



42 U.A.S. 2

Minutes from October 04, 2010

1 Summary of Senate Meeting

The meeting began with a special Senate Development workshop and speech by Tom Kochan, Chair of the Faculty and Professor of Management and Engineering Systems, on how to undergo interest-based negotiation, as opposed to the traditional position-based or stance-based negotiation. He breaks the negotiation down into 4 main important factors: knowing your interests, understanding the balance of power, figuring out options, and deciding on results. Kochan uses various exercises and case studies to try and help us create questions that gauge the true interests of the opposing party, in order to appeal and alleviate those interests. Many of the Senators seemed to enjoy this learning experience. Kochan cautioned the Senate to make sure that they always knew their base interests and when to pull out. Kochan also discouraged email since it removes the personal factor.

Afterwards, there was a conversation with Oliver Thomas on Senate's recommendations on Athena printing. Among possible changes in the near future are hold-and-release printing, multifunction printers, more workstations, printers that have direct printing access to Stellar, etc. There are plans for future pilots at strategic locations, and Thomas urged us to continue to provide feedback via his contact email.

Among the legislative business of Senate: minutes approval of 42 U.A.S. 1 was moved to next week, so that Senators may have sufficient time to look them over. Then, Alex Dehnert was appointed Parliamentarian of Senate. Among the items mentioned in the Exec Update, Vrajesh notes that the UA has obtained more money from the Dean of Student Life to support Student-Faculty Dinners. In addition, the advisory committee has been quite a success. Special compliments were given to Alex Jordan for institute representative nominations, as well as Christine for the Fall Festival.

Senate proceeded to pass 42 U.A.S. 2.1, the Bill to Reutilize the Former Game Room based on Student Opinion, which tasks the Committee on Space Planning to gather further input from students before making a final decision, given certain parameters and recommendations for the Game Room. 42 U.A.S. 2.2, the Bill to Amend the Bylaws on Parliamentary Procedure was postponed till next week.

Finally, Tim Jenks was nominated as an Institute representative; 42 U.A.S. 2.3, a bill on Senate minutes, was postponed to the next meeting; and closing remarks were made by the Speaker and the President with regards to reaching out to constituents. Surveys were distributed to Senators who will be giving them to constituents over the course of the next week.

2 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 pm.



3 Roll Call

The following members were *absent* without being excused:

Samuel Rodarte, Senator for Ashdown/NW35
David Jia, Senator for MacGregor House
Samuel Acquah, Senator for Next House
Cameron McCord, Senator for Fraternities
Cody Zoschak, Senator for Fraternities
Katherine Fang, Senator for Sororities
Christine Chen, Chair of the Events Committee

The following members were *absent and excused*:

Ellen McIsaac, UA Treasurer
Adam Bockelie, Chair of the Committee on History
Cynthia Bouldrick, Chair of the Finance Board

The following were sent as *proxies* for members:

Rachel Meyer for Sivakami Sambasviam, Senator for Sororities
Rebecca Krentz-Wee for Alex Dehnert, Assistant Vice President of Information Systems and Senator for Independent Living Groups

The following members were *late*:

Vivek Dasari, Senator for Burton Conner
Jason Hu, Senator for Next House
Richard Dahan, Chair of the Committee on Student Life

4 Senate Development: Negotiation

Jonté C.: Alright, thank you guys for coming out. We have a great speaker tonight, talking in terms of developing skills and negotiation: Thomas Kochan, Chair of the Faculty and Professor of Management and Engineering Systems.

Tom K.: Thanks for the invitation! I'm delighted to be here. What I decided I'd do is give a real quick example of what we do when we teach negotiation. This is an excerpt of what I teach in 15.668, designed to teach all of you what the world of work is in early stages of your career when you don't have all this authority and a big office. We'll do a little bit of negotiation; what we'll do here is a quick overview and a sort of case study. 15.665 is a full course on negotiations in Sloan School, but you're welcome to enroll in that course. We're really interested in building these kind of skills as part of leadership development. This will be a sort of teaser/introduction. What I'd like to do is begin with the problem posted on the slide.



