I've been accepting feedback on the topic, but I don't have any personal control. I've had a lot of complaints on that side. That's going to be a matter of contacting the people that maintain quickprint.

Leonid: I S&T does not maintain quickprint; you'll have to ask SIPB.

Alix: Have you been concerned about getting students a certain amount of pages to go use at CopyTech?

Allan: The interesting aspect is, CopyTech will be running the print system. You get 3000 pages a year and all through CopyTech. In theory, you should be able to print. I'll ask about it; it's interesting.

Richard: In terms of solving the problem of getting you ID Card, how hard would it be to implement you just typing in your username and password?



Allan: I talked to Oliver briefly; the technology cannot do it. I've also seen that there are schools that don't do it. That seems like an optimal solution; I'm going to dig into it more.

Jonté: How would you describe your relationship with Oliver Thomas?

Allan: He's a pretty cool guy who isn't afraid of everything. He's very good; he got back to me in 5 minutes once. It's a great relationship, and he's a great asset.

Jonté: Membership?

Allan: Two is enough. It's a single topic, and I'll probably expire by the end of the semester. The committee, not me. If anyone else wants to, though, I'm not going to say no. I'll be more than willing to take it on.

8. Approval of Minutes from 42 U.A.S. 10

Vrajesh: White ballot.

Adam: Second.

Minutes from 42 U.A.S. 10 are approved.

9. 42 UAS 12.1 – Bill to Fund Additional Power Outlets in Stata

Will: ***Authors bill.*** So yeah, we met, and we talked to them. They were unwilling to pay the whole cost; so, we negotiated to each pay half of the costs. I believe there were several emails about this. Their partly is the issue of: should we be paying capital expenses or not. I do not have an ongoing clear picture of what Senate wants. In this case, the CAC does not have a lot of money. I think they'll be unwilling to spend it with less money. I'm hoping to do future projects. I didn't want to negotiate harder. That said, should we think the UA should not be spending half the money or less money, I think, in the future, Senate should have a guideline for what to fund or not fund. I think students should talk about this. We should work in the future arrangement. This is what Senate wants. This is the deal. It's going to be somewhat awkward to go back: "No, we will not pay 1200; we will only pay X amount."

Richard: I would like to make one point. The point is, \$1200 is a small fraction of the Senate discretionary, if I did my math correctly. The main point is to get students. One thing for certain is: if you guys don't pass this bill, what would you use the \$1200 for? That's my main question for you.

Anika: We're at \$10000.

Shuang: Just one question: how many plugs are we talking?

Richard: We're talking right across from the fitness center. It is a very long bench. There are plugs on either end, but none in the middle. Near the day care center, there's none in that one. So, we're thinking one plug in that area and 3-4 on the long bench.

Will: 2-4 outlets basically.

Anika: It's 10,000 without the additional \$7,500.

Jonté: But we only have \$7,500 allocated in the budget; so, that's how much the account has.

Rachel M: There's other money in the account, but we have \$7,500 allocated.

Betsy: How did you gather student feedback?



Richard: I just talked to a whole bunch of random people, and I asked them. I didn't figure out how much it costs then yet. I asked them, would you actually care, or would you really like this; about, I think I talked to around 45 people; in the mid 30s really enthusiastically said, "Man, I want this." Of the 10 or so who didn't want it, all but 2 really did not care at all. Two people brought up some of these points; the one that Shuang brought up.

Will: And basically whether it should be a lunch area or a work area.

Jessica: If we ever need to do projects like this, is this Senate discretionary going to be paying for half of it?

Will: That's the question I wanted to ask. In the future, we can go in. Senate want to pay something; we can say we want to pay half. We can make that proposal, and, if they don't agree, we can just not fund the projects?

Jessica: There's no establishment for these?

Will: I think these types of projects have been really recent.

Adam: Can you look in the past to see if there's been funding for capital expenses?

Ashley: Weren't there power strips in the past?

Richard: Last year.

Adam: Yeah, we bought some light thing this year.

Will: Yeah, that was \$10000. That was student groups. This is really more like improving MIT campus, and therefore arguably not something that we should be paying up front for because it's really part of MIT's job and Facilities' job.

Janet: Why is there such a big price difference between the outlets in the Student Center and these? We only paid \$500 for those right?

