

**General Body Meeting**

Sunday, December 8, 2013

9:00PM-12:00PM, Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall

1. **Roll Call**
2. **Open Forum**
3. **Reports**
	1. **President’s Report**
	2. **Vice-President’s Report**
	3. **UA Report**
	4. **Treasurer’s Report**
4. **Project Updates**
	1. **Academic Affairs**
	2. **Discussion Papers**
	3. **Completion Reports**
	4. **Old Business**
	5. **New Business**
5. **Executive**
	1. **Project Updates**
	2. **Discussion Papers**
	3. **Completion Reports**
	4. **Old Business**
	5. **New Business**
		1. **Proposal II Re Presidential–Vice-Presidential Qualifications for Candidacy**
6. **Academic Affairs**
	1. **Project Updates**
		1. **NGSS Updates**
		2. **Uncoordinated Dual Degrees**
		3. **UC Committee on Academic and Related Affairs**
	2. **Discussion Papers**
		1. **Technical Writing Seminar Discussion Paper**
	3. **Completion Reports**
	4. **Old Business**
	5. **New Business**
		1. **Penn Mobile App Resolution**
7. **Dining, Sustainability and Facilities**
	1. **Project Updates**
	2. **Discussion Papers**
	3. **Completion Reports**
	4. **Old Business**
	5. **New Business**
8. **Social Justice**
	1. **Project Updates**
		1. **Typhoon Yolanda Relief**
		2. **DPS Advisory Board Meeting**
		3. **Committee on Manufacturer Responsibility Meeting**
		4. **Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention at Penn**
		5. **International Student Advisor**
	2. **Discussion Papers**
	3. **Completion Reports**
	4. **Old Business**
	5. **New Business**
9. **Student Life**
	1. **Project Updates**
	2. **Discussion Papers**
	3. **Completion Reports**
	4. **Old Business**
	5. **New Business**
10. **Communications**
11. Open Forum
	1. Smoking on Locust Walk (Angela) - I have received a lot of student support on this topic.
		1. Aidan - Dan Bernick was trying to head something similar last year. Since this began as a class discussion, I don’t know if the administration would take it seriously.
		2. Christian - This is something I looked into as CPE director. It has been pushed back a lot. The concern is not about students, but it is about staff. Some of the employees, especially in the med school, rely on being able to leave and smoke. There is a center opened recently focused on tobacco research. It’s something that’s been tabled for now.
		3. Abe - This is something that Dan Bernick spoke about. There has been discussion this year in SHS. I sent it out in an all-school. We have not reached a consensus yet. There is not an intent in the short term to ban smoking.
		4. Bill - Is there a way to ban people from smoking in front of Huntsman? Can be enforce it?
		5. Abe - I’m sure we could enforce it since it’s already banned.
		6. Kat - There are some places that have designated smoking areas. Maybe we could pursue something like that.
		7. Eric - Maybe one of the things we could work on is that some of the spots are located close to the building. We could put them further away.
12. Reports
	1. President’s Report (Abe) - Cabinet met with VPUL. We had the PRISM co-chair attend. UC was focused on re accreditation and green initiatives. We also spoke with Athletics - potentially getting groups that are non-Athletics related access to the Box Office. There’s a Council of Undergraduate Deans meeting this Wednesday.
	2. VP Report (Gabe) - Our next UA Steering meeting is this week with Rudie Altamirano. We worked recently on a project to develop an international integration program. He’s a good person in regards to international relations in general. I met with ESAC, CDAB, LC, Hillel and Panhel this week. We talked about how they can use Steering for their benefit and the University’s benefit. We primarily talked about collaboration with different Steering groups and the UA. You will see a survey soon and be sending it out the body. It will eventually go out to all students and will help share the mobile app. There is holiday gift wrapping at the Penn Bookstore on December 12th.
	3. UA Report (Josh) - Annual Report deadline soon. It is very important to admins - I will be bugging you about it soon. Additionally, there will be a survey sent out about the UA and your experience with it. The data can help shape next semester and next year. Due to a resignation on Budget Committee, we will have an election next meeting. We thank Anthony Cruz. Happy birthday to a bunch of people. Congrats to the member of the week!
		1. Jane - Thanks to all of the Exec and Cabinet members.
	4. Treasurer’s Report (Tiffany) - We’re sad to see Anthony go. The elections will be on the first meeting. Feel free to email me, Anthony or Aidan. I am specifically free Wednesday - Saturday.
		1. Anthony - I resigned this afternoon after being elected cochair of POCO and the President of the College Republicans. I decided to leave after not having enough time.
		2. Tiffany - Budget season is coming around Feb and March. We go by an estimate when we do the budget. So that’s how it works.
13. Executive Committee
	1. Prop II (Will) - For those of you who aren’t aware, the UA President position is only about four years old. Last spring, there was an adhoc committee to think about the election of the President and VP. The way that they stand now, the rules that are expiring say that they have to get signatures of 5% of the student body in addition to 5 signatures of sitting members of the student body. For every signature you do not get, you have to add an extra 1% of signatures of the student body. The changes we made are that: the requirements for VP and President are no longer the same: VP members must get signatures from Steering heads; signatures are not incentivized. If they get 5 signatures, they need to get 3% of the student body signatures. Now it is not a sliding scale you either have the signatures or you don’t. Now the Executive Information Sessions are optional because they were redundant. We changed the expiration discussions.
		1. Fred - The range of 5-10% was arbitrary before. The main discussion we incurred was that we would have end points of how many signatures you need to get elected. It makes no sense to have the high end of getting elected be more than the number of signatures necessary to recall someone. We think this enhances democracy and UA members’ ability to affect who gets elected.
		2. Will - We need to pass an identical version to this bylaw - otherwise we won’t do this job.
		3. Frank - I support this.
		4. Aidan - What does optional mean?
		5. Will - You either need 5% of the student body or 5 signatures and 3% of the student body
		6. Aidan - That means that 5 UA Steering groups for Vice President are not optional? I’m confused by the percentile and the signatures.
		7. Will - It works the same way as the UA President - they need 5 Steering member signatures and 3% of the student body.
		8. Pro (Fred) - We do think this is a lot better. We think that this makes the UA more accountable. This is the best thing we can offer. I highly encourage you to pass it.
		9. Con - None
		10. Passes by a vote of 30-0-1.
14. Academic Affairs
	1. NGSS Update (Justin) - This is a committee designed to get input into future technology systems. We talked a lot about Penn InTouch. We will have similar discussions in a couple of weeks.
	2. Uncoordinated Dual Degrees (Andrew & Tunmise) - We have gathered all of the necessary information by talking to all of the coordinated dual degree directors. We’ve also talked to people in charge of regular dual degrees. We’ve seen a need for changes. However, the changes are all different. We’re going to try to see which ones are the most popular and gain feedback from students.
		1. Tunmise - We can handle it on a case-by-case basis after that. We have gotten some frequently incurred problems.
	3. UC Council on Academic & Related Affairs (Yessenia) - Read it. If you have any suggestions on the self-study report, please comment on the link I sent out last week.