Suppose Chancellor Clay said, 'Our tolerance for student hacks on the Dome has to end. Our lawyers tell us the risks are just too high and these pranks obviously take time away from students' academic work. From now on anyone who does a hack on the Dome will be subject to discipline and potential expulsion. You need to communicate this new policy to the student body.' That's the problem. I'm going to work through this and come back to this as phrased. There are two questions. I would say something a little bit more socially acceptable. This gets us into two opposing positions in negotiations. What leads you to say this? Those of you in Spring remember the Boston firefighters. It took about three weeks of my life to work through a solution of drug testing. This summer, the State merged the Mass Highway department, the Mass Turnpike, and a couple of smaller agencies all into one organization. That brings all of the employees into one union. Again, complicated negotiation. It's really important that we learn these trades.

How many of you have taken a negotiations course? Ah, one.

Tim R.: It was more like a leadership camp.

Tom K.: Well, by all means ask questions, and we'll try and go by. The four basic building blocks are very simple: interests - what do you want?, power, options - what are my options?, and the results. What do you want to get out of this? You've got to live with the people at MIT. The next time you come back to this association, you need to make sure you don't have mistrust, and you want to always worry about substance and how you leave a relationship.

There's a lot of stuff written now around reforming negotiations. There is position bargaining. You see it a lot in the Middle East. We're going to continue to build settlements in the West Bank, or we'll stop, etc. That's the traditional bargaining, and we'll come back to what it looks like. There's another approach, but sometimes there's another way to do it. Another option is interest-based bargaining or principle based bargaining. If you say you need a 10 percent bargain, why do you want that? What is your true interest behind this? Such as, my family is in significant danger. Maybe we can start to bargain. Originally, I wouldn't know if it was some kind of bluff, but I know the reason behind it. Once you can get off of these positions, you can start to deal with each party's problems to see if you can bargain. One of the things we want to do tonight is to kind of reframe these situations.

What are the differences? In position bargaining, if you're in it, you've got to know your bottom line. You need to know when you're going to walk away from this. If I'm buying a used car, I've got to know what I'm going to pay for this. If you're selling, you need to know how many miles, how much it's worth, etc. You need to go in with a very clear bottom line; otherwise you don't know when to stop. You make these positions nice and public; you have strong commitment. You limit communication by having a spokesperson do the work. You don't talk much unless you have something clear to say. And so on. You can go down this list, we won't go through all of them. There's a set of tactics if you're in a positional discussion, too.

The interest-based tries to break us out of this. It's more in tune with these ongoing relationships. You're going to have big debates in Senate, and you're not going to all agree what your priorities are. You're going to have different priorities, so you want to make sure you allow those different interests to be reflected in these negotiations. You really want to get down and understand the goals. Why are you concerned about these topics? That means you've got to share a lot of information. You've got to share information with each other or with those on the other side. Sharing information means



much more information shared across the table in problem-solving groups. This allows people to do their research and work together.

Once we understand everyone's clear interests. Sometimes we can achieve most of everyone's interests, and sometimes we need to find some creative interests to compromise between the two. Any time any one of you has a different spokesperson, you need to go to your separate rooms and the spokesperson comes back and talks. You just write down ideas without judging them, and you slowly work through a process to see which ideas have backing behind it. If we can apply that with negotiations, then we can open up to more possibilities.

Suppose you were a maintenance team leader (reference the sheet). Help me transform this into an interest-based space. What are his interests?

Tim R.: He wants to do his job.

Will S.: He wants to do his job well.

Shuang C.: The promise made a few months ago was not kept.

Jessica C.: He doesn't want you to get in trouble? Maybe he's worried about you.

Candace C.: He also might be afraid of not being taken seriously.

Tim R.: There may be a time management issue.

Tom K.: So, we now have 8 different hypotheses. How would you know which one is his real one?

Daniel H.: Just ask him. Run down the list.

Daesun Y.: Take him out for drinks.

Tom K.: That's possible. Just go somewhere else; change the environment.

Candace C.: Try and expand the options?

Will S.: Just ask why is it important to train you.

