45UAC14

Attendance

Lars Johnson, Simmons

Gaurav, Random

Sean, Baker

Rodrigo, Senior Haus

Jessica, Easyt Campus

Phoebe Whitwell, East Campus

Chloe Orphanides, McCormick

Tegan

Arthur

Anna, anHel

Yasmin, PanHel

Hal, IFC

Richard, IFC

Obasi, IFC

Cory, Treasurer

Devin, VP

Sid, P

Sid: Thank you all for coming, we have six or seven votes today, so please go pretty quickly. Questions arise about, what are we voting aout, since we have aout 21 statements in all, key in at those times. We will start off with the proposal for innovation committee and discussion. The proposed incoming chair will present.

Shruti: efore that, for next year, we see our goals eing funneling the … making UA a aprt of that energy and putting all of the groups together. Will will be focusing on aiding and energizing student entrepreneurship.

Will: One of the greatest strengths of MIT is this reative energy that permeates campus. StartLabs, etc. … I am proposing the creation of an innovation committee to bring leaders of all of these different groups together to connect as one seamless network to allow undergraduate innovators to engage in MIT's spirit in a seamless way in an interdisciplinary manner with different backgrounds wthrough this committee to help studetns take their dieas for projects and turn them into reality. I have a poprosed membership on here. We can look into it and deide in the future who can be on the committee. But I was thinking techX, the Trust Center, etc., would be good people to have on this committee. The committee would also aim to have a report on the status of innovation and the opportunities to innovate at MIT. Currently, most of the resources MIT offers are engaged by graduate students, for example, the 100k pitch challenge is almost exclusively done by graduate students. We want to lower the barrier for undergraduate entry into such things and compiling a report would be another task of this committee. Other thoughts that we had is the committee could compile a guidebook to help student innovators come together and from ground zero figure out where they need to go to make their diea a reality. Are there any questions?

Emad: I would like to point out, under 3d, the functions, you mention that funding MIT udnergraduates innovative ideas is a key component of this committee. Bearing in mind that membership thus far is MITx and corporate sponrors that go through these roganizations, what exatly to you want this committee to fund?

Will: First of all, the membership that is proposed is an outline of potential groups that I could see fitting into this, but as for your question, I think that if a group that already exists on campus would be very well suited to funding a specific group or individuals projet, if that seems like it would fit their goal well, we could direct them to techX to get that funding, or direct them through StartLABS or any of these other major groups on campus. But if there is a group of individuals across disciplines with an idea for a project that does not fit into the overall goal of any individual group that already exists, we could look…

Shruti: A lot of thes groups are having a lot of course 6 people, and we want to get into supporting projects, and we want to … how do you get someone from course 3, course 2, together and work on a prosthetic system?

Jessica; Your list of preliminary membership all has question marks. Have you spoen to the leaders of these groups?

Will: Yes. We have spoken to the leaders and the people.

Shruti: They have already said that they want to be members.

Gaurav: Why should the UA sponsor these groups? You have these groups on ampus that are interested in innovation, but I don't see any reason the UA should be involved.

Will: The UA already has bery broad ties to undergraduates, and since we are targeting undergraduates, I think the UA would be a very direct route to reach out to undergraduates. There is not a lot of bias from any kind of MIT government. I think it is a good route to reach MIT undergraduates.

Sophia: My concern, is the, how the committee is composed, and I think other than having the current group members, I think Will is interested in getting more members involved… and projets like that are what we want to support on campus. And we have a lot of cool stuff and ideas, and a lot of ideas are open to change, and Is essential to wat the committee needs.

Doug: What do you see as the greatest need from undergraduates that this committee would be positioned to fulfill?

Will: I feel that a lot of undergraduates that have these ideas do not have a clearcut map on how to take advantage to have the resources that MIT has to … if we could have the committee provide a roadmap for all the different ersources on campus, and use it as a map to take advantage of these opportunities, that would be a gere.