*Thank you to Joyce Kim for covering this discussion paper.*

* 1. Technical Writing Seminar (Angela) - Technical writing is a style that focuses more on brevity of writing in order to inform a certain audience. As an engineer, I believe that this form of writing is more applicable. I have spoken to graduate students who wished that they had more of a background. I met with Valerie Ross and my ideal was to have a seminar that focused more on technical writing. She felt that the current system provided that. It’s difficult to implement something when the administrators are opposed to it. Some things I propose is having a course separate from the writing seminar or incorporating it into an intro course. Of the options listed, what do you think is the most applicable to take it?
		1. Alex: You mentioned your parents used a lot of technical writing.
			1. Angela: 80% of what they do is based on technical writing
		2. Angela: Have you spoken with EDAB yet?
		3. Jess: Have you considered any types of technical writing except for EDAB?
		4. Alex: I was just wondering, are you aware that Weingarten offers workshops for technical writing. One of my advisors got a workshop leader for technical writing?
		5. Gabe: I think the video is very valid. I would say along the lines of what Abe was suggesting EDAB would be a very good resource whether there was a history of this. I would suggest having a meeting with EDAB to discuss this further and then going school by school. It just happens to be that administrators happen to have the same resources. I can follow up with you to see if we can go school by school. There is a nursing dean’s advisory board as well.
		6. Pratyusha: Obviously, I’m passionate about this. This is the best idea I heard this year. As an engineer you need technical writing herself. They already just go into writing seminar. I think that by offering these, you would get more engineers that engineers don’t find writing seminar very useful so you should talk to teachers who teach more engineer-related writing seminars. Get their feedback- show them your curriculum and show them if the experience is the right thing to do. I think talking to lab professors would be helpful. Once you have this thing, where it’s pretty much useless than she is forced to make changes on this. I tried for two semesters. I think for two semesters there are technical and writing based. The only people that these are similar to, actually I’m not even sure but from my experience writing seminar is very necessary.
		7. Will: The writing seminar is nothing like papers for history majors
		8. Fred: I’m also an engineer while I agree with the kind of writing that they do, considering you may do consulting or something like that. A lot of labs actually do this kind of training. In my junior year we are doing the level of the Royal Society of Chemistry is doing. That’s technical writing for you there. While this class offers you training, but thank you for bringing this up.
		9. Jordan: I was in the AA committee. Perhaps you can write something technical about it. I would do the option of the own or the home course, in the short term you may want to incorporate it into the existing class.
		10. Aidan: I think this is a good opportunity rather than focusing solely on technical skills. The writing seminar doesn’t seem to align well with our goals, so this would be a better attribute to our goals. I think this can both be a stopgap.
			1. Angela: The seminar I proposed didn’t entirely supplant the entire curriculum, but by doing so you would have to restructure the entire thing.
		11. Kat: You mentioned STEM classes- mathematics are in the college, not exactly engineering. If you’re a math major you’re in the college. Math majors may say this kind of thing. This may be a slippery slope.
		12. Rahul: Engineering does offer EOS 101- I know that they helped me.
		13. Abe: First off, this is a great initiative the place to start is EDAB I would try to develop them with them then if it is shown to be useful then with the engineering school, then I think displaying that and developing the curriculum would enable you to have long-term discussions then having something to show.
		14. Alex: Building off what have Aidan and Fred have been getting it, I don’t enjoy the writing seminar and through trial and error. The skills that they are giving you may be a little arcane. My topics of a French writing group like poetry the skills that I’ve learned may effectively kind of scan my own work, the tailoring of my work are skills that are transferrable to writing such as technical writing. In the process of writing this paper, I found that a lot of them began- esp the broadly written ones has an explanatory opening, kind of synthesizing opening together. You share them with a more general audience. As much as it pains me to say, I wouldn’t be completely towards just having a completely technical writing seminar.
		15. Andrew: I agree with option 2, echoing what Fred said earlier if there are people that are in these fields, before they get in these courses they should get these technical skills so maybe focusing these skils- maybe recommending there should be faculty development to nurture these skills. I don’t think many people would take the course they wouldn’t be that interested. I believe that technical writing should be included probably in the only courses they offered. The Critical Writing Courses are completely flawed and don’t completely write conventionally- bringing that up to Val. I feel that it is really pertinent. We have kids wasting hours of their lives-it’s not even something for a liberal arts curriculum. If she really wants to nurture liberal arts, then that needs to be fostered. I think this is a great idea.
		16. Pratyusha: We’ve talked about how technical writing is the opposite of creative. I have to write my language in a certain way- the point is to be creative. I don’t think just because you are writing in fluffier topics- then that’s not necessarily a point. Jeanine Meyer write Chem 53-54- she writes 6-7 very intense lab reports, she would be your best bet if you wanted to include a technical portion. She’s a lot like Val Ross. Engineers like to really check off the boxes- getting that listed as a natural sciences requirement, that would be something they might consider taking.
		17. John: I just wanted to point out having a unified writing curriculum- I think the writing seminar gives you a unified way to self-evaluate.
		18. Natalie: Instead of having a separate class, then there should be writing seminar class not specifically for engineers but also incorporates other types of writing. I just want to have another writing seminar about it. It’s hard to find professors who teach that.
		19. Fred: Was just looking at ES400-500 Technical writing. Description: Students will have methods and approaches for maximum effectiveness in technical writing. It may not be in demand. I just wanted you reach out to SCUE.
		20. Margaret: Agree with the point of CHEM 53-54. Maybe you should get rid of the first lab and encourage TAs to write out and give copies of lab reports. I guess if you approached EDAB we’ve written a lot of papers for BE, maybe we can have a class or two about technical writing.
			1. Fred: Really don’t think Chem 53-54 or really the best indication for technical writing. Not necessarily the best places to do this.
			2. Margaret: What exactly did you submit for writing interpretations. How much writing was technical? I’m assuming for the justificatory or explanatory. Wanted to see if there included a source. Included a grant proposal.
				1. Pratyusha: Talk to Lisa Xu
				2. Margaret: Class is considered an elective- I don’t think that’s very easy. I don’t think having an entirely separate class.
				3. Alex: Incorporating technical writing into writing seminar curriculum. Pursue possibility of writing seminar curriculum, maybe the topic of writing seminar includes the reading of technical writing.