Tom K.: Good. Just remember, all of your questions were questions. We don't know. You might know this guy a little more, but we're just guessing. But the first step in an interest-based process is to just ask. Help me understand why this is of great concern to you. Maybe you'll hear the various reasons. You need to open it up. Keep pushing. Questions one after another. Do I hear you right? Then, put it back. Let's see if we can find the resources, etc. Once you begin to understand, then, we can go to the next step.

The next step is to figure out who's got the power to do it. The power is the ability to bring out the desired outcomes. Too often we think somebody else has got it all. Erase that from your thinking. If you're dealing with a Chancellor, you can't overcome the positional power; he has a budget, position, etc. But, you've got alternative sources of power. First of all, you have a lot of ideas and information; you may know some things about the student body that he doesn't know. You may have some expertise because you've been doing some of these. Those are sources of power you can bring. You have colleagues; you can build a coalition. You can find out more about what's really in the interests of hacking on the dorm. What do they care about? What don't they care about? You can work to build on the trust that you've established in prior relationships. You can build up that trust, and you can build up those relationships with others. Why is the Chancellor



so uptight about this? There are coalitions. Sources of power. Ways of broadening out. We can spend more time, but it's worth thinking about. Where can I develop some power that I don't have? When we deal with these issues though, if I leave you with one piece of advice: never go into a negotiation unprepared. Make sure you know what your interests are; try to understand the others; do your research to know your options; think through to mobilize different sources of power; try to understand your own personal style: if you're reluctant to talk, bring somebody with you. Try and understand what kind of people you're dealing with. Know what your best alternative to negotiating agreement is. What happens if you don't agree? What are your consequences?

Before we go through this Chancellor problem, let me put it in real terms. The year before, the issue of the career fair came up. I didn't know a thing about this, but I knew it would be a problem. You have to introduce a resolution in one faculty meeting, and you bring it up at the next. The faculty introduced it in May, and I thought this is not good. You're not going to have enough support. I don't want to bring chaos to the floor. I did some homework over the summer, and I said - we don't have the votes. I called Mike, and I said, 'I don't think you've got the votes. I don't want to take down something you've worked so hard on.' So I said, 'Why don't you go back and talk to the faculty who voiced opposition. Go back and try to understand their concerns, probe for their interests.' I knew what some of these concerns were, and I tried to engage them in some of these conversations. I think if you try to understand, you could build this coalition to have a power to go to the faculty. To his credit, he did; he worked all summer. He went back and found out some of them didn't think it addressed the needs of freshmen. Some were concerned that it was taking time away and students who didn't want it were penalized. Over time, we found ways to tweak this resolution to address each of these concerns. Then, we came back to the faculty and said, 'Now we got something.' We took over the faculty, and not only did it pass unanimously, we got applause at the end.

Now, let's go back to the chancellor's hacking problem. How might you reframe this to a more interest-based approach? Let's take about 4 minutes. Turn to groups of three and brainstorm how to transform this into an interest-based approach. Identify some of the options.

Let's start discussing. (Here are some of the results given by the assembly:)

1. You could try and see if they're losing grades or skipping academic work. Then, we can stop it based on...

Tom K.: You need to be careful. Don't jump to options. That's what MIT students love. Help me understand the interests.

2. Well I guess some of the interests can be if they're worried about how their parents would react.

Tom K.: How do you know that that's an interests?

3. Their positions seem like they're trying to assure the appearance of safety.

Tom K.: That's a really good guess; how do you know though? How do you find out what's really in the interests?

4. I'd talk to the lawyers and such and see how we can deal with the legal concern interests.

5. One question is like why now?

Tom K.: Why are you so exercised about it right now? Why now? That's a good question. You



might get more information.

6. Is there something specific about hacking that takes away from academic work?

Tom K.: Tell me more about why you're so concerned. Why is it hacking?

7. Why the dome?

8. Does this have anything to do with the recent attack on BU?

9. I would ask if it has anything to do with like visibility and publicity?

There's something behind this kind of strong statement. The first step is to try and unpack that. To ask these good questions you're asking and to not jump too quickly to solutions. You may solve a problem that doesn't exist. Then, the question is: have you done your homework with your constituents? What do they think? What ideas do they have? Are there people that are really against this? Are we working within the culture, or is this something that's going to break the deep norms? Understanding that is part of being a leader - knowing when doing something will change the culture.