Will: My understanding was, they were willing to pay a large fraction.

Richard: Originally, they weren't hesitant at all.

Jonté: Point of information – how much did the outlets out there cost?

Vrajesh: \$4000; that was last year upstairs, if I remember correctly.

Almas: So, like my concern was, by funding those from Senate Discretionary Fund, funding maintenance things, I don't really feel that's Senate's job. It seems to be like, our responsibility is more towards student groups. I think is a great idea, but I think I MIT should be paying for it. Discretionary fund, is there any other way that the UA can help fund it?

Ashley: You can fund it from another, but I don't see how it's different.

Almas: My point is we shouldn't use this as a precedence.

Richard: We already have a precedence.

Will: there's no established fund; we could do that in the future. We don't have one now. The other thing is, you can pass this; you can go and say no. We will go back and say we will not fund half, and we will fund \$500. The project will go ahead or not.

Alan: Where did you say these plugs would be?



Will: ***Locates on map on screen.***

Richard: If you want to do Forbes Family Café, I'm not sure they're willing to pay that.

Jessica: I guess my question is like, if you don't do the funding, they're not going to do the funding. What will it take for the project? If we say a lot of students want this, why would they not fund it?

Richard: Their rationale is that they have budget cuts. They have a very very low budget; take that if you will.

Will: When I talked to CAC, they said they run the Student Center; they get their money from small amount of businesses; therefore, they are stuck for cash. Not necessarily to their operating goal.

Richard: I'm going to say: if you don't pay, you have to find a place to do this. I don't care whether we pay them through senate or not; we have to figure out some way.

Ben: How was the negotiation? How was the process?

Richard: The way it originally became... towards the end of last semester, we approached this topic. We said they really don't want to do this. They don't want to pay for things really towards plugs; then, we came back again this semester. We might be able to convince the Senate to pay half. Is that acceptable? That's how it went.

Allan: I'm just going to sum up my view. I think it's a great idea for students. I think this is what we're about. Points have been made; so, I call the question.

Janet: Second.

42 UAS 12.1 passes.

Will: I want to say, I would like future guidance on what should we negotiate. Does Senate want to say this amount, we'll pay up to half?

Jonté: I would recommend that you guys, once you have the quote so that was you guys have a better idea, bring it to Senate. As to whether or not Senate is going to be behind this...the floor's open.

Ben: It should be as close to 0 in the beginning as possible; we shouldn't have to pay for facilities.

Ashley: The CAC should be more included in the Student Center; maybe you can get more projects that way?

Will: I guess in response to your point, if they say no, we should go and say – well, should we just handle this discussion there?

Ben: So, I think that maybe if we go towards the issues, we might want to start giving them money from Senate.

Rachel M: I guess my response to that would be to ask them what contribution do they think it would take. What are their general expectations? Try and get what you want; let them know what they should ask.

Anika: I was going to say, I like Jonté's suggestion. Did you have the quotes before CAC?

Richard: We worked with them together.

Will: The CAC will figure out the quotes.



Betsy: Yeah, I was going to say, Senate would like them to pay as much as possible. Just negotiate up from 0.

10. Nominees for Vacancies in Institute Committees

Sammi: Basically, these are vacancies that came up this week. Everybody on NomComm except for Alex is here; so, we can answer any questions about nominations.

Rachel M: The ones in gray are the ones you care about; italics means alternate.

Betsy: I was just wondering about the choice of Sivakami, given that she hasn't done anything for FinBoard.

Senate is in off-the-record discussion.

Jessica: So, this is just till the end of this year right?

Sammi: The way that nominations to Institute Committees work is, if you are someone that has been attending meetings that the Chair feels has done a good job, they would usually ask you to return. You can actually vote to remove the person, which we did that last week, but for the most part, once you're put on the committee, you get to stay on the committee until you graduate. That's why we chose to nominate a senior.

Karan: How many applicants did you have for the First Year Experience, the FYE committee?

Janet: We had around 30 something total.

Jessica: For the ones that have very few people, do they have that few because there are no applicants, or that's just how big the committee is?

Sammi: There are no more vacancies on all of the committees; all the ones that have very few people, that's the number of undergrad seats. These are all pretty standard.

Rachel M: In response to that, roughly a dozen, although 2-3 didn't show up.