Matthew:

Will: I think that funding MakerSpaces and such is an excellent idea, I have not completely thought that through in this initial proposal, I think if the committee does begin to really succeed and take off, and does well with sponsoring individual projects at MIT, then I think that we could use the committee as a route to establish MakerSpaces within dorms o campus. I know that President Reif saw some interest in that, and I do not know why…

Romi: On that note, I feel that the purpose of this committee is to cut underneath the politics that exist between different individuals, so using the UA as a vehicle to cut under the politics to do something quick, going with that methodology, I think that aiming for small wins such as funding individual projets is a good way to get smaller wings quickly, and getting larger wins down the road.

Lars: Sorry, the idea of coordinating the ideas, I am confused as to how this comes into funding projects. Is this money from the UA that funds startup ideas, or external funding? Are you connecting projects to funding, or are you another group that you pitch your idea to?

Will: We do not want to be another group, but if a student group came to us and it looked like their … we would seek to connect them with that existing group, then that project idea, that did not fit perfectly into the ideology of one of the groups, we could fund them. We are not just looking to fund startups, we are looking to fund innovative projects and ideas.

Lars: Where is this pot of money coming from?

Shruti: There are going to be StartLabs and rough drafts, but I think it is really nice if the UA could give seed money, but really just to start rolling. With these other groups, you need a really detailed proposal, bt to get started, the seed money is really important.

Leah: I had a quick coment or suggestion, the innovation initiative on campus, are you familiar? Have you connected with thos folks?

Will: Mmhmm.

Leah: Okay. That is an instititewide initiative, so you could connet with them.

Shruti: But there are two undergraduates, and we think it is really great for the Undergraduate ASssocaition to handle this personally.

Leah: I would just connect with those folks.

Gaurav: As proposed, I do not think this is something the UA should support. There is the committee on education, I do not remember its name, it talks about policy, the mental health and wellness committee talks about that, this sounds like something for FinBoard but not for student groups. Unless we want to redefine what a committee is, I do not think this would work.

Will: If we see this as connecting other student groups on campus, and then creating a roadmap for students, I do not think it falls too far outside of the definition of a UA committee. I see how you could see projet funding outside of the definition, but I do not have extensive knowledge.

Shruti: We will be publishing the handbook, and that is something that the Provost and Reif want, and I feel that every committee on the UA, there is policy, but we have projects, like the studentfaculty dinner, and if you look at Sustainability, that is the most active committee out there. I think this is something that the UA does.

Yasmin: Can I make a suggestion? I think the major part is the funding clause. Can we come back and rediscuss the funding clause?

Arthur: I would like to point out that we are sitting on money that we never spend, but we have hundreds of thousands of dollars that we never spend.

Yasmin: I do not think that is the issue, there is just no criteria as to where the money is going.

Arthur:

Turner: The comporomise would be to change the current one to say that over time we could start something.

Sean: I agree with him, I feel that we are trying to find a way to spend our reserve account, and I feel that President Reif is all for this committee and what its goals are, it would be a good way to spend that money.

Sid: Turner had a lot of feedback on that. Do you want to vote on this committee and remove the funding component?
Hal: Instead of making it complicated, can we just vote to remove the funding component?

Shruti:

Matthew; We are not approving a budget,

Vote

Random Hall votes no.

Hal: Can we hear what he proposes?

Gaurav: I have no problems with a committee focused on innovation, but from what it sounded like, it seems like a group of groups involved in innovation, and besides this report, there is nothing there that is fundamentally the UA's goals. We should encourage innovation, but that did not seem like the goal.

Sid: You should consider what the scope of the UA is, and how it lines up with that. Is it focused on policy, or other things/ I think it is focused on a variety of things. Let's move on to proposal for funding of the UA Boston Half Marathon team.

Shruti: Last year the UA had a Collier Strong team, this last year we did fifty runners, so it cost around $5000 dollars, this year we could od around thrity, and we could open it to the UA and the greater undergraduate body. Reif did an MIT Strong team, it would be nice to have continuity at this event.

Lars; What event is being funded?

Shruti: Boston Half Marathon.

Gaurav: To clarify, this would be a half marathon organized by the UA/

Shruti: It is $75 to register for the marathon, the shirt is $10, so for those membes, it would be $2550.

Sid: Just to be clear, we are participating in an external one, not organizing one at MIT.

Hal: What is the proposal?

Shruti: $2550.

Sid: All in favour?

Matthew: Well, where is the money coming from?

Shruti: The CounciL Discretionary.