These are some of the tools. I'll encourage you to use them. There are classes on negotiations in Urban Studies and Sloan school. We believe in action-based learning. First, learn some basic concepts. Then, go out and try it. Then, come back and talk about what worked and what didn't work. We only internalize when we talk about it in brief and learn that sure as hell didn't work or that really worked. That way you internalize it. Learn some basic concepts. Use them, try out. Try it again. Please put these concepts to work. You're doing such good work, and we want this governance process to really work. So listen for interest, work on reframing, and understand when you're bumping up on culture. So, let me stop here and we have a few minutes left to see what's on your mind.

Insert quick discussion.

I run the faculty policy committee. I oversee other faculty. We meet periodically with the Provost, Chancellor, and President. We have faculty meetings, etc. Let me stop and see what's on your mind. What's on this role, how can we work together effectively?

Daesun Y.: When you first posed the Chancellor problem, I didn't think of him as a human being. Once you got into all these traits that kind of humanized the Chancellor, it seemed better to be interest-based.

Tom K.: I think the worst enemy of negotiations is email. Email doesn't give you the personal side of Phil Clay, our Chancellor. When he had to write things down, it looks authoritative and cold. Sometimes you read it, and you're offended by it. We've all sent those kind of emails, and we're all human beings. When you know what lies beneath the words, because you know them personally, you can use email. But try to understand them and get to know the person.

Candace C.: I noticed the Chancellor problem didn't really talk about his personal opinion. So, maybe he wouldn't quite agree with what he was stating then. I would kind of treat him like a friend.

Tom K.: If you ever get to the airline, and your flight has been cancelled. Often the person on the other side is just citing stuff. Don't be afraid to say: I've got to be at home for a wedding or



something. What do you think I could do? What do you think are the options here? It may be possible to differentiate that person from his position. Insert various examples.

Allan M.: I was wondering what you do if you come up with a person who will not play in the interest-based field.

Tom K.: You just work with that person, but you've got to understand that. You've got to push back. Try agreeing to some ground rules, and if I couldn't get the leader to deal with it this way, then I'll have to come up with alternatives. First, you test out if you can feel the waters or try something different. Sometimes, reframing it. Let's look at the data, etc. Sometimes just calling it something else and probing for different alternatives can work; be careful when you're dealing with someone that doesn't care about the relationship. You folks have a long agenda, and I don't want to overstay my welcome. I appreciate the opportunity to meet. I think it's a tremendous service to the Institute, and I think it's a tremendous leadership development opportunity. I urge you to take advantage of the course work, ask for more workshops, train your skills and tools, practice it, come back and talk about it with each other, and reflect on it. I think it will really serve everybody here. Good luck, and don't be afraid to raise issues.

Recess Begins: 8:36 PM Recess Ends: 8:40 PM

5 Discussion

5.1 Changes to Athena Printing

Jonté C.: We are going to start with changes to Athena printing, our topic last week. Oliver Thomas is back. You guys have once again been going out to the constituents, and we'll start to discuss some of that feedback.

Oliver T.: So, just to refresh you guys on the background. There were a couple of past course recommendations that came out last fall around Athena and printing. They were fairly general and both of them suggested that we spend some time going into detail. So last spring, Dan Hastings created a working group to look at both of those in an initial case. We came back with a report in mid-May that had some information and some next steps for the sponsor question. At this point, the Phase 1 recommendations have been accepted. Let me just talk a bit, and if you have any questions, just ask.

On printing, one of the things I thought went very well were just the considerations for charges of printing. They were dismissed early on. We've been working on trying to save money by reducing waste. We've also considered making it a little easier. We've considered working on peer institutions and off of the surveys that the UA have actually released. Probably the most prominent change was the switch of the public printers to hold-and-release models, which basically means that you send the job to the printing infrastructure and then you go to the printer to release it. Now, we hope it will take away waste issues and improve visibility.

