Housing online with priority changes

By Eleanor Baccay
Contributing Writer

As the new semester is nearing its middle mark, new midterm grade reports will be released to students enrolled in 1000 and 2000-level courses. Midterm grade reports were issued to students last semester for the first time with the aim of improving freshmen retention as well as improving professor feedback to students about their progress in class.

Now, many students are starting to wonder whether or not the reports met their goals.

“They made a huge commitment to involve collaboration among professors as well as academic advisors. The professors needed to give our grades early enough in the semester in order to evaluate whether or not students would receive a ‘S’ for grades ranging from a ‘C’ or higher or a ‘U’ for grades below a ‘C’. Cooperation was also needed among students receiving a ‘U’ to meet with their academic advisor. Collaboration and cooperation were achieved last semester between the faculty and students. Training to their problem,” said Joseph Shoch, Chemical Engineering academic advisor.

Many students in the past have told Shoch that they did not know that they were failing until they received their final grades.

Freshmen retention has been improving over the years at Tech. At the beginning of last semester, 91 percent of second-year students came back to Tech, which is an increase over last year’s record.

Official statistics of freshmen retention is only recorded annually; however, it has been observed at the beginning of this semester that freshmen retention has increased, which could possibly be attributed to the immediate feedback given in the midterm reports.
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U. of Colorado SGA considers partner benefits

By Jessica Fruchter
Colorado Daily

(U-WIRE) University of Colorado—If U. Colorado student government officials have their way, all employees of the Student Union will be eligible for domestic partner benefits. The issue of extension of health care benefits was raised last week when two UCSU representatives authored a bill that would extend current health insurance benefits to domestic partners.

A similar initiative that would have affected all CU employee went before UC's Board of Regents in September and was killed by one vote. Zac Colbert, vice president of UCSU's Legislative Council, said the bill is intended not only to provide health coverage to UCSU employees, but also to bring the issue back into the limelight so that the Board of Regents might reexamine its decision to deny University employees partner benefits.

"We wrote the bill in an effort to comply with the UCSU and the University's non-discrimination clause," Colbert said.

It was only after last Thursday night’s meeting that Colbert and other supporters of the initiative realized UC's legislative council lacked the authority to change health care policies.

Despite the setback, Colbert said, the fight for domestic partner benefits is far from over. While Colbert said he felt confident that UCSU would make progress, Stump said it is too early to tell whether changes could be made.

"It's really a two-prong question: is it possible and how can it be done," Stump said. "I'm not certain it can be done, but it's something we're going to look into.

UC-Berkeley male sexuality class suspended

By Steve Sexton
Daily Californian

(U-WIRE) University of California-Berkeley—The UC-Berkeley male sexuality class was under fire last week after two instructors of the student-run classes took place Friday, following an inquiry into the classes by the Daily Californian.

Those activities came as a surprise to the professor charged with overseeing the course, Caren Kaplan. She is heading the investigation into the reports, which have attracted national media attention.

"The DE-Cal program, which sponsored the class, currently is offering a new seating allocation plan for Bobby Dodd Stadium. The changes were made after 2,000 seats were removed with the construction of the Student Success Center. The new seating plan took effect at the beginning of the next season.

10 years ago: Feb. 21, 1992—The Athletic Association approved a new seating allocation plan for Bobby Dodd Stadium. The changes were made after 2,000 seats were removed with the construction of the Student Success Center. The new seating plan took effect at the beginning of the next season.

20 years ago: Feb. 19, 1982—The Yellow Jackets were defeated by number one ranked Virginia in front of a packed house at Alexander Memorial Coliseum. Although the Jackets led at halftime, the Cavaliers came back for a 56-52 win.

30 years ago: Feb. 18, 1972—Student Body Vice-President Ron Ovetsky began pushing for an off-campus pub that would be set up and run by SGA. The plan came after the idea of an on-campus pub was turned down by the Board of Regents. Several department heads and officials backed the project, including the Director of Campus Planning.
the program and its predecessors. “We’ve done scholarship programs in the past but this is very different,” said Steele.

“The scholarship programs we did in the past included less scholarships and focused on leadership achievements.”

However, the committee wanted to focus on students who had a great impact on campus life that was not necessarily related to leadership experience. “We know that students have an impact on the Georgia Tech campus in many ways and it’s not always through leadership positions,” said Steele.

“We wanted to get away from the sense that we were rewarding the outstanding leaders, although we might still be doing that in some cases. We wanted to expand the search to include [all] students who impact the campus in any way.”

The new program will award ten scholarships of $3,000 each to students who meet the criteria set by Meyers, the students who receive the scholarship won’t necessarily be the more well-known student leaders.

“We will award the scholarships to students who through some activity have made an impact on the campus or student life,” said Meyers. “So that although they may not be some of the more well known student leaders, their activities are notable and make an impact.”

“We want to target students who are emerging leaders or who may be only interested in one area and recognize them and reward them for the good they have done for the campus.”