Karan: In terms of FYE, is this a permanent committee or is this temporary?

Anika: As far as I know it's a permanent committee. It's chair, Julie Rothhaar, as far as I know from what I gleaned at meetings, has allude that it's permanent.

Vrajesh: Just for clarification, FYE is not a faculty committee; it's a subcommittee within the Committee on Student Life.

Anika: So, FYE is comprised of different representatives of different areas; so, we have representation from DSL, reps from SAO, reps from organizations, etc. I can get more of a definitive list, but I don't know if that's relevant.

Betsy: FYE, are they going to dissolve it and start again actually, or is this like an additional student rep? Are they're confirming through channels to make us happy?

Vrajesh: The second one.

Anika: The two current ones are myself and Ellen McIsaac. I just asked and emailed Sammi. Am I not supposed to be in FYE anymore?

Vrajesh: I had a discussion with Henry Humphreys about this topic during the last week, and I believe that, since FYE is not a faculty committee, there's a consideration to it being, the membership being



similar to SLOPE; there's a rep from IFC, DormCon, UA, all of the other places. In a certain sense, those folks are viewing FYE as a during the year version of SLOPE. So, I'm less distressed about it than Orientation, which is faculty chaired with concrete recommendations.

Betsy: Do you talk about the two students that are already on FYE? That doesn't solve the problem right?

Vrajesh: It doesn't, no.

Rachel M: As something to note, that's not completely relevant. I can't speak to how important it is for FYE. I know it doesn't work for SLOPE.

Vrajesh: I guess I kind of express how I felt in the letter I wrote for the faculty newsletter. One can view that as a policy piece. I take it that Senate also feels that way about that particular approach. Unfortunately, we don't want that committee, and they can do whatever they want with it. This is something that's ongoing under the umbrella of student engagement. Hopefully by the end of the year, moving forward, we'll have a slightly, greater clarity about how things are populated.

Sammi: I just wanted to remind people we're talking about a slate. We'd like to reflect on opinions about the slate.

Karan: There's FYE, the Orientation Committee, and SLOPE. I'm just not sure if I see a lot of overlap. I'm not sure there are clearly defined boundaries.

Sammi: Slope is responsible for planning the Tuesday Night Event and Friday Night Event, and the move between dorms each year. The Orientation Committee is going to take a step back and look at Orientation and see how it can be improved as a whole. The FYE Committee is going to look at how to run programs that are going to be effective for freshmen and ease their transition to MIT freshman year.

Allan: Given how we've moved away from discussing the candidates, and I think they're fine, I'm going to call the question.

Anika: Second.

Nominations for institute committees are approved.

11. Budget Presentation

Jonté: There was one emission from the agenda. Anika was going to present the budget?

Anika: So, if you guys are interested, I would like to postpone this to next week.

Vrajesh: We realized that the accounts are not updated.

Betsy: Let's look at it next week.

11. New Business and Discussion

Rachel M: I didn't finish the sentence...but...

Vrajesh: I move to consider 42 UAS 12.2.

Sammi: Second.

Jonté: Seeing no objections, it is now before you.

Vrajesh: I call the question.

Betsy: Second.



42 UAS 12.2 passes.

Vrajesh: I move to consider 42 UAS 12.3.

Janet: Second.

Jonté: Seeing no objections, it is now before you.

Rachel M: This is an additional guideline to add to the policies. It came up briefly in CFP. It wasn't included because it wasn't seen as something that was necessarily needed at that time. A larger portion of the committee thinks it would be useful. If you bring up the policies, you can see where it fits in. This is our recommendation, in addition those factors. It's the standard three things of member size, group activities, how central it is to the group purpose, and yeah.

Vrajesh: Can you explain where other groups have historically fallen? Second of all, explain in the same vein how many, what % of groups would otherwise exceed it or be below it?

Rachel M: To my knowledge, there are 3 groups that have recently requested such expenses. I don't know all of the numbers. One is \$400 a semester, and one is \$1000. I don't know the 3rd. In terms of additional groups, there's probably about \$1000-2000 that could be asked for more. The other qualifying factor was the regularity of the expense.

Vrajesh: What do those 1-2 dozen do right now?

Rachel M: Some pay for it out of their own expenses.