Matthew; Okay. I change my vote.

Unanimous approval

Grace: This month, I partnered with a fashion designer that is inspired by the beauty of coral reefs. All bonuses from the bags will go towards proteting marine areas. We are far enough along in the projet that we can… the only thing holding us back is funding. We are looking for $5k to start the proect. It is something that is kind of in th e middle, it is not a tech startup, and tie is of the essence, and we want to have the bag marketed as part of my underwater expedition, and we were talking to Will and Shruti about this project and other projects like that. I think projects like this really enrich the undergraduate community as it brings students together from acros the community.

Lars; Can you elaborate on how it enriches the community?

Grace: I am working with a fashion designer at Kent State, and I have spoken to more people on this projet, I have spoen to … at MIT, Omar at Harvard Medical and he started a startup at MIT, I Have spoken to other startups at MIT, I feel like personally I learn more about projects that I work on on the side.

Yasmin: Can you elaborate on other funding sources you already explored?

Grace: I have been working on this for about three weeks now. As a student, I contributed like fifty dollars since I am broke, now I am talking to you guys, also, yeah, that is about it.

Shruti: Also, Yasmin, a lot of funding sources at MIT have expired, like Arts@MIT.

Grace: …

Shruti: And the PSC deadline was March 31.

Gaurav: I guess I still don't see how this is the UA's job, even though you may have talked to a number of peope, I do not see a direct or indirect benefit to the undergraduate community as a whole it seems that this will benefit you on a personal project.

Cory: Everything the UA spends money on does not have to benefit everyone. FinBoard funds a lot of things that are specifically for student groups.

Hal: I agree with what you [Gaurav] just said, I am also looking a this from a precedent perspective, if we started funding every individual's project at 5k, we would run out of money.

Turner: If I understand correctly, this is the kind of project that does not fit into stuff already out there, and if we set a precedent of not everyone can get this money, and why we should fund a group, that is important.

Hal: There appears to currently be no process.

Turner: My assumption is that this is an example so that people can have a sense of what is going on.

Grace: With this project I would like to see it as an example to work through the Innovation Committee, I will be keeping a blog, and I can menion the UA and how it is helping, we can work through the rough points of this project.

Gaurav: I guess, given that we have not given the Innovation Committee a charge and money to do so, this is something that they may want to look at, but before the Innovation Committee, and not the Council as a whole.

Shruti: The Council is the only body that can help, and the UA sponsorship on that website,

Sid: If I was going to read between what Cory and Hal said, is it possible? Yes, we do fund groups that are focused on a subset of people, and we cannot give 5k to every student, but can we do soething in between, but it is a lower scale and more manageable for the UA to finance something, is there something say, 3000 could get you?

Shruti: Would it make a difference?

It is the idea of using funds. I think this is great for the Innovation Committee to do, but it was introduced, and because of timing, this may not be the time to approve a project like this. I understand we are the only organization that can provide it, but that does not mean we are obligated to provide it.

Arthur: Instead of being afraid of setting a precedent, maybe it could be good to try something, we may be setting a precedent. If it does not work, we say it does not work and never do it again.

Hal: When I mentioned setting a precedent, we haven't seen a structured proposal, it is 5000, why not more than that, why not more than that? There is no formal review process to go through. Somebody comes to us, no matter how good the idea is, and without researching it or doing due diligence, we are just throwing our money at it.

Yasmin: Are we allowed to vote via email? If you could give us more tangible options, we could vote and be alittle more assured.

Sid: We voted on things over email, however, they have been more in the nature of, last year, literally this time, the Athletes Dinner during the fall sports between August 20 and September 3, what we did is hash out the final amount as opposed to the concept of it, what I would say is that there has been a precedent for it, however, you would not be able to have a good discussion over email. However, if the people in this room are comfortable putting this on the backburner, that is up to the voting members.

Obasi: I would argue for deferring it, hile I think this could be a good idea, as it stands now it would just be giving 5000 dollars. We have not seen independent documentation, our due diligence, before distributing the money. Why would the UA fund a project like this? It helps promote the culture of students starting their own projects and there is nothing you have to lose outside of the money. Time is of the essence, but this proect will be gone.

Shruti: How about we vote?