Kat: You don’t have to take it your freshman year you can take it second semester senior year.

Angela: We are pushing it off- did bring it up, but she was like y’know.

Aidan: I was thinking about what Pratyusha said earlier about communications about Valerie Ross and that is assuming certain things about what is technical and creative. Technical= tactical, process-based. Creative writing has strategic approach. Maybe that definition is a little more conducive.

* + 1. Margaret: Thanks for the input, I’ll talk to EDAB and try Janine. Thank you.
	1. PennApp (Gabe) - There is a demonstrated need for this. The resolution will allow us to push different departments to release APIs. A lot of information is decentralized and this mobile website will bring it together. The mobile site exists, but it isn’t used because it doesn’t offer as much useful information such as dining. It is also difficult to access. If you were to create a mobile app, it would reach a large group of people. This mobile app would allow people to navigate school easily. Additionally, DPS could reach out to students more easily. The impact is general but the scope is very large. Please read the enactment clauses. I have attached an appendix that shows what it will probably look like.
		1. Aidan - Thanks for presenting this. Can you present us with specifics on the developmental deadlines. How much do you see it based off of Princeton’s website.
		2. Gabe - I would like to see this before fall next year. Prior to this, I used Harvard’s to model it. Fred has helped me to realize that the best way to reach people is to have a mobile site component, which Princeton does.
		3. Eric - Would it roll out slowly and have links to the mobile website or would we roll it out together.
		4. Gabe - We have to reformat a lot of information and add other features as it comes along. Something I haven’t seen is student government or student related stuff period. Jesus has talked to me about including student government website and student-endorsed websites.
		5. Alex - Have you thought about incorporating Penn Rewards into this mobile app?
		6. Gabe - I have not thought about that. I don’t think that would work with the mobile site though.
		7. Alex - Then is your app just a browser?
		8. Gabe - Yes. The app is a window to the mobile app.
		9. Fred - The difference is that you can have actual mobile app components.
		10. Pro (Gabe) - I just want to say that the impact is great and have spoken to a lot of students.
		11. Con (Andrew) - Dining already has their own app. They don’t want to be part of a UA app.
		12. Pro (Abe) - There is no mandating. Departments just have to open APIs. That’s not critical to the passing of the resolution.
		13. Con (Jordan) - It’s going to be a window into the mobile site?
		14. Gabe - You could get the same information on your computer anyway. It does the same thing as any mobile app.
		15. Pro (Aidan) - I have moderate support. I support the processes. In terms of process aggregation. I think it will take more than a year to a year and a half. There’s time for cross coordination. I know, for example, using Events at Penn has helped website rates. I just wanted to express that concern. I encourage everyone to support this. We may or may not see this at our time at Penn.
		16. Passes 27-0-0.
1. Social Justice
	1. Typhoon Yolanda Relief (Joyce) - We’re continuing to support them in any way possible.
	2. DPS Advisory Board Meeting (Aidan) - This past week, the Department of Public Safety had a meeting. We reviewed the crime statistics. They will also be turning a week-long program and making it semester long.
	3. Committee on Manufacturing Responsibility (Aidan) - The proposal is with regards to the Fire Building Safety Accord in Bangladesh. Penn has embraced the Fire Safety Accord approved by the Worker’s Union. We have tried to see if there’s another layer of impact that Penn can add.
	4. Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention at Penn (Joyce) - This is a big issue on campus. This past Thursday, I met with leaders from 1 in 4 and ASAP to discuss a pre-NSO or NSO orientation to aid awareness along with educational tools.
	5. International Student Advisor (Joyce, Julio, Sebastian, Fred) - Something that was brought to my attention was space for international students. Based on continuing conversation with AIS, ISAB and ISS, having a professional student international advisor is the first goal. I mentioned this at a meeting and I got feedback. I also met with Reverend Gibson. President Gutmann asked Provost Kade and he handed it off. This is something that is being taken under consideration. Administration is currently talking about this and I’m excited to see what will happen.
2. Communications

President’s Report

**1.) VPUL:** Cabinet met with Valarie Swain-Cade McCoullum and discussed the interfaith initiative. We will be following up with another meeting in Janaury.