Jessica: Is it \$500 a semester for every group?

Rachel M: This is in the policy. It basically says that the official recommendations of FinBoard and Senate are that groups are not be allocated more than \$500 a semester. If they don't ask for it, they don't get anything. Even if they ask for \$500, maybe if you have really good reasons, you give them \$500 or \$1000.

Tim R: Could you clarify on the relation to the groups they name? Does that mean that, if the groups come up with new event, they need a dance choreographer or something, while they're not approved around dancing, let's say culture, does this not apply to them or does it?

Rachel M: It would be a factor they would need to explain, like for...I'm going to use an example that doesn't follow this requirement...but concert band hires conductors which is integral to that program. But if a culture group want to hire a conductor, a group that wants to play on shows, that may not be integral, but they would have to explain why it is integral. It mostly goes to like, how important is it or the group to function.

Tim R: Can I discuss a secondary thing? Is this to specifically beneficial? I know they bring in an outside group.

Rachel M: It also goes to groups of an educational nature. It's one of the hypothetical examples. If you had a cooking club, they want to occasionally hire. They had a weekly seminar. It could be instructional. Things like that. I think it's probably more likely than not to happen with performance groups.

Jessica: For paid personal, do special guests count?

Rachel M: These are things, I don't want to say, cycle long commitments, and you want to pay them several hundred.



Betsy: Is this like: I recommend based on actual request, or is it just like projected?

Rachel M: We're basing it off of a small sample size currently, but that was for the target that FinBoard felt would be sufficient for a group. It's hard to compare to. You can't go online and get quotes, cause they're normally less. It's sort of to set a baseline: so FinBoard, we think you're request is unreasonable, but maybe we can do it this semester

Shuang: What if a group only gets less than \$100 for their semester? Does this tack on to your thing? Do they get more money for hiring instructors and stuff?

Rachel M: It would be part of their request. They get \$500: Let's hire Bob to teach us how to do the Bob. I think that would be absurd. Just because you have a guideline doesn't mean you get it. If it's a group that only has 5 people, 2-3 are undergrads.

Anika: I think what Shuang is asking might be confusing. The way FinBoard allocations are done, they send in a request. Based on their request, FinBoard will allocate a certain amount. Prior to the beginning, they just have a set amount that each group just gets.

Ben: If the group requests more than \$500, do they?

Rachel M: In the past, there was a past, the way it's worded in the whole...these guidelines indicate that requests beyond these levels, they do not imply that request beyond these levels are granted.

Karan: I feel as if the amendment covers a pretty reasonable comment that in the Senate, that this is an area that people are asking for a lot of allocations. It's reasonable, so I call the question.

42 UAS 12.3 passes.

Rachel M: The third one is to allocate funding for the support of student groups, for \$1000.

Jonté: The question is now whether or not we will adopt this.

Rachel M: To add a little bit of incentive, the Student Leaders Awards application is going on this week; so, if you want to be included, if you want to be included as sponsors, we probably want to do it now. That's not to say we have to do it.

Anika: Motion to consider the bill.

Senate white ballots to consider the bill.

Rachel M: This was something that Alicia Erwin of SAO went to various people for. She's approaching UA and GSC about these. She's also working about gathering support from CopyTech. Basically, her whole goal for this is to revamp the Student Leaders Award so to make it more than, "Hey, somebody submitted your name; we get a piece of paper." A lot of this support and all for this we're doing is directly straight at student groups. We're not giving an individual \$500 but a student group.

Vrajesh: What has historically been the situation with this award? What input are we going to have as far as who wins?

Rachel M: In terms of the past, when someone won this reward...

Vrajesh: Did they get \$500?

Rachel M: No, a piece of paper or a little plaque.



Vrajesh: My second was our role. And my third is, as your role as ASA president, do you think this is something that would help student groups?

Rachel M: In terms of input, I don't have a solid answer on that. My understanding is it wouldn't change anything, but we can put additional restrictions on what type of groups. I'm not sure there will be involvement that way.

Vrajesh: If I were funding this, I would want to know it's going to create something, not just something that is already happening.

Rachel M: The hope with this award in particular since it goes to recognizing a group that's developing a strong culture or a set of programs or events is that it can be used to enhance that process – whether its for them to have a general body meeting or do more outreach events to gather student interest. I guess some of the things that are top priorities are a mini retreat or, I would like to say \$500 doesn't take them very far, meals for a conference.