Steele elaborated on the characteristics the committee is looking for in a potential scholarship recipient. “We’re looking for students who have a lot of passion for their cause, who are successful in what they do and are very industrious in how they go about doing things,” said Steele.

“We’re finding those people who have a lot of passion for their cause, who are successful in what they do.”

“We’re looking for students who have a lot of passion for their cause, who are successful in what they do.”

Rich Steele
Student Center Director

SGA elections on the way

Let the schmoozing, handshaking, and mudslinging begin; SGA elections are right around the corner, as the Undergraduate House recently approved an elections code and schedule for this spring. The official campaigning begins on March 13, and the general elections take place just a few days later. The polls will be open March 25-27.

Students will be able to vote for a number of Undergraduate SGA positions. They will vote for the two main executive officers, President and Executive Vice President, as well as class and major representatives. Each member of the House must be reelected to keep his or her seat.

In addition to voting for executive officers and representatives, students will also be asked to vote on a number of referendums. The Undergraduate House of Representatives already approved one constitutional amendment that will be on the ballot in March. The proposed amendment will increase the size of the Undergraduate Judiciary Cabinet to twelve members, so that it will be better able to handle its increased caseload. The amendment also stipulates other requirements for the UJC, Chief Justice and Justices.

In addition to UJC changes, the undergraduate student body will most likely be asked to approve proposed changes to the honor code written by the Honor Advisory Council. These changes to the code have not yet been proposed to the UHR. Other constitutional amendments have been proposed, but they remain in SGA’s Internal Development committee.

For more information about elections and SGA visit sga.gatech.edu.

Undergraduate SGA Elections Schedule

| February 27 | Candidate applications due to SGA office by 4 p.m. |
| March 13 | Campaign period begins at 12:01 a.m. |
| March 25-27 | General elections (end at 4 p.m. Wednesday March 27) |
| March 26 | Expense reports due to SGA office |
| April 1-2 | Runoff elections (if necessary) |
| April 2 | Runoff expense reports due to SGA office by 4 p.m. |

By Judy Shaw
News Editor
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Housing

According to class standing, the system will find ways to get groups of four to room together, especially. Some quadrads in the Woodruff residence hall for example, are almost identical, and will be considered equally in order to grant a greater number of block housing requests.

"Because the computers will hold more options, we can wait until the maximum number of openings," said Morrison. "Students will be guaranteed a contract, but may not know their specific room. However, if we can choose a room similar to that, there is a possibility that they will get that."

The biggest benefit of the online system is that students will be notified if they will receive a room before they decide upon their preferences of roommates. Under the old system, students were sometimes forced off-campus even after they had requested to be with a group of friends.

During the course of the room selection process, students who have been issued selection numbers will go to the Boggs Chemistry building to select a specific room. This is one of the few parts of the process that has not been converted to an online process.

The selection numbers, once drawn via lottery, will then be listed according to class standing. Waiting-list numbers, however, will not.

Students wishing to sign up for block housing will be ranked on a different list altogether, comprised of the averages of the individual students’ selection numbers. On April 5, students will accept the housing contract electronically.

"We [the committee] discussed if students would simply scroll down and click the accept button without reading the contract, but it was finally agreed that this would be the most efficient way," said Morrison.

Although the revisions were designed to allow the most number of students to be placed in on-campus housing, the new system does not completely eliminate the problem of the waiting-list.

The committee does stress, however, that Tech can house approximately 40 percent of its students, considerably higher than those located in the center of a city. In addition, the committee discussed the future prospect of holding block housing priority for students even before selection numbers are issued.

Under the revisions, block housing will be issued to those students who have already been notified that they would receive housing, but they would have to wait to learn the exact location of their room.

"It's very appropriate for Tech to have this on the web. However, we shouldn't lose the human side of it," E.W. Looney, Undergraduate Vice President of Campus Affairs, said.

"Any other problems will be addressed, hopefully with a solution," Wang said. "The committee believes it has solved a lot of the problems that were there. We have two more years to work on it. By the end of the fourth year the system will be very sound and will be used in the future years."

Changes in housing policies will make more rooms in Woodruff available for block housing. Students will also be able to register for housing online.

Midterms

midterm grade reports. The majority of students who received a ‘U’ on their midterm grade report did end up receiving a ‘C’ or better," said McMath.

In his appearance before the Undergraduate House of Representatives last Tuesday, Institute President Wayne Clough noted that about 60 percent of students who received a “U” in a class actually wound up passing. Clough was pleased with this number, but also noted that more needs to be done to help the other 40 percent of students who did not pass.

However, it seems that to many students the “U” was a wake-up call to perform better. The average GPA for students last fall was 2.9, which was an increase over previous years.

The reality of Tech’s rigorous academics seem to catch freshmen early, and Tech realized that something was needed to ease the shock of receiving unexpected grades.

At the beginning of last semester, students in freshmen experience dorms were asked to estimate what their grade point average would be.

About 90 percent estimated their average to be above a 3.0. However, only 50 percent of those students did receive a 3.0 GPA or higher.