A second recommendation was to move it to the printers. The hold and release isn't authenticated and held back at the client. We used to have identification for all the issues. Now, Kerborized printing has fallen on the wayside. There's no real authentication, so doing anything like quotas is



really hard right now. This is due to changes in Windows and such. There were some recommendations on quotas in the report. The idea is we choose a quota on users that are high enough that it will only affect a small number of people. The initial quota was roughly 3000 pages a semester, and only 100 people went over that. It's very hard to tie people to that, but it was mostly not students.

Alex D.: You said they weren't students. Does that mean they were faculty?

Oliver T.: We're not sure. All we really know is the username and not much more. There were a lot of Administrators which could be anyone.

We should also emphasize that this is for academic work.

Alex J.: Does it work that when you swipe it with your ID during the release part of hold-and-release, that it is authenticated by you, so it doesn't matter who prints it, but rather who releases it?

(8:49 PM Jason Hu enters.)

Oliver T.: We're thinking about it. There needs to be some work on the hold and release stations. We'd also not want to restrict the computers that can print. We'd need to find a way of having the release stations work efficiently that can map your user name from a personal computer to your ID. I think we want to do a few more pilots around the user interface.

The other thing that wasn't specifically in the recommendations that was talked about a lot. With the quota, we don't really have the kind of flexibility we need. This includes getting multi-function printers. Scanning will come in handy for the RFP process, where you guys need to submit receipts. The reason the copying piece has been tricky in the past is because we have a slight idiosyncratic process. We have unlimited Athena printing, but copying costs money. With quotas, everyone can choose what they want to use it on.

Alex J.: What's CopyTech's slate on this? What is their take on putting a copier in an Athena cluster? If that allows you to print 3000 pages even on the copiers or printers, does CopyTech oppose that?

Oliver T.: They won't. They would get money from us. We have our own budget on this. We would continue to spend that budget on printing. There may be some subtle changes we still need to make. CopyTech is fine with it.

Jonté C.: I would like to remind the assembly that we're in discussion format, so I would like all the laptops with the exception of the Secretary-General to be closed at this time.

Oliver T.: I suppose there is a little bit of concern. I think the concern is everybody goes up to 3000 pages. That's not the pattern we see so far, so I don't think stuff will change that drastically. I'm also hoping that scanning is a lot easier. Part of my motivation to switching to that is to get that infrastructure in place. This allows us to get some partnerships built up.

One of the cool things about hold and release printing is it has a new structure. We're looking at something called Feros. Copytech already has some familiarity running it. One of the nice things about Pharos is that it gives you virtual printers. What that basically means is that there's really only one print queue for every type of printer out there. For example, we might have just one print queue based on printer type. So you can walk up to any black-and-white printer if you printed to



one and you can hold and release it from that.

Hold and release basically makes the job free. There's no submission cost. You can submit the job; you can choose to print it or not. Also, with hold and release, you might just be able to email the job. There are also kind of longer term possibilities, such as for high-capacity jobs.

(Adam Bockelie enters.)

There's one other thing I should talk about which is what was new this summer. The printers and CopyTech have been relatively smooth in the hardware side and the service side. The other big change of the summer was that the dorm printing was not covered under the same service contract. Therefore, dorms are no longer printing for their own printers. It just seems cleaner for a transition.

If you guys need discussion topics, one of the things I would like to get out of today is to try and reach some kind of consensus around policy and numbers.

Krishna E.: If we install these new multifunction printers, we run the risk of students running closer to 3000, and we're going to be printing more as a whole. What will that do for the costs?

Oliver T.: I think for the long term, this notion that it doesn't cost money to the public printers could be problematic. I think you'll see a shift from copytech to athena clusters. Their revenue will go down also. The short answer is, I don't think it's a big enough concern for us right now to try and engineer a completely comprehensive policy that takes all of these changes in account. If we end up going way over budget, we'll need to figure something out. It might be tweaking quota. With something like Feros, it can keep track of printing or making copies. We could potentially charge back for making copies. I don't really want to go there because it will encourage people to scan and print. The third phase of this is it's probably better to understand what people are actually printing. It can help us out. Course packs might be delivered to the dorm and people might be more willing to pay.

Krishna E.: I guess my other concern was also in terms of visibility for students. People printing really long jobs can be a problem if you want to print something out. Also, are the multifunction devices more likely to break?