**2.) University Council:** UC met this past Wednesday and discussed reaccreditation and environmental sustainability.

**3.) Athletics Box Office:** Jordan, Tiffany and I met with Peggy to discuss access to the athletics box office for other types of events.

**3.) Council of Undergraduate Deans:** Will be meeting this Wednesday.

Vice-President’s Report

**1.) UA Steering:** Our next UA Steering Meeting will be Tuesday, December 10th from 7:30-8:30pm at the LGBT Center. Our guest will be Rudie Altamirano, the Director of International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS).

**2.) Board Elections:** Congrats to the Anthony Cruz, Varun Anand, Amiyr Jackson, Jane Meyer, Dawn Androphy, Reggie Stewart, Tanya Jain, and as of a few hours ago, Josh Chilcote and Shira Papir, on their elections to the Presidency, Co-Chairmanship, or Vice-Chairmanship of POCO, Penn Democrats, Lambda Alliance, United Minorities Council, and PRISM.

**3.) Meetings with UA Steering Groups:** Met with ESAC, CDAB, LC, Hillel, and Panhel this past week to check-in with new leaders of Steering groups.

**4.) Penn Mobile App Survey:** Look for a survey to be circulated through the UA-Member and Associate Member listservs that will ask you questions regarding what you feel would provide the most meaningful content to the Penn Mobile App. Please fill this out before Thursday of this week!

**5.) Holiday Gift Wrapping:** @ the Penn Bookstore on December 12th and the 13th! Let me know if you are interested in helping out.

UA Report

**1.) Annual Report.** Don’t forget to go to <http://pennua.org/public-documents/annual-reports/> to view the past annual reports. Please look at each of the committees and understand the write ups. There are going to be twelve main projects--three per committee--highlighted with a third of a page each. The rest of your projects (basically everything you’ve done) will be written up, about a paragraph total (written by you) and sent into your committee directors. They may put different timelines on you, but know that each committee must have all of their write ups (both the long ones and the smaller blurbs) to Pratyusha and I by December 10th. From there Pratyusha and I only have from December 11th to January 1st to put together the whole of the report, ignoring the fact that we also have finals and lives and OCR-prep and families and such that we normally catch up on at those times. If you don’t get your stuff in on time, it is basically an affront to us...so be kind and get everything into your directors by the time of the deadline. The annual report is something that is meant to show administrators of what we’ve finished with their help, as well as what we’re going to be doing or are currently working on and need their help doing.

**2.) Year-In Survey.** I’ll be sending out a survey about how the UA has been doing in many different aspects: be it from the sides of UA GBM effectiveness and social atmosphere to committee cohesion and project performance. This is a practice that we’ve done in the past to understand what has been working, what hasn’t, and what can be improved on both the next semester and throughout the rest of the future terms of the UA. It’ll be sent out over the winter break.

**3.) Budget Committee Elections.** Due to a resignation on the budget committee, at our next GBM, January 19th, we will be having elections an open seat on the Budget Committee. The body formally would like to thank Anthony Cruz for the work he has put into the Budget Committee thus far and look forward to seeing the other roles he plays on the UA and throughout campus.

**4.) Birthdays.** Happy birthday to Aymen (today, December 8), Andrew (December 11), Abe (December 23), Justin (December 28) as well as half birthdays to Jane (regularly June 2), Danielle (regularly June 10), Bill (regularly June 12), and Natalie (regularly June 18)!

**5.) Member of the Week.** This member of the week has been working very hard providing a great service to the student body as well as been quite persistent in getting replies from administrators for projects. For this, the member of the week is…

**6.) Jane’s Surprise.** Not entirely sure what this is, but I know better than to cross Jane.

Treasurer’s Report

**Budget**

**Project Updates**

**Discussion Papers**

**Completion Reports**

**Old Business**

**New Business**

**Executive Committee**

**Project Updates**

**Discussion Papers**

**Completion Reports**

**Old Business**

**New Business**

**Proposal II Re Presidential–Vice-Presidential Qualifications for Candidacy**

*Frederick Ding, Will Smith*

Proposer: NEC Elections Subcommittee

Approved: 2013-11-25, 34-0-0 by the NEC

Background

In the 2009–2010 referendum which changed the head of the UA from an internally elected Chair to a popularly elected President, the UA and NEC were empowered jointly to regulate qualifications for candidacy, “which may include petition and experience requirements” (UA Constitution §18.a). As part of this joint regulation, the UA Bylaws and NEC Fair Practices Code require candidates for the UA presidency and vice-presidency to attend executive information sessions, to have petitions signed by 5% of the electorate, and to have 5 signatures from members of the UA. In lieu of each UA member signature, the candidate must have petition signatures from an additional 1% of the electorate.

Thus, the status quo establishes a “5–10%” range.

The sunset provision, UA Bylaws §27, causes these conditions to expire on January 1, 2014. The NEC and the UA must jointly approve proposals regarding the qualifications that either extend or abolish the sunset provision.

The Ad Hoc Committee on UA Elections Bylaws was formed from members of UA Steering to investigate the rules in Section III of the UA Bylaws and propose solutions. It includes:

* Will Smith (UA)
* Frank Colleluori & Frederick Ding (NEC)
* Lindsay Tsai (former UA)
* Mia Garuccio (PRISM, former CUAD)
* Urja Mittal (PoCo)

This proposal emerged from negotiations between the NEC and the UA, incorporating the UA Steering element proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on UA Elections Bylaws.