Hal motions

Gaurav seconds

No for, opposed, Chloe, Tegan, Arthur

Motio to discuss later

Gaurav abstaining, Hal abstaining

Gaurav: I don't see any reason to vote for this over email if we decided no right now.

Hal: The thing I was thining about, with the innovation committee, I see the involvement of those people who have expertise to see if these things are worth ivesting in, being more suitable to decide these things, but I do not know if my voting on it has any value. I am deferring it to later, it will not chane hat I think.

Samuel: The question I see is are we turning this into investing, or crowdsourcing?

Sid; Are there any more thoughts? I assume we can discuss it over email. Emad, contribution to sexual assault report?

Emad: I want to get a sense, who was not here when we discussed the proposal? Did you all also receive the revised version of the report? There were the revised changes to it. Since we are running into some trouble doing this, it may be easier if you all have it open on your laptops. For all of our guests in the Council chamber today, you may remember that Chancellor Barnhart was charged with… to compile a report and get a whole lot of research to support all of the findings in a semester, to that point the Chancellor has been conducting listening tours. The best we can manage are informal conversations. The focus groups were a major part of this committee. In forming the questions, we wanted to be very conscious of how we posed the questions. We do not want to unnecessarily provoke feeligns amongst those in the focus group. This is all part of this render mission to assess the cliate around sexual assault on campus and see what provisional steps we can take … some of you may remember that last Sunday the Chancellor sent out the survey that would be the primary instrument to measure how sexual assault is paying out in all instances of misconduct on campus. Thre have bee some hurdles along the way, the best that we can do as members of student government is set the initial framework and see whether we can work from there. We make a statement now and we can continue to work on the issue. With that in mind, I will start off with the assumption that lal members of Council have read the report. Ths first thing is we added language that says sexual assault is a community issue. There was a small section where paragraphs were reordered under the introduction, that is to emphasize the inpt that you as Council have put in. There was also a bit of rewording that was more for emphasis rather than to change the intent of recommendations. Motivating principle 1, used to read, we want to empower advocates of sexual assault and denounce sexual misconduct and its contributing factors. There is also some issue with wording under the motivating principle. The sexual assault is not the fault of whoever is assaulted. Uner motivating principle 4, it came yo our attention that this greater utilization of MIT support reosurces is still hypothetical, so some of the phrasing of that was changed accordingly. A few other edits for emphasis, brevity, clarity, one of the more substantive edits is all of our recommended action items have been sorted into one of three categories. There is a role for students and student government. There are also issues in which all community members should contribute equally. The wording of each recommendation was left unchanged, except for reommendatio c3, and that is to:

What I added in was, since that got added into the recommendations for everyone's sections, it was clarifying how students and administrtors could be meaningfuly involved in the process. And then there is a summary to put a nice bow on it. Any questions?

Okay. The only thing I have to add is the Chancellor's Report is due to come out late June, since the survey will close in May, I would consider a few weeks to summarize the quantitative data, so necessarily this process will continue on beyond when Council concludes in … our goal will be to reconcile our findings and reocmmendations out of what came out of quantitiative research, and conversations with people we have talked with. So, that wraps it up for me, if we are all ready?

Sid: Any thoughts, questions?

Yasmin motions to vote.

Seconded by Arthur.

Unanimous approval.

Turner: At the last Council meeting we briefly talked aout this, Turner's email you pointed out has that one change. Do people have any other comments or questions? …

That wll also be the beginning of an open discussion with them and look at some example situations, and make sure that administrators looking at this document are aware of each other, and it is difficult to …

Hal: On the admin side that were involved in the creation side of the approval process?

Cory: From the President, Chancellor, DSL, DOE, etc.

Rodrigo: How is the fairest manner possible going to be decided?

Turner: That was the issue I was talking about. What I would love to be able to say is that students have no ogliation to implement a decision they disagree with , unless students have been involved over two months, that would be great if we could say that, but there are some decisions that have to be made in a day. We have to allow for that in the document. How I expect that to be handled is by the committee in the future. I do not see a way to do that in the future. Suggestions would be great.

Hal motions to vote.

Rodrigo seconds.

Unanimous approval of document.