Vrajesh: Do you think it's actually going to spur additional activity?

Rachel M: No, it's a little indirect, but I think in the long term it's sort of incentivizing the program. It would encourage groups to be more proactive in letting people know what they're doing. You could argue that recognizing what they're already doing isn't useful, but it will help other groups work off that model, or help ASA or Senate or FinBoard know how student groups need to be supported. This is what we manage to do over \$5000 that can also be applied.

Anika: So, Alicia's specific goal in asking this was to incentivize applicants. When they had this in the past, there hasn't been reason to apply. Groups haven't. She's hoping to get groups to apply for the reward and motivate them to do better themselves.

Betsy: Does SAO not have the money to do this?

Rachel M: I haven't asked for the state of their finances. They know they are reaching out. I know they're talking to GSC about funding correlated awards, I think; well, maybe they could do one or two of these. They couldn't do the whole thing.

Anika: To some extent that would be given anyways, depending on what you use them for like giving them direct access to the funding.

Betsy: Do you think there are groups that deserve \$500? That might take a couple of years. Maybe if you start something smaller, like work your ways up, there are groups that do such a good job that they will deserve it.

Rachel M: I think it's complicated because there's definitely groups that deserve it. I think there are some groups that are in that realm because they are doing good work. I think there definitely is an area for me for this kind of thing to go to. What I think would be the other part of that...if we did want to start with a lower amount, this is the number Alicia threw out, but if people want to amend it, I don't think that would be an issue.

Tim J: I really don't like this, funding \$500 for just two prizes that are given to student groups that we don't have control over with. I don't think they're proper use of discretionary fund, and it's a lot of money to give to student groups. It's not your typical \$100 for TechCash. It is proprietary, not the best word, but it goes to like a set. I don't know – I don't think it's a very good use for our discretionary fund



Tim R: I think its okay to fund this, but giving the percentage of our discretionary fund, I'm not okay about doing this. I think if we had a bit more clarification of what our input would be, what our money is doing afterwards, etc. that would convince me as a member to go forward in this. I'm okay with look into the future in defining where the money goes.

Richard: Briefly, SAO I know for a fact is quite strapped for cash. Secondly, if you were to do something like this, why not do it ourselves? Secondly, I completely agree that they're still going to be happy for \$200 or \$250.

Vrajesh: Can you clarify how you know?

Richard: Funding for PLUS. They needed to pull strings. Even they didn't pay for it; they got special line item, and they had to get more money.

Sammi: Point of information – does anyone remember how many new people SAO are hiring this year?

Vrajesh: I was wondering if you can clarify this is a one time commitment. What is going to be the evaluation, and what bearing will it have on future awards?

Rachel M: That was to make it clear that this is not precedence, if we pass this, this is only one to give them this year. It was to put in to make sure this was very clear that it isn't a long time commitment. In terms of it being a large percent, I gather that it is roughly 1/7 or 1/6 of the money, but historically, we don't spend a lot of that money. But, if you be more comfortable with it, where it would be very small percent, I think it's more inappropriate coming from senate discretionary.

In terms of it being a lot of money for a group, I think the idea was for it to enable them to do activities depending on the group that they wouldn't be able to do otherwise – organize an on campus retreat or pay for transposition they otherwise wouldn't be able to use – where the money would make a difference. If you give them \$100, it's like: okay we'll get 10 pizzas; it doesn't help them.

In terms of there not being a gain, I think there's a very clear gain. I think this is in our line of funding for student groups. It recognizes groups that are doing a good job without going through the process of normal funding. In terms of input, we could add a clause that's like 2 \$500 to be used for X things. Alicia has some wording for ideas she thought it could be used for; if we wanted to limit what it could be used for, we could do so.

Tim R: Point of Information – how much money do we have left?

Anika: \$7500.

Vrajesh: \$6300, after the bill earlier passes.

Tim R: Are there other ways we can fund the groups? Give them something like buy pizza for their events, not given them free cash. If we do want to give them straight cash, can we play it up to say student are giving more to MIT? It doesn't seem like we should be covering expenses, I'm kind of scared that groups associate us with the admin who are asking us for money.