Rationale

The textual changes to the UA Bylaws and NEC Fair Practices Code would have these effects:

1. Separate the requirements for President and Vice-President
2. Maintain the baseline petition requirement at 5% of the electorate
3. Optionally, enable Presidential candidates to lower their petition requirement to 3% with the support of at least 5 sitting UA members
4. Optionally, enable Vice-Presidential candidates to lower their petition requirement to 3% with the support of at least 5 UA Steering groups
5. Make the Executive Information Sessions optional
6. Extend the expiration of the regulations to January 1, 2018

This proposal differs from previous proposals in that it primarily sets the endpoints of the petition requirement range to sensible and non-arbitrary numbers, rather than attempting to find any equivalence between UA members and the number of people they represent. It preserves the ability for UA members to express their support for Presidential candidates they respect in the process of petitioning, while overall adopting a fairer barrier to entry that can engage the student body.

In the status quo, the incremental amount—1% of the electorate for each UA signature absent—is rather arbitrary. As illustrated below, the status quo establishes a 5–10% range for petition signatures, based on the degree-of-freedom (UA signatures).



However, this sliding bar has two issues:

1. **Fairness.** If incumbents were to conspire against an outsider candidate, the alternative path would be too difficult (up to 10% of the student body is a formidable number from which to get written signatures). Furthermore, it is unfair to give each individual UA member the weight of, for example, 75 voters.
2. **Effectiveness.** A candidate with signatures from 2 UA incumbents does not truly demonstrate that they have the support to lead the UA. Furthermore, UA members give out signatures relatively freely and do not consider the importance of their individual petition signatures.

Under the proposal, the fairness issue is addressed by lowering the range from 5–10% to 3–5%, thus potentially engaging more candidates in UA elections, and making the path without incumbent support more attainable. (See below for how these numbers were selected.) Furthermore, it requires an all-or-nothing bloc of UA signatures in order to express support from the UA membership (and equivalently, UA Steering for the VP), which enhances its effectiveness in giving UA and Steering members a voice in selecting their next assembly’s leader.



Instead of trying to find equivalence between UA members and elector signatures, the endpoints are set as such:

* The upper end, 5% of elector signatures, is consistent with
	1. The current baseline for Presidential/Vice-Presidential candidates
	2. The threshold to initiate a referendum, such as one that would replace the Constitution, abolish these rules, or even recall a President
* The lower end, 3% of elector signatures, is consistent with
	1. The current baseline for any other UA position in general elections, except that the denominator is *all* electors rather than the number of electors in one school

This proposal recognizes that *it should be no more difficult to get on the ballot than it would be to recall an elected official or change the system altogether.*

These rules formalize both the gravitas of the presidency, and the reality that a President needs to be able to lead the body of the Undergraduate Assembly. *As a compromise solution, it maintains the UA membership’s input in putting candidates on the ballot*, without making that provision an insurmountable barrier to entry, and brings us further along in the transition from internally-elected UA Chair to the ultimate end goal, a popularly elected President. Furthermore, for those candidates who do not get incumbent signatures, for political or personal reasons, and those who come from outside the PSG ecosystem, the alternative—direct petition signatures from members of the public—is now an achievable and sensible path.

The role of the UA Vice-President has much less to do with leading the internal members of the UA, and much more with leading UA Steering, a collective of influential and important student groups on campus. In recognition of this specific role, the ad hoc committee proposes using petition signatures from Steering groups rather than UA members for VP candidates. (Note: although UA members, GAPSA, and Penn Dems/College Republicans/Penn Leads the Vote are special observers, they do not count.) This “petition and experience” requirement ensures that VP candidates are student leaders respected by the groups that they are supposed to work with and lead. Unlike endorsements, these signatures behave just like petition signatures; they do not confer an obligation for signatories to vote for or to endorse specific candidates, and they are not published.

Finally, this proposal would change the Executive Information Sessions (EIS) to be optional. While EIS were imagined to be informative, the reality is that NEC members giving the presentations often have nothing more to teach the candidates, who are usually seasoned UA veterans. In the event that someone desires a refresher, or wants to understand better the role for which they are running, the NEC and relevant members of the sitting UA exec will execute an EIS nonetheless.

Current

UA Bylaws

1. In accordance with UA Const. s.18(a), the UA and the NEC determine requirements for candidacy for President and Vice-President by “joint regulation”.
2. Under joint regulation, the UA and the NEC possess equal legislative initiative. The NEC maintains, under their own rules, a set of regulations identical in content to this Section. Either the UA or the NEC may approve changes to these regulations that shall subsequently be sent to the other authority for approval or disapproval. Only those changes approved by both bodies shall be valid; only then shall this Bylaw and the NEC’s copy of the regulations be changed.
3. To be eligible to run, a Presidential or Vice-Presidential candidate must:
	1. attend one of the Executive Information Sessions (EIS),
	2. submit a petition signed by 5% of the total number of undergraduate electors,
	3. submit an additional petition of signed from at least 5 sitting members of the UA, including one member from a constituency other than the candidate, or additional signatures from undergraduate electors totaling 1% for each UA signature below five obtained.
4. All provisions relating to the qualification for candidacy herein contained shall expire on January 1, 2014.
5. The EIS shall be held between the time petitions are released and the time they are due. Multiple sessions should be held; the principal organizers should attempt as much as possible to accommodate all sincere candidates. The NEC shall judge the validity of all borderline cases and special circumstances that may interfere with a candidate’s attendance and make appropriate arrangements.
6. The EIS shall be run by the NEC, and include the Speaker, the President and the Vice-President if they shall not be candidates for an executive office. It shall include an exhaustive overview of the duties of the President and Vice-President, in law and in fact, and substantial opportunity for candidates to interact with members of student government.
7. The NEC shall certify attendance at an EIS and the submission of petitions for the purpose of candidacy.