Cory: Bylaws. As Turner was saying, this needs to be an ongoing thing, people forget about it otherwise, our broad vision of SAC as a standing committee is just implementing this document with ervisions as necessary, SAC would be the point as the sexual assault report comes out. The enw drugs and alcohol policy, CPW, all of these decision making processes, SAC would be a point. Its specific unctions are in section four, do people have questions?

Obasi moves to vote.

Matthew seconds.

Unanimous approval.

Sid: The outgoing UA President selets the incoming Judicial Board and Election Commission. For JudBoard, there are a maximum of three people with one chair. This year we have had two, I have proposed two people as well, a strict requirement of JudBoard is that the person cannot be a part of any kind of UA committee except one that reviews governing documents. So… I will keep talking. The two people I have selected for JudComm are Matthew Davis on our left. Matthew will reprise his role as a current Secretary once our term completes as well as his role as a Council member, as well as John Halloran, who has been involved as a member of IFC who is a JudComm liaison, as well as within DEK, I think those are two very strong choices, they represent two very different aspects. Matthew has been in the UA and with issues, and has raised a lot of ethical questions, and Jon brings an outside perspective, he is course 17, and has spent a lot of time reviewing the governing documents. So, those are kind of the two people for JudBoard. For election commission, you have between three to eight people, and the requirements are not as strict as for JudBoard. The chair I have proposed is Kevin Yan, it is important to have someone who has been through the process be on it, it would not be advisable to have an outsider do that position. The other five names are Ani Sailesh, Greg Kravit, Connie Huang, Nathan Varady who ran as the VP during the last presidential run for the Election Comission, and Markus Bradford. Questions and thoughts?

Yasmin: There is only one girl on this entire list of people. I am sure the people listed are qualified, but since the goal is to have equal representation, and that on this long list, there is that unequal distribution.

Sid: I reached out to a lot of people, and these were the people who replied saying yes.

Yasmin: Out of the people you replied to, what was the gender distribution?

Sid: 60/40. I will say that when I presented my team alst year, one of my goals was to have gender equity, and our team this year is 55/45.

Hal; I cannot help but notice that Nathan Varady is on there. I do not know how appropriate it is that he is on there.

Sid: My thought is that he has been through the process, and there were some issues on it, since he is not the chair he cannot act unilaterally, so it is good to have checks and balances, you may argue that Nathan has extreme thoughts, but he is one of a team of people, that is where my mindset is with t hat. He has been on the other side of the Election Commission, and understands, a year from now, can understand the position of presidential candidates during a heated time. The last two elections have been a heated time.I feel like he will have a perspective that needs to be represented.

Cory: I am going to completely disagree and ay that a team that violated as many eletion codes as they did, I do not feel comfortable, and the fact that they threatened to sue the election commission and sent that letter to the Chancellor and others, also gives me concern, so does he actually see it as a valid body, and does he want to follow the rules?

Obasi: I knew there was contention between members of the election board. Is it possible to know if anyone else threatened to sue?

Hal: I was on the Election Commission. Nathan was the only one who threatened to sue.

Obasi: Are there any extraneous factours that we should be aware of before voting?

Hal: As far as the suing thing goes, I do agree with Cory in that there were a few rules that I felt were broken, I also see Sid's point in that he wants another perspective, I am conflicted because it is difficult to take it on his word that he wants the Election Commission to be better or effective. That is where I see it going.

Sid: My goal with the Election Commission was, I like checks and balances, there are six people on there, Nathan may represent extreme points of view, but I feel that he is counterbalanced by not being the chair, that being said, it is not kind of make or break. It is to have as amny conflicting views as possible. I feel that is what a good government has.

Jessica: I agre, good dialogue is important, I think there is a difference between points of view that allow dialogue, and a point of view that seriously overreacts and makes irrational decisions. I will leave it at that.

Gaurav: More than that, because he has been cited by the Election Commission, it brings down the Election Commissio to be on it. I still don't think we should put him on because he brings down the board.

Obasi: I agree that we should have diversity, but I agree that it hruts integrity, and if we know that people knowingly violated election rules, they demonstrably do not see it as a respectable entity or a powerful body. I am very disquieted about putting someone who is demonstrably not respective of the guiding principles of the institution.