Rachel M: My point was it wouldn't be useful to give them \$100 for pizza; that wouldn't improve things. It might be targeted for group strengthening exercises, etc. The point is to give them money to be useful; it's not: "Here, have something shiny because you won an award." It's meant to impact their group.



In terms of why we're giving money to officers, we aren't were giving money to student groups. I very clearly said it's from the UA to student groups. We're not giving \$1000 to SAO; we're giving funding to student groups.

Vrajesh: I want to ask the same question I asked earlier. I need to understand the impact of the event, are the going to have post event, are they going to report.

Rachel M: If a similar request comes in the future, at that point we can consider it. If we wanted to write in that we want that now anyway, we could do so, but the intent of that clause was not to set up an evaluation system. It was to make it clear that we would have to make it clear again.

Karan: I think this bill and the ideas it encapsulates, if done right, will serve as a really good incubator for student groups. They do what they do well; they don't have the resources or have the opportunity to go campus wide or do whatever they need to do. I think something like this could do well on helping these student groups. I think trying it on a one time basis wouldn't necessarily be a bad idea because that's what it's supposed to do, to an extent. I also feel like, in terms of actual amounts, there are ways groups get 50-100-150; this is not something really to reward the groups that don't necessarily have something to do.

Betsy: This seems like the kind of thing that there will be an expectation for to maintain it. I like the idea that, since much of Senate's job is to fund student groups, we have an award for student groups to do well. I'm apprehensive about spending \$500 this year because we don't know how the process will go, I think Senate doesn't have enough input. I would be more in favor of doing \$200 this year and then evaluating it.

Jonté: I sounds like the main objections are future commitments the decision about how these rewards are actually made, and the actual amounts of these awards.

Ben: Based on the issues we've been talking about, how much we fund, and how much input we're going to have; we don't exactly know how SAO is going to decide.

Rachel M: The way they've done these awards previously, the fund student groups and individual groups. I don't know too much about specifics; so, I can't elaborate.

Ben: We don't know if they're going to allow us; we might want to wait before we sign the bill to see if they sign a bill. I was just saying we might want to wait.

Anika: I just wanted to clarify. It helps a lot on what she was expecting. This is the sentence that resulted in the funding. My thoughts was the Golden Beaver Award for groups something around that x-amount of funding to be put towards groups activities. My hopes are the golden beaver will go to undergrads and graduate groups. Yeah, and, she said that the ASA Arcade is funding for the outstanding winner, just as an example of what's happening with this. If you want, I can forward this.

Rachel M: For a little more context; it's a little bit more nuanced.

Anika: Would that help?

Tim J: Yes. If we're going got evaluate it in the future, why are we going to not do the evaluation now? I don't think these student awards have been publicized enough, but to give up a large valuable prize. I think the field of viable candidates would be small. If the group knew about the prize a year ago, they would have time to work on this, say next year. I'd like more publicity in this before we actually give out \$1000; it's supposed to be improving groups before they give out the subject. At least, the prizes this year won't be publicized.



Also, if this is an SAO program, why are they funding this program? If they don't want to support this, why should we? Is this something to do, that was originally funded by other people? If that's what they really wanted to do, I think that's the route we're going to take. Basically, if the UA really wants to do this, we should give out the award ourselves.

Also, the point on funding going back to groups; so, if we don't pass this bill, the funding doesn't get passed. That rolls over to FinBoard then the funding goes back to student groups. So, the funding is going to back to student groups.

I'm going to call the question to this bill.

Senate votes to close discussion. 11-5. Jonté votes against closing discussion.

Rachel M: First of all, I think it's a little bit of an inappropriate move to ask a question and then quit discussion. On the topic, in terms of long term discussion, something that somebody brought up, I don't think we should make it clear to them. I will tell Alicia, it's only for this year. We're going to have to go through this process again. I think they clearly understand that. In terms of the processes involved, I think it would be reasonable to ask to have a representative involved. And I will make a motion about – two years ago – knowledge of student groups and various things they do, and if we don't spend the money, it doesn't go to a group. I motion to amend that "a representative of ASA be involved in deciding who receives these awards." I put ASA instead of Senate because I think ASA is best to give this input.

Vrajesh: I don't think we can technically force a representative in ASA. I move to amend the amendment to read that this award only be awarded if a representative was required.

