Introduction
Redacted Minutes from the previous meeting are now ready to go on the Interact website.

Item I: Homework due from last meeting (Interact)
- No homework was received from the previous meeting. The plan is still set for the CSL Chair to meet with students regarding the implementing of the Interact website.
- Ideabank and several other independent sites organized by the students themselves are good examples of the website format where questions are posted and the most popular are generated to the top of the website.
- The Interact website was noted by Chancellor Phil Clay in his letter to the community but only as a part of a huge list. Ways to promote Interact:
  - Make a timeline where Interact is launched this term in order to have something to work from.
  - Events can be used as milestones. For example, a booth could be set up in Lobby 7 to feature Interact during CPW (April 16-18).
  - A story can be put in the Tech about Interact.
  - Interact can be mentioned in emails to prospective students and they can use their Kerberos certificates to access the website. This would be a good way of implementing the site by making it a part of the expected experience of the incoming students to MIT.

Item II: CSL and CSL Taskforce: Our Input
Summary:
- The first meeting of all the subcommittees of the taskforce was last Tuesday. It was purely an organizational meeting. The Minutes from this meeting will be put on a private wiki and once the taskforce has received feedback on the Minutes they will be posted publicly. These will not be official decisions that are posted but rather ideas that are currently going around, some of which will never come to fruition. The purpose of the public posting is so that people can post comments and also so that there will be no leakage of information since it will all be publicly available.
- The taskforce would also like to go to graduate, undergraduate, east campus, and west campus dorms in order to get student interaction and to discuss the student sentiment. The problem with this is that the large number of off-campus students won’t be as involved.

Discussion:
- Contacting students through events at the dormitories has been done successfully in the past. The Resident Redesign Committee was a pre-Simmons committee which included graduate students, undergraduate students, and alumni with the intent of preparing the way for freshman to be on campus. They used events at dorms to sell messages that were unpopular and that people didn’t want to hear.
  - The model is a good one to review, but the budget taskforce is not trying to push an unpopular message but rather is trying to get a feel for the sentiment of what
people think of the resources provided to them. If a survey were to be done right now the taskforce wouldn’t even know what questions to ask.

- There are many surveys that have already been taken which can be looked at before doing a new survey. The Admissions Office does an admitted student survey for why MIT students come to MIT and why they don’t. This would be helpful to understand students’ expectations of MIT and also to see if the message of what MIT offers is being explained properly to prospective students.
  - Right now is a good time to look at surveys because many are being put together for the upcoming accreditation.
- A good question for the taskforce to ask is what does MIT Medical do, what does S^3 do, and how can redundancy between the departments be stopped? There is no official continuum between the two, but students do feel a lot of fluidity there.
  - S^3 provides academic, health, and personal advising as well as crisis response. Therefore, DSL, S^3, and Medical are often interlocked. Is this the best way?
  - For example, if students are sick and need to be excused from class they go to S^3, not medical. This involves a lot of jumping around and involves the question of whether Administrators should be involved in academic matters? Members of the faculty do appreciate having counseling deans who can help students with deep issues.
  - Another example is leaves of absence. At the graduate level this is very straightforward and students do not have to be readmitted as it is more of a departmental matter. However, at the undergraduate level the process can very difficult, there are distinctions between physical and mental illnesses, and parents have expectations even though students are legally adults once 18 years old.
  - Administration wants to provide an integrated service for students where people do not fall through the cracks.
- The taskforce wants to put information out in the open with a disclaimer about the process because they cannot discuss matters such as salary and personnel. This is not to gain students’ faith in the process but to obtain feedback.

Item III: Guess who’s coming to dinner? - MIT, Dining, and CSL

Summary:
- The Blue Ribbon Committee will not be disbanded. Starting a committee from scratch is too tough and Administration does want a brand new way to look at dining which has many options and serves the community.
- The Blue Ribbon Committee put together a document which was sent to a consultant and contained guidelines and principles. The first feedback from the consultant was very weak, not half the work had been done by the committee that was needed. This was not a manipulation of the data. The consultant has sent back the final recommendations and the committee has been instructed to come up with their own recommendations, reach out to the community, and to hold several meetings in order to discuss final recommendations before they return the document to Administration.
  - It was very disappointing to Administration that data from the document sent to consultant was leaked as it could only have been done so by someone on the committee. If this happened because committee members are being stymied it needs to be dealt with.
A faculty member who was on the Blue Ribbon Committee told Administration that it was agreed by the committee not to leak information, but that it was unfair for the committee to have to defend the consultant’s report before they even had a chance to look at it.

One recommendation in the document that has been leaked is that McCormick should be closed. If this is still in the final recommendations, then the Housemasters group will be able to respond to it.

- There have been concerns about transparency and all of the redacted Minutes of the Blue Ribbon Committee meetings will be posted. Issues will be dealt with right away if possible; otherwise, issues will go out to the community. This is in addition to the fact that the committee has been asked to reach out to the community before finalizing their report.
- Current dining halls are Simmons, Next House, Baker, McCormick, and eventually W1 (which will have a required dining plan to live in that location). It must be kept in mind that there are many considerations for dining plans and the recommendations must be sustainable, especially in this time and period with the budget restraints and people being laid off.
- Hopefully, this will demonstrate to students that Administration is doing what they said they would do, and if they don’t do what they said they would then they will take the negative criticism.

Discussion:
- According to a member of the Blue Ribbon Committee, the Blue Ribbon Committee wants the dining issue to be finished. The failure on the part of the committee is not what they have done but how they communicate it. Additionally, people are catching flack for volunteering on the committee which shouldn’t be happening because why would members of the committee have anything but the best of intentions if they are volunteering their time?
- Need to think about communities and how to help them, especially residents without dining facilities: should Tech cards be able to be used at store like Trader Joes?
- There is a socio-economic culture being built around the dorms. The quality of the facilities is based upon what buildings contain kitchens, etc., and because there aren’t any dorms being built the dining tends to be in the newer buildings. Dining plans are also expensive; should dining plans be imposed upon people who want to live in a specific location? There are many poor people with financial aid who might get dining paid for, but there are also many poor people with no financial aid who can’t afford dining plans.
  - While many students want to preserve the option to spend their own money on food and not money routed through MIT, many of the people who aren’t publicly speaking out probably want the dining halls.
  - The student expense budget does need to be looked at and if dining costs increase this needs to be taken into consideration.
- Students want to be involved with or at least aware of the process that is currently happening and little bits of information go a long way, even just a few sentences of updated information to the community every few weeks will helpful in keeping the process transparent.

*END OF MEETING*