NEC Fair Practices Code

1. Eligibility Requirements for Candidacy and General Rules of Candidacy
	1. All provisions relating to the qualifications for candidacy, as documented in UA Bylaws III.28, shall expire on January 1, 2014.
2. Candidacy Procedures
	1. Nominating petitions with the required number of signatures are required for certification of a student’s candidacy.
		1. A President or Vice-Presidential candidate must submit a petition signed by five percent of the total number of undergraduate electors. They must also submit an additional petition signed by at least five sitting members of the UA, including one member from a constituency other than that of the candidate, or additional signatures from undergraduate electors totaling one percent for each UA signature below five obtained.
	2. Executive Information Sessions (EIS)
		1. To be eligible to run, a UA Presidential or Vice-Presidential candidate must attend the Executive Information Session.
		2. The EIS shall be held between the time petitions are released and the time they are due. Candidates must attend, and shall notify the Vice Chair for Elections immediately if they cannot attend. The NEC shall judge the validity of all borderline cases and special circumstances that may interfere with a candidate’s attendance and make appropriate arrangements.
		3. The EIS shall be run by the NEC, and include the current UA Speaker, UA President and UA Vice-President if they shall not be candidates for an executive office. It shall include an exhaustive overview of the duties of the President and Vice-President, in law and in fact, and substantial opportunity for candidates to interact with members of student government.
		4. The NEC shall certify attendance at the EIS for the purpose of candidacy.

Proposed

*Italicized text has been newly inserted.* ~~Struck text has been removed.~~ Underlined text has been moved.

UA Bylaws

1. In accordance with UA Const. s.18(a), the UA and the NEC determine requirements for candidacy for President and Vice-President by “joint regulation”.
2. Under joint regulation, the UA and the NEC possess equal legislative initiative. The NEC maintains, under their own rules, a set of regulations identical in content to this Section. Either the UA or the NEC may approve changes to these regulations that shall subsequently be sent to the other authority for approval or disapproval. Only those changes approved by both bodies shall be valid; only then shall this Bylaw and the NEC’s copy of the regulations be changed.
3. All of the following provisions relating to the qualifications for candidacy herein contained shall expire on January 1, ~~2014~~ *2018*.
4. To be eligible to run, a Presidential ~~or Vice-Presidential~~ candidate must submit a petition:
	1. signed by 5% of the total number of undergraduate electors, *OR*
	2. *signed by 3% of the total number of undergraduate electors and* at least 5 sitting members of the UA, including one member from a constituency other than *that of* the candidate.
5. T*o be eligible to run, a Vice-Presidential candidate must submit a petition:*
	1. *signed by 5% of the total number of undergraduate electors, OR*
	2. *signed by 3% of the total number of undergraduate electors and representatives of at least 5 sitting groups of UA Steering, who must file their signatures separately with the NEC.*
6. The NEC shall certify the submission of petitions for the purpose of candidacy.
7. Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates may request an Executive Information Session (EIS).
	1. The EIS, *if requested,* shall be held between the time petitions are released and the time they are due. ~~Multiple sessions should be held; the~~ *The* principal organizers should attempt as much as possible to accommodate all sincere candidates. ~~The NEC shall judge the validity of all borderline cases and special circumstances that may interfere with a candidate’s attendance and make appropriate arrangements.~~
	2. The EIS shall be run by the NEC, and include the Speaker, the President and the Vice-President if they shall not be candidates for an executive office. It shall include an exhaustive overview of the duties of the President and Vice-President, in law and in fact, and substantial opportunity for candidates to interact with members of student government.

NEC Fair Practices Code

1. Eligibility Requirements for Candidacy and General Rules of Candidacy
	1. All provisions relating to the qualifications for candidacy for UA President and Vice-President, as documented in UA Bylaws ~~III.28~~ §III.26–30, shall expire on January 1, ~~2014~~ *2018*.
2. Candidacy Procedures
	1. Nominating petitions with the required number of signatures are required for certification of a student’s candidacy.
		1. *A Presidential candidate must submit a petition*
			1. *signed by 5% of the total number of undergraduate electors, OR*
			2. *signed by 3% of the total number of undergraduate electors and at least 5 sitting members of the UA, including one member from a constituency other than that of the candidate.*
		2. *A Vice-Presidential candidate must submit a petition:*
			1. *signed by 5% of the total number of undergraduate electors, OR*
			2. *signed by 3% of the total number of undergraduate electors and representatives of at least 5 sitting groups of UA Steering, who must file their signatures separately with the NEC.*
	2. Executive Information Sessions (EIS)
		1. ~~To be eligible to run, a~~ *Any* UA Presidential or Vice-Presidential candidate ~~must attend the~~ *may request an* Executive Information Session.
		2. The EIS, *if requested*, shall be held between the time petitions are released and the time they are due. Candidates ~~must attend, and~~ shall notify the Vice Chair for Elections immediately if they cannot attend. ~~The NEC shall judge the validity of all borderline cases and special circumstances that may interfere with a candidate’s attendance and make appropriate arrangements.~~
		3. The EIS shall be run by the NEC, and include the current UA Speaker, UA President and UA Vice-President if they shall not be candidates for an executive office. It shall include an exhaustive overview of the duties of the President and Vice-President, in law and in fact, and substantial opportunity for candidates to interact with members of student government.
		4. ~~The NEC shall certify attendance at the EIS for the purpose of candidacy.~~

**Academic Affairs**

**Project Updates**

**NGSS Update**

*Rahul Gupta and Justin Talesnik*

Thursday's NGSS committee meeting topic was Penn in Touch. The structure of the meeting was less informational and more based on voicing concerns that the Penn student body faces with daily Penn in Touch use. Major ideas included having more efficient Academic Worksheets for cross-school majors and making the course search more accessible for students looking to fill non-College requirements (SSH/Tech Elective for SEAS, for example). These ideas, however, will require full system overhaul and will likely be implemented for the next generation Penn in Touch replacement system. Other smaller issues with the system (glitches, back end problems) were also discussed. Some of these can be addressed with the current system, and others will be put off for the next gen system.