Rachel M: That was my intent.

Vrajesh: Rephrase. I move to amend it as "this prize is only awarded if a representative of ASA is involved in deciding who receives these awards."

Anika: I call the question.

Motion to amend the amendment passes without objection.

Karan: I kind of hesitate to say this. I would say that it almost seems that we're more concerned on who receives the credit as much as the thing itself. I'm not saying we need to total control to them. That is not a reason to reject the idea. This is something to do that would support student groups; it is within our purview to spend it.

Anika: My only question is if Senate is the one providing a funding, would we have any say on who the ASA representative was.

Janet: Since this award is targeting student groups anyways, I was just wondering if we can pay for it through ASA.

Rachel M: ASA gets it's money from the UA. If you want ASA to fund it, I'm going to put a bill for the UA to give ASA money.

Tim J: I'd rather see this amendment say Senate instead of ASA. It is coming from Senate instead of ASA. If the money is coming from FinBoard, you won't put somebody on FinBoard. Just a comment.

Jessica: I was going to motion to say a representative of ASA chosen by Senate. Er, actually confirmed by Senate.



Rachel M: I would question the need to challenge the authority of people elected by the student groups because I feel like this isn't necessarily making sure student groups aren't properly used. I don't think this will make a difference.

Vrajesh: I just wanted to remind everybody that ASA is a committee of the UA.

Ben: I just wanted to amend it so that maybe we have some sort of formal report.

Alec: Point of order – I don't think that's germane.

Janet: Yeah, do that separately.

Ben: I was going to add it on as an amendment.

Alec: Point of order – We're only allowed to amend the amendment.

Tim J: I call the question on the amendment to the amendment.

Motion to amend the amendment passes without objection.

Ben: I'd like to add an amendment to the amendment. There's a line right after the word awards that they'll be required to submit some sort of report to Senate about this election. "The representative chosen will be required to submit some sort of report to Senate about how the groups were chosen for the award."

Tim J: I call the question.

Alec: Point of information – is it a separate that clause?

Jonté: It's still the same; I worded it as it reads.

Rachel M: Did this motion ever receive a second?

Anika: Yes.

Motion to amend the amendment passes without objection.

Adam: I call the question.

Motion to amend passes without objection.

Adam: I call the question.

Some confusion on voting. The question is called.

Tim J: I'm going to stand up for this because I didn't stand up last time. As quoted in the FPRC report, it requires ***Reads quote from FPRC***. I don't see where this bill fits into any of that. I see it very far away from the guidelines set forward in the FPRC report. I think that contribute more over as to why we should not pass this bill. Also, I don't think my previous concerns were addressed to how this money was allocated. We have to confirm them, then we have to listen to a report that they wrote just so we can allocate \$1000. I think this bill is actually a terrible thing of bureaucracy and just needs to go away and come back after it's been thought through. Therefore, I call the question.

42 UAS 12.4 fails.

Jonté: What just happened guys? We just spent 45 minutes on this bill, and we amended it and then voted it down. We mentioned 3 things at the beginning; then, we did a lot and voted on the same 3 things. If those same 3 things were good at the beginning and at the end...

We have a discussion section scheduled now. I was hoping you'd bring something towards discussion.



Shuang: So, Will, is Will here? Will was talking about putting lights on a path between Simmons and Dorm Row, and we were wondering if that's what you guys think. Simmons residents are in favor about that. Do you guys want?

Jessica: If we're going to put on lights, we should have conditions on where to have lights on. I think people are not crossing the field because it's icy. I don't see much point in turning on lights when most people aren't using it, but that's me.

Sammi: The time for the lights we can talk about in the winter. I can relay that to Will, but the plan was to have it to 2 AM.

Ben: Can you define what you meant by lights?

Shuang: I don't know the details. It's going to be a path. It's just going to be a little dirt road, and possibly a blue emergency box between the path.

Sammi: There's actually not going to be a path, it's just going to be the field. They're going to put a big light to light the sides of Macgregor's, Simmons, and two lights at some point in the middle of the field so it wouldn't interfere with the baseball diamond, just so you feel more comfortable walking across.

Abel: How dark does it actually get on the field? There always seems to be a good amount of light coming in.