Oliver T.: The multifunction devices are less likely to break. A big issue that we've had is the job translation. If you send a properly formatted job to printers, it actually prints really fast. With all of that, you're still going to have queuing issues. One of the things we're going to have to look at is where the higher multifunction things are going to have to go. There's 5 printers right now. They're all the same black and white printers. Queues can get really long on them. We may want to look at some clever queuing. There's the possibility of sending lots of jobs to lots of printers, but I wouldn't want to do that without feedback. One possibility is we actually have some really high quality printers. You can go print it out there. Maybe there are one or two IFPs where all the jobs need to get printed on. So, there are a lot of options. I'm a little bit reluctant to design this issue without feedback.

One of the options is you can release it from any printer. You can just go to another printer and release it from there.

Allan M.: First of, thank you for coming. The whole hold and release thing sounds like there is a lot of potential. My question is can you speak of rough numbers of what the savings will be?



Oliver T.: I can give you some guesstimates. Basically printing and public printing that includes consumables, service, etc. It's about 270000 dollars. That's actually not a huge number, if you think about how many people. We bought about 9 million sheets of paper and roughly 60-70 percent of that paper ran through our printers. The other piece we did some research on was how much paper gets printed and never leaves the clusters. Turns out that about 20 plus or minus 5 percent a day on paper that gets printed doesn't actually leave the cluster. That's really kind of significant. The actual printing that goes on may go up. If we break even, I think we'll be really happy about that. If we save some money, that would be great to look on some service side features. Right now we're really talking about effective but relative low quality standing. I'm hoping that we'll save some money.

Alex J.: I think that a lot of ideas you brought up were really cool and exciting, especially the potential to have certain default things. I was thinking if you can do that with documents on Stellar. That way, you can just swipe and print and you don't need to download the file on the computer.

Oliver T.: That actually sounds really cool, and we have all the parts to do it - so it's certainly possible. I think we'll find a way to pilot it soon. Some of the hold and release stations we want to try out include a card swipe so it's certainly easy to get on stellar. I think you're probably in a better position to identify things that are problems with hold and release than we are.

Another thing that I may ask you to think about and give feedback on are potential options. Stellar is kind of an interesting one, because it includes weekly stuff. It also includes semesters and course readers. Often those are uploaded as huge .pdfs. It might actually be interesting to make course packs smaller chunks, check box that somebody uploads that these are intended for printing or not really intended for printing, etc. Those are the kind of things that you're in the kind of position to help us do.

Jonté C.: Please keep your questions short and to the point from now on.

Daniel H.: Copying is actually a better savings. Can you comment on that?

Oliver T.: I'm glad you brought that up because it is true that there are more savings on a page by page basis for copiers. Interestingly, we've only seen relatively small jobs. I think that having actual places to make copies, where you don't feel like you're pushed into policies violations, is important.

Daniel H.: I think that it's really good to have a card to just swipe. But, it's also nice to be able to log in.

Tim J.: I live in a fraternity, so I was wondering if there's a potential to give some money to fraternities to subsidize these printing costs.

Oliver T.: We had a similar question that came up. The volume in the dorms was high enough that, as I said, it just seemed to make sense to not be overly complicated in the policy and just start treating those printers as cluster printers. There is a risk there, in that just because we can't take the total cost and divide it by students. That would mean that your residents don't do any printing. The more likely scenario would be on looking at the possibility of printers for FSILGs. The same quota applies but is not just on campus. There are a lot of issues, for example CopyTech doesn't do service off-campus. However, we've had a bit of luck working with FSILGs, such as the



network updates. There's a lot of opportunities to do some kind of hybrid model.

Suan T.: They want a max cap on the number you can print at a time. [?]

Oliver T.: Those are actually exactly the kind of things we want to work out this fall. Max daily pages was a possibility that was brought up. Another possibility was you get a quota that was divided into chunks. Therefore, you don't blow dry by the end of the semester if you used up your quota. There's a lot of complications. That's where the partnerships come in and that's where the surveys come in. We're probably not at the best position to reach out for a large number of undergraduates. Seems like partnering with the UA is a better way to come up with a policy. Feel free to volunteer yourselves to work with us more closely. The goal is to have an implementation that seems student driven. We would also like more color printers. We would also like to control the jobs that go to color printers. It turns out that color printers are not very effective at printing at certain jobs.