**Uncoordinated Dual Degrees**

*Aymen Saleem, Tunmise Fawole, Andrew Gegios*

Aymen spoke with the College Dual degree advisor and the Wharton dual degree advisor and collected the information on various dual degrees that each offers with other schools. I (Aymen) am currently also in correspondence with some dual degree students and some coordinated dual degree students to get an idea of the difference in their workload.

Andrew talked to the advisor of the Huntsman Program and have been in e-mail communication with Dr. Stokes of LSM and Mr. Boland of M&T. Andrew currently has advising worksheets for M&T (BAS and BSE), Huntsman, NHCM, and VIPER along with a layout of LSM's program. In addition, we have been in correspondence with an M&T transfer and are working on surveying a dual degree panel that appeared in November. It appears that uncoordinated dual-degrees are stressing out students when they really don't need to. Enough curriculum could be covered with fewer course units but this needs to be changed on a case by case basis for each combination of degrees. Starting with the most popular combinations was a suggestion by some students.

**UC Committee on Academic and Related Affairs**

*Yessenia Moreno*

The committee had their third and last meeting of the semester on Thursday, December 5th. We continued our discussion about Ch. 6 of the Self-study report on research. We gave our general recommendations which will be sent to the Vice Provost. Some recommendations include the creation of a better system of tracking the students that do research, whether that is work-study, non-workstudy, independent study, and through CURF. We find it would be useful for there to be a public record of what research is being done and by whom. Also, I suggested that data must be measured of the students that are applying to do research. Misrepresented groups in particular that apply must be given careful attention in order to assess as to why they are not receiving such positions and how the selection process could be reconsidered to generate a more diverse pool of research students. All recommendations and suggestions are due by Dec 20 (see previous GBM minutes for link)

**Discussion Papers**

**Technical Writing Seminar Discussion Paper**

*Angela Ni*

Background

What is technical writing?

Good technical writing results in relevant, useful and accurate information geared to specifically targeted audiences in order to enable a set of actions on the part of the audience in pursuit of a defined goal. It focuses on clarity, conciseness, and at the same time, completeness.

Some engineers, myself included, push back the writing seminar because they feel other classes are more important to take. Engineers have an inclination to take the writing seminar pass/fail because they do not want to put in the excessive amount of labor and effort—that is already inherent in their rigorous science curriculum—for a course that teaches a style of writing that is obsolete in their field. As a student with parents that both work in the scientific field, I have heard them voice their opinions to me about the critical importance of technical writing in their day-to-day careers. Furthermore, graduate students I have talked to have also expressed to me their wish of having had the opportunity to gain a stronger background in technical writing as undergraduates.

I have met with Valerie Ross, the head of the critical writing program. She is adamant about the curriculum of the current writing seminar, and claimed that it provided the writing skills needed for any situation. She claims that Penn students are smart enough to teach themselves forms of technical writing and that that the explanatory section of the writing seminar provided a grounding that can apply to all other career fields. However, as an engineering student I believe that a focus on a more specific type of writing, such as technical writing, would help engineers and students studying STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) fields would better familiarize with the unique, unorthodox style. The university should not just expect students to “teach themselves.” Just as there is a management course that helps students familiarize with group leadership, and a prospective public speaking course that teaches communication skills, there should be a technical writing course that helps further develop the presentation skills and professionalism Penn students are well-known for.

Problem

Not only does Penn’s current critical writing program curriculum lack a technical focus that is vital to an engineer’s professional career, but also there is virtually no other course provided at Penn in which technical writing is taught.

Solution

Ideally, I propose that a technical writing course be created that fulfills the writing requirement. However, I understand this is not feasible. As I have learned from speaking with Valerie Ross, the technical writing component would not fit into the writing seminar curriculum nor be able to fulfill the requirement as it would mandate a complete restructuring of the current writing program model. Thus, instead I propose that technical writing be taught either:

Option 1: In a course on its own, separate from the critical writing program

Option 2 : Be incorporated into an existing course such as an engineering introductory course or general lab course (such as chem lab)

Questions

1. Is this goal worth pursuing in the first place?

2. Of the options listed, which do you think would be most practical and effective?

3. If it were not probable to take this technical writing course in lieu of the current writing seminar, would students still have an incentive to take this course? Are there any suggestions on other requirements it may fulfill?

4. Are there any other helpful administrators I can talk to who will be willing to help carry out this goal/ a similar goal?

5. Any other thoughts?

**Completion Reports**

**Old Business**

**New Business**

**Penn Mobile App Resolution**

*Gabe Delaney*

Background

At the University of Pennsylvania, there is a substantial demand for a both accessible and mobile-friendly source of centralized information. As smartphone owners become more and more ubiquitous both within and without the university, the market for mobile applications that serve the custom needs of the consumer has sky-rocketed. This market extends well beyond the private sector. High schools, universities, independent research centers, government agencies and the like are implementing these virtual gadgets to centralize information pertaining to their specific functions. Perhaps, most pertinently, we have seen several of Penn's peer institutions including Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Stanford, the University of Chicago, MIT, the University of Michigan, Duke, and many more move forward with mobile applications like the one proposed that helps to make the exchange of news, contacts, courses, transportation, athletic events, social gatherings, and dining options on a college campus seamless.

Now, Penn already has a mobile website (m.upenn.edu). The features of this site actually fit with many of the proposed features for the Penn Mobile App. The issue here is not a matter of mobility, but rather convenience. Mobile Apps are Internet applications designed to run on smartphones and other mobile devices, helping users connect to Internet services that are more commonly accessed on a desktop or notebook computer. It should be noted that the mobile site will remain, but a new mobile app would be created for those who prefer the convenience and experience of a mobile app.