Sid: My goal was to have as many different thoughts, but I am going to retract that name [Nathan Varady]. Last year there were 2 on JudBoard, five on election commission, are there any thoughts on that moving forward?

Yasmin: I still don't feel like, especially since you mentioned diversity, I do not feel that it was taken into account.

Matthew:

Sid: Are there any more thoughts?

Chloe: can you discuss how you chose Markus Bradford?

Devin: He is a senior in Course 14, and a lot of work he has done on campus has been with the NSBE, his role has been much more procedural, and he adds a certain level of formalism, he is a person who is by the book, and he does not really get lost in the circumstantial things, especially after the last two, for the elections of UAP/VP, so I feel comfortable with the perspective he would bring.

Hal: If we vote without Nathan?

Yasmin: Can we vote with the idea that the replacement will be appointed with the thought to diversity?

Hal motions to vote.

Rodrigo seconds.

Unanimous approval.

Sid: Last thing is the presentation of the UA Exeutie Team, which Shruti will do.

Shruti: Okay. Our vision for the UA, I think there are three components to it, there is a student support, communciatio side, and the future side, residential planning, where the innovation and leadership really plays into the MIT vision. So, in so doing for our executie team, we found qualities that do represent all of campus, and we looked at former leadership. We effectively do represent most, if not a large majority of, campus groups.

This is our executive board, and we will be going more in detail with each position and its role next year.

Again, with diversity, Yasmin, we have 50/50, and that as really key, if you are trying to represent all of campus, we kept in mind gender, and made sure we had all segmets of campus represented once again. So for President, I am a Junior right now studying Course 3, and I am the Chief of Staff, I have bene in the UA since my freshman year, and it is my sole passion around student roanizations and making it grow and be as great as possible is really my priority.

Billy; Hello everyone, I am Billy, I am a Course 1 junior, and I will be serving as your Vice President next year. I was on the Committee on Education my freshman year and it is great ot see ho posilices can affect the student experience.

Shruti: For our chief of staff, we have Douglas Coughran, Douglas is Course 2, he has ben involved in the UA, he is on the Innovation Initiative, and he will be the tie between all of the institute committee members.

Billy; As Treasurer, we will have ryan McDermott, he has served as next House Rep, FinBoard, and he will bring his experience to us as Treasurer.

Shruti: Sophia will be the Vice President of her class, and she has a lot of experience with leadership, she will be leading the way with exec, with the IFC, PanHel, DormCon, and dormitories, we see her facilitating everything that goes on.

Billy: For Athletics Nathan will be serving as athletics chair. He will be bringing in ideas for students to get involved in athletics and credit for club sports, and his experience will bring in more efficiency next year.

Shruti: For UA Educatino, we are implementing co-chairs, Billy and I have been involved in education for many yers, but to make Education more concrete and have a larger reach on campus, we will have Trevor who has been on the committee since freshman year, who knows the underground of the committee, and projects that he has talked about is making sure that classes that report to be twelve units are twelve units, and not fifteen or eighteen units. Also doing events such as the faculty dinners or having faculty come to our dining halls. Right now we want to make sure students have more mentorship and advising, whether through mentorship evaluations, we will be doing that. Our other chair is Jenny Zhang, she is amazing, she TA's for a lot of classes and has been ver ative with research. She will be looking at how to connect all of the UROP's and evaluations, how do you make it to have more UROP's carried out over a longer lasting term at MIT and looking at Project Based learning.

That ties into MITx, but Colin is really charged with working with Sanjay Sharma and making a document perhaps on how students feel and with experimens, and having a standard for what MITx classes should look like, instead of us being guinea pigs and having lots of experience. We also want Colin to work on a video hackathon, to get students on board with the online education system.

Billy: For MIT 2030, we will have Laila, she is a rising junior, and she has a lot of ideas on moving forward with situations likeB exley and wider-ranging campus planning, and her experience will be a good addition to the UA.

Shruti: For Financial Board, we are co-charing Financial Board. Ani will be involved in a lot of policy for financial board, from tuitition increases, CUAFA, expanding CVC's, and he has knowledge of financial board from this year, and streamlining it as muc as possible. Alekhya will be co-charigin and mentoring student groups on how to spend money. And so working toegeht I think they will accomplish a lot.