Jonté C.: If there aren't any objections, I'm going to extend the discussion by 10 minutes.

Owen D.: With this new service plan, is there still potential to steal paper to nonprinting?

Oliver T.: It makes it a lot harder to testify drastic measures because you're not saving a huge amount of money. And you're actually not saving a huge amount of paper. If we want to keep paper flowing, just the labor cost is more than the paper. Also, if printing actually gets easier in the public environments and more convenient, it becomes preferred for students to leave the rooms.

Almas A.: I just want to clarify something for the dorm printer paper. McCormick never seems to have paper.

Oliver T.: Both printers have stickers for the institute copy program. The house managers know to request paper and toner from the CopyTech. Front desk staff should, but I can't promise you that they all do. What they will do, though, is they will deliver paper to the front desk.

Almas A.: It seems more like an internal issue. I just wanted to know it's an issue.

Owen D.: One thing you can also do is send a note to IST help. I can, in fact, send one for you, so we know that that's going on. I would encourage you to take advantage of the service address for all of these kinds of things. Don't be afraid to send an email to that address.

David C.: Can we talk real quickly about quickstations? I was just wondering if you could get some more in more distributed locations? I'd like to see like a quickstation on the first floor of every building, period. Failing that, one within the near vicinity. Like bathrooms. You know there's going to be a bathroom every 50 feet. That will be the idea here.

Oliver T.: We'll see how much money. It's not quite as ambitious as in every building. There's also another recommendation that you could very well have feedback on. Another recommendation is to drive down the cost of every station. One of the long term proposals on this report. I don't want to spend too much time on this report. In the W20 cluster, there might be a lot of opportunity. Long term, we're trying to work on the distribution requirement with quickstations. We'll really look at 3 spaces that have a lot of different functions on cafe systems and all. There can be a little bit more diversity than our normal model. A faculty member on the working group really wanted certain characteristics.

Will S.: When is the pilot coming out?



Oliver T.: We're already talking about a few possibilities and we're looking for a lot of guidance from you. There's currently one downstairs and one in Baker. We're currently in the process of setting up a Feros structure. What I'd like to do is look at a few more pilots, ideally some in a residential context and some in a public culture context. Probably around specific features. It might be interesting to have some pilots of hold and release stations.

Will S.: Would it be possible to have some on the East side of campus?

Oliver T.: Don't be shy to bring out your dorm. But think about what kind of usage in your dorm will help us kind of monitor the performance of these things. For example, if your dorm is kind of far or unused. One kind of case we'd like to have a pilot around is sort of this notion of submitting a job from your room. Lerman downstairs is seeing a little bit of that kind of usage right now. If you do have a pilot around that, I think it might be interesting to couple that with a little publicity campaign to try and encourage people to use it awhile and collect some feedback. I think that at this point the inbox for suggestions on pilots is wide open. Obviously if every dorm wants to be a pilot dorm, I'd want to see how we can have these representative cases. Even if you're not a pilot case, you can still help.

Tim R.: We have other business, so I'm going to forward all my business to you in an inbox. Thank you very much for your time. You've been really informative.

Oliver T.: Just a quick question. I assume you're going to share my contact information.

Vrajesh M.: Yes.

6 Approval of Minutes from 42 U.A.S. 1

Motion to approve the minutes.

Some points of information

Jonté C.: I'd like to follow Robert's Rules. Please indicate orders. I would like to not waste too much time on details today. I'm going to bring the motion back up.

Motion to approve the minutes reiterated.

Jonté C.: The matter of the assembly is to approve the minutes as you see before you. They came out over email. I would like to open discussion.

Tim J.: I think 33 pages of minutes is too long. I think minutes only need to contain not the most important parts. I think anything that is not irrelevant to the meeting should be in the minutes. I think if you do that it would be shorter. Some people think you need to write down every word. I think that because this is Senate and these are Senate meetings, they should be transparent and concise. When I approve the minutes, I'm not going to read through all of this.