There is a unique opportunity with this project to bring about a greater level of sophistication to how we exchange information on campus. In many ways, our peer institutions have moved ahead of us in this regard, but that does not have to be the case moving forward. Below is a set of potential features that I hope may be included in the development of the Penn Mobile App. The full integration of these features is a task that would foreseeably be proposed to the Office of Information Systems and Computing (ISC), as the UA and other administrators feel that this is the best route to developing a truly sustainable mobile application for the university community. It should be noted that ISC will not bear the full responsibility for the fruition of the project. The essential plan will be to have ISC develop the necessary application programming interfaces (APIs) for the relevant departments after which it would be the job of Penn Apps Laps (PAL) to fully integrate these APIs into a downloadable mobile application.

Finally, it is the hope that the cooperation between the UA, PAL, and ISC on this project will provide further support for the UAs Open Data Initiative Resolution, which was passed unanimously by the UA in February of 2012. To be clear, the purpose of said resolution was encourage the University to “make data in various institutional repositories public and machine readable. Such data feeds include real-time bus location data, dining hall menus, building data and job listings, among other things.”

Proposed Features

*Penn Directory*

Links directly to the Penn Directory and allows one to search by first and last name for phone numbers, email addresses, and office location for Penn students, faculty and staff.

*Campus Map (See Appendix A)*

Creates a mobile-friendly platform that allows one to navigate around Penn's campus by searching for classroom buildings, houses, and offices. The map will display the location, and you can zoom in, zoom out or scroll in any direction. You can also browse locations by type, such as libraries or museums.

*News (See Appendix B)*

Get the latest official Penn news, featuring the latest information about the Penn community, arts, culture, science and research. You can share articles using email, Facebook, or Twitter.

*Events (See Appendix C)*

Using the newly developed Events@Penn site, find out what events are planned at Penn any given day. Events from the official Penn calendar, student groups, and other relevant organizations will be available by category with the date and time, and location. Where available, you can click on the event's location to see it on the map.

*Courses (See Appendix D)*

The complete course catalog is searchable across all of Penn’s schools and/or individually within each school. You can type in a keyword or subject to access general information about the course including the course description, meeting times, location, and instructor name where provided. This already exists on Penn’s mobile website, making it easier to transfer over to app-form.

*Dining Information (See Appendix E)*

This would show one “What’s for dinner, and where?” Student dining includes current and upcoming menus for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Also find out the hours for each of the dining halls. This may also be expanded to include the hours and cuisine type for each of Penn’s retail partners (eg. Starbucks Under Commons, The Bridge Café), allowing these groups to make more effective promotions via the app.

*Shuttle Tracker (See Appendix F)*

This allows one to make their way around campus by viewing real-time maps of shuttles and routes, getting up-to-date announcements of changes in service, and viewing bus schedules and calendars. Also available would be phone listings for the “Penn-Ride” shuttle service and locations for parking around campus.

*Emergency (See Appendix G)*

This would give any user instant access to the Penn Police and MERT by simply tapping the link on one’s phone.

*Library (See Appendix H)*

This would allow one to search for and reserve books, which can already be done via computer now. This feature would also display the locations and hours of Penn libraries.

Enactment

The Undergraduate Assembly,

Supports the creation of a downloadable mobile application that delivers meaningful university and student life-related content in a way that is convenient for the average student

Calls Upon the Office of Information Systems and Computing to work with the Undergraduate Assembly in providing this service to the students of the University of Pennsylvania

Encourages the relevant university departments and organs, whose approval and support is needed to carry out this project, to work with the UA and ISC in the formation of the Penn Mobile App by:

* Allowing for the creation of application programming interfaces (APIs) to better organize and synthesize meaningful content on the platform of a mobile device
* Permitting the amalgamation of these APIs into a downloadable mobile application
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**Social Justice**

**Project Updates**

**Typhoon Yolanda Relief**

*Anthony Cruz, Travis Shingledecker, & Joyce Kim*

Attended the PPA General Body meeting on Monday to learn more about how the UA could offer support regarding the planning and logistics for the upcoming events concerning the relief effort. For example, the PPA Typhoon Ice Skating event will take place this Friday at midnight.

**DPS Advisory Board Meeting**

*Aidan McConnell*

Met with DPS to discuss new crime numbers, review development of the Penn Guardian program, discuss new University bike safety and infrastructure policies. DPS briefly discussed lost & found ideas for retrofitting the current system into something more centralized and sustainable.

**Committee on Manufacturer Responsibility Meeting**

*Aidan McConnell*

CMR discussed and passed a resolution affirming Penn’s commitment to worker safety by requiring Penn apparel licensees to sign The Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh. The resolution directly impacts four licensees and places Penn as the first Ivy League institution to emphasize the Accord as a requisite in its business operations with apparel manufacturers (http://www.upenn.edu/pennnews/news/penn-require-licensees-apparel-sign-safety-accord). The CMR is set to discuss garment worker unionization policies and treatment standards as a follow-up to the now-accepted resolution.

**Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention at Penn**

*Joyce Kim, Joanna Kamhi, Jeremy Pincus*

This past Thursday I met with Jeremy Pincus, new 1 in 4 president, Rishi Simha, Joanna Kamhi from ASAP, Karu Kozuma from VPUL, Michelle Goldberg from OSC, and Litty Paxton from Penn’s Women Center. We discussed/were updated on how NSO and/or pre-matriculation training could better be accomplished amongst staff and students who engage with these issues. We spoke about both a short-term and long-term strategy plan for these trainings.

**International Student Advisor**

*Joyce Kim, Nikita Patel, Julio Arias, Sebastian Negron-Reichard, Frederick Ding*

Worked with International Students Advisory Board, Assembly of International Students, and International Students and Scholars Services to talk about having a professional permanent student advisor so that Penn could better met international student’s needs. A concept paper was submitted to Dr. Rudie Altamirano this past Monday and Joyce met with Reverend Gibson (Vice Provost of Equity + Access). Valerie de Cruz (Greenfield Intercultural Center), Karu Kozuma, and Dr. Altamirano will be meeting next week to discuss this further.
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