Billy: For Technology Systems Group, we are co-charing it, wit Kulprect and Jin. They have a lot of experience and working with publicity and acks and making sure the website is up to date and making information more accessible to students.

Shruti: Both Jin and Kulprect will be working with all of the committees, and making sure that all of campus is aware of the great work that the UA puts in. Special Projects really does tie up loose ends and gets to work on projects that can be really helpful for the undergraduate body. We have Robert who is really great, he has already started hitting the ground running, contacting other organizations, whether internationally or domestic, seeing how other governance strutures work, and how we can work with other organizations to spread the MIT UA throughout.

Billy: For SAC, we will be co-charing, the first is Obasi, and the second is Phoebe Whitwell. They will be bringing the perspective on collaborating with adminisrtators to help facilitate this process. Obasi is currently on IFC and Phoeve is involved in East Campus and also DormCon.

Shruti: Our views for Obasi and Phoebe is that Obasi will be involved in managing the gap with students, whether it is about explaning the appeals process for COD and CAP, and going around to dorms and clarifying any gray areas that exst on campus. Phoebe will be working on the administrative side and revieing large areas of concern to students, so that we can present them and have accurate documentation.

Billy: For Student Support and Wellness, we will have Chrysanthia and Morgan, they have been reocmended by Emad so we are confident that they will do a good job.

Shruti: For Public Relations, we have Tegan, and she will really be working on making sure that the campus knows about the UA and is aware of what the UA is doing and working with us and events and committees that we have.

Billy: For Sustainability, we will have Jacqueline and Anna walsh, their projects will continue next ear, and we hope that their experience will further the Sustainability committee next year. Jacqueline and Anna Walsh.

Shruti: For Events, co-chaired, we have Raicehlle, who has experience with events and class councils, whether it is SpringFest and having it outside, or bringing more speakers to MIT, her and Diviya will be working together to see that we have more campus impact.

Phoebe replaces Jessica as EC Rep, 8:52PM

Shruti: For innovation, we have Will Jack, and he will be forming a united force for innovation. Right now there are so many segmented groups, and really putting everyone together and ensuring that MIT is at the forefront of innovation. So, that is what, that is all.

Sid: Any questions?

Gaurav: Could you come back to the list of all committee chairs? I do not remember all the names you said.

Hal: I do remember last year having the people leave so we can discuss it in Council. Just having the Exec people step out for a little bit and then come back.

Matthew: Would anyone be opposed to having the voting members for East Campus and Next House remain?

Hal: My one question, last semester there was significant concern as to how Ani handled FinBoard, and if people are still concerned, if those were addressed from your point of view, and if that is generally ok.

Cory: So I think the, I personally think this semester has been a lot better, and having both him and Alaikya, having both of them, with good experience running as Treasurer, two years now, the y have a lot of experience, Ani and Ryan worked together.

Yasmin: Just to clarify, it says FiNBoard and CVC, is FinBoard …?

Cory: No, CVC is still separate, but Ani will chair that as well.

Hal: In that case, he is chairing CVC?

Matthew:

Shruti: I think liens being blurred, it goes to Cuoncil, we did that with SAC, we did that with the sexual assault report, for Chancellor Barnhart, for sure, you have oversight always and for policy I think given that the Financial Board does work with a lot of student groups, advocating for student groups is something that he/she could do, and I think it is about time that we had someone involved in CUAFA and how MIT does its financial process, and also advocating on the side of , okay, we have studet life fees, where does that go, or tuition increases, I think that is a great role to play as an advocate.

Hal: I just wanted to make sure that, with the two of you, this is your Executive Board, you must have vetted him, but do you foresee you and Nathan Varady being an issue with having him on your exec?

Billy; I don't think that will be an issue, especially since he is so interested in Athletics. I don't think that will be an issue.

Gaurav motions to vote

Hal seconds

Unanimous approval.

Sid: The final order of busness is to swear in the new team. I am going to swear in Billy and Shruti, and they will swear in their new officer team.

I am also going to swear in Matthew, because constitutionally they have to be done at the same time.

[insert oath of office]

Sid: We will now have Shruti swear in the officer team.

[insert oath of office]

Gaurav: Motion to adjourn the meeting

Hal: Seconded

Meeting adjourned at 9:04 PM