Shuang: Speaking from not personal experience, people have done things on the field and...

Tim R: It's not a matter of there being light on the field, it's a matter of proof. People don't see you when you're on the field; there's an issue that your eyes adjust to the light around you; so, you don't pick up on the small amounts of lights on the field. Anytime on the field, you won't be able to see; so, it's more of a safety concern. They can see everything around them, but people outside of the field can only see the dorm. If they're on Briggs Field, and you can see anyone else, it's pretty much just on the field. Point of information though, was the intent to have like permanent lighting? They drop concrete and put a 50 foot pole. Also, where would the funding come from?

Sammi: They want to put up 4 lighting installations. Two of them are going to be paid for by housing; as to funding for the other two, either through DAPER facilities or some other place. Apparently, it's not that expensive; so, it might be able to be dug up somewhere, and I had no idea how permanent the lighting fixtures will be.

Tim R: I'd like to comment about the committee I met with on Thursday that was organized by Sammi. There were only couple of senators where, and I'm curious why the rest of you guys weren't here. I have classes, too, but this was a chance to meet with people that have decades worth of knowledge at MIT. It's nice to pick out the roots of their explanation; they don't just come here to hear us bicker, but they really quickly see the problems. This isn't really a discussion; this is more me making a point here. Don't know if you guys have any thoughts on that.

Vrajesh: I was just going to remind people, it doesn't matter anymore for this year, but the people on the advisory committee are awesome. One of them was the former Secretary of the Air Force; one of them is going to be the next Faculty Chair. Another is the CEO of the Alumni Association. It's hard to get names with these people. I know that one of them, I think actually, Hawkins was able to get a meeting with one of them after this week just from this relationship. It's really a missed opportunity that you should come to, depending on whoever is around next year, that the decision is made to continue it.



Tim R: Like I just said, if you meet them and get the business card in their hands, they understand the value of large network. If your name ever comes up, they'll look for your name. They'll be like, "Oh, I met you at this conference in 2007; how's it going since then?" It helps the UA as far as you can tell.

Also, if you guys can get more advisory meetings like that, if that is at all possible.

Vrajesh: Even three is hard. We'll see what we can do, but definitely no more this year.

Jonté: Hopefully you guys can start brainstorming something on UA lists; so, we can have hopefully some discussion that can have some action items.

12. Midterm Reviews for Officers and Committee Chairs

Vrajesh: I don't see a need to divide it up this time. Our committee chairs did extremely well, they all scored between a 3 and 4. I really don't see the need to put it up there. They all just did really well in their reviews. I can take questions if folks have them. The distribution was...the highest score was a 3.93, the lowest score was a 3.05. It's a grade out of 4 points.

Rachel M: I think it may still be useful to go through, since there were some serious concerns about some people previously to give Senate some more specifics about what's changed, even if it's not as much of a critical exercise as much of an update.

Vrajesh: The people who didn't do well last time were all people that updated senate in the last week or this week. I can still do it, but we should still take a last minute recess.

Tim R: I motion to close discussion.

Motion to close discussion passes.

13. Closing Remarks

Jonté: I mentioned at the beginning of this meeting, we don't have that many meetings left. I would encourage you guys to think about that you guys want to get accomplished this semester, as I'm sure you know from your classes. While we don't have that many more meetings, we still have a lot of the semester. We have a lot of room to make an impact this semester, and we want you guys to start thinking this week about how we are an organization and how you individually as senators can make an impact on the dorm and together on the campus. With that said, I'm definitely open to suggestions for a caucus.

After our next meeting, I think we're going to have a week where we have Spring Break. If there are people around, we're going to have a referendum on dining come up. We should probably sit down and gather that data from ElectCom on that. I think there are a number of issues, things that need to be done in the Student Center for example, across campus. Really, if you guys put it in front of the assembly, and we get in touch with the higher administrators, we can hopefully improve student life. Think about that, and please take it to hear and make it mean something this week in terms of what you do what you ask constituents about and what you put on the UA discussion list. I think that's all you had. I hope that you guys are still finding that Senate is something that you're enjoying. If you're not, please come talk to me.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



UNDERGRADUATE ASSOCIATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139
ROOM W20-401 UA-SECRETARY@MIT.EDU

Alec Lai
UA Secretary General