Rachel M.: I don't think we should approve the minutes tonight. I don't think we should address it tonight, since most people didn't have a chance to talk. I was also wondering if I can bring up new discussion.

Jonté C.: I'm going to have to double check the rules, but we might have discussion later.



Rachel M.: I think the original topic was in the agenda.

Jonté C.: That's a good point, we'll move it to after 10:15 additional nominees. We'll talk about Athena printing and enrollment, and people can bring up new topics. Are there any questions? The agenda stands approved.

Tim R.: When I was looking over the minutes, I found that everything I said was in order. I think the purpose of the minutes is to be transparent, and it is up to the senators to summarize the agenda. It's not possible to remember everything, but I feel like it's kind of your responsibility to summarize that. This could be done at the Secretary-General level. I guess my point is that this is the kind of job and I don't see what the complaint is; it's kind of concise and has everything in order as opposed to having a short version.

Adam B.: I think it's important that the minutes contain all the points and counterpoints and all the salient items in the order that they are brought up. I think attribution is essential, but at the same time, I don't think that transcripts are necessary. I also don't think it's too hard to hit ctrl f to find all your responses.

Alec L.: I think senators should learn to speak more concisely if you want to avoid ramblings.

Tim J.: I think that you should consider whether or not to approve these minutes based on if you actually read them.

Vrajesh M.: I think it's a fair point to postpone the minutes approval to next week because there wasn't enough time.

Jonté C.: The question is whether or not we can move to postpone the approval of these minutes until the next regularly scheduled meeting which is 42 UAS 3. I believe it's not the coming Monday but the one after that. A motion to divide the body has been put forward.

Motion passes with 15 to 3.

7 Opening Remarks

Jonté C.: I have up here motion charts. I've also put together a handout on how we plan to run the meetings. If you have any issues with them, please raise a point of order. When you're speaking, please rise. If you want to be on the queue, raise your hand. You're allowed to speak for one minute. According to Robert's Rules, you guys are allowed to speak on a certain motion at most twice and then move on. Laptops should be closed at my request. The only reason I'm going to request that is because I feel like it will move the conversation a lot more quickly. At any time, you may raise a point of order about a certain thing that were deciding. There's details on the two modes. Straw polls are not in order. On the back are the motions. If you have any questions, we can talk about this afterwards.

We have appointments for the Senate officers. On that, I'm appointing for Sergeant-at-Arms. He's not here...we'll move it to another date. For Parliamentarian, I'm appointing Alex Dehnert. Please use him as a resource, he has a lot of experience with Robert's Rules.



8 Exec Update

(Off-the-record section)

Vrajesh M.: As far as the Exec update goes, there were no action items last week, so there's no real update on those. We're posting on the website, under transparency, the status update for each individual committee. Some committees are very good at submitting these updates, and others are not very good. I don't want to go into that level of detail, because that's going to take a lot of time. I do want to update on what I, Sammi, or other officers have been working on.

We are currently in the final phases of drafting a memo with the Chancellor, and the goal is to clarify the best ways of student engagement in Institute Committees. This comes out of the Task Force for Student Engagement. If you have further questions for that, you can talk to Sammi and me.

We further talked to Dean Colombo and got additional money. We can have 5 more student faculty dinners a semester. We also noted a discrepancy in the student life fee. We're trying to find potential causes. I will update you next week, and hopefully we can find out the missing part of the pie. If you multiply the number times the number of students and you subtract all of the money, there's money left over. Maybe it's just going somewhere and it's not labeled. We'll find out - it's a sizeable amount.

CJAC met last Thursday. The undergraduate members on there are me, Benjamin Mensah, and Hattie Chung. Ben and Hattie were nominated through the UA nominations committee. It specifically has no administrators on that, and it's a very useful. The meeting is in the process of being rescheduled.

The advisory committee that met last Thursday was moderately successful. It provided us with a brief oral report. I think kind of one of the main successes of that is the fact that I got kind of all of the sessions together. It was nice to see that there was a positive light.

Sammi and I will be meeting with IS&T to get a better view of the timeline that online reg is on (online registration) as opposed to just preregister. We are also