No changes will be implemented in the system of midterm grade reports for this semester. The system will be fully evaluated at the end of this semester to see if changes need to be made. Several issues regarding the midterm grade reports have surfaced that may be reexamined in the future. Concerns about why the reports come after the drop date were presented before the reports were employed last semester.

However, much of the faculty was not comfortable in having enough data points to calculate grades so early in the semester. Making the reports more specific has also become an issue.

"I would like to see an actual grade instead of just an ‘S’ so that it is easier to tell how I’m doing," said INTA freshman Melissa Wallace.

Despite the concerns regarding the midterm grade reports, the reports seem to encourage students to seek help from their academic advisors as well as their professors.

"I think that midterm grades were most beneficial to the students at risk of failing," said Klara Grodzinsky, a Professor in the School of Mathematics.

"Several of these students sought additional help after the reports were filed and improved their final averages."

More statistics about retention can be found www.irp.gatech.edu.

"I would like to see an actual grade instead of just an ‘S’ so that it is easier to tell how I’m doing."
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Senators cut SAC, approve budget
By Jody Shaw
News Editor

The members of the Graduate Student Senate sank their teeth into the budget on Tuesday and made one amendment before passing it. However, because the Senate passed a different version than the House, the budget debate is not over. The $2 million-plus bill will head to a conference committee of graduate senators and undergraduate representatives who will attempt to write a compromise.

The two portions of the budget targeted by the Senators were two of the largest allocations in the bill—Student Athletic Center and Student Center Programs Board. SAC requested funds to buy approximately 80 new squash racquets, which a number of senators found extravagant.

Campus Recreation Director Burch Stamphill was on hand, and he noted that squash racquets are easily broken. Once satisfied with his answers about squash racquets, the senators moved on to questioning other portions of the SAC budget, including the money for office supplies, towels, and Buzz Card reader maintenance.

The office supplies particularly bothered the senators. Just three years ago, the amount of money allocated to SAC for office supplies was $5,000 dollars. Last year, SAC received $10,000, and this year, it requested $15,000. The Senators did not believe that the office supply needs had tripled over the past several years, even though Stamphill noted that intramurals, ORGT and some options programs used the SAC supplies. They decided to cut the allocation to $10,000.

After cutting SAC, the Senators moved on to the Student Center Programs. Maybury proposed cutting the budget of the Concert committee to nothing, since he felt its mission overlapped with two other Student Center committees, Major Programs and Special Events. Much debate ensued, but the majority of senators felt that the Student Center programming budget was already underfunded, and they decided against the cut.

Council Clippings
Senate and House

House debates its reapportionment
By Jody Shaw
News Editor

The Undergraduate House passed two bills allocating over $15,000 to the Student Center Programs Board on Tuesday. The first bill provided a new projector for the movie committee to show films in the Student Center Theater. The second bill actually provided funds to renovate the sound system in the theatre, which currently uses equipment that dates to the 1970s.

An extended debate took place concerning each bill, as Biology Representative Brad Bolton suggested that ad hoc committees be formed for each bill to ensure that the equipment being purchased were the best values. Other members of UHR, however, argued that the Student Center has professionals who research to find the best equipment at the lowest prices. In the end, Bolton lost both arguments, and the bills were approved.

The most extended debate of the evening concerned a bill from the Internal Development committee to reapportion the House. Author Brian George proposed that the current freshmen and sophomore representatives be combined to six underclass representatives, defined as individuals with 0-59 hours, and the totals for junior and senior class representatives be lowered to three. The argument is that under the current system, freshmen are represented by sophomores, and seniors are underrepresented, since they have only three reps compared to the five other classes have.

After much debate and little progress, Member-at-Large Stephen Popick motioned to divide the bill, which had many parts, and vote on each change individually. In the end, the only portions that passed concerned co-op representation, which was reduced to two representatives, one for each semester. The portion regarding the number of hours and when they must be acquired that defines each class representative was remanded to the Internal Development committee, and the proposal to combine the freshmen and sophomore representatives and equalize the classes failed.

Looking closer

Bills Considered

Undergraduate House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Allocation to Stu. Cam. Programs</td>
<td>Andrew Kean</td>
<td>passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Allocation to Student Center</td>
<td>Andrew Kean</td>
<td>passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Allocation to GT Parachute Club</td>
<td>Brian George</td>
<td>passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to UHR Constitution (UJC)</td>
<td>Brian George</td>
<td>passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to Bylaws of UHR</td>
<td>Brian George</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to Bylaws of UHR</td>
<td>Brian George</td>
<td>passed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Student Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002-03 Student Activity Fee Budget</td>
<td>Troy Childress</td>
<td>passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Allocation to Stu. Cam. Programs</td>
<td>David Maybury</td>
<td>not considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Allocation to Student Center</td>
<td>David Maybury</td>
<td>not considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Allocation to GT Parachute Club</td>
<td>Brian Davis</td>
<td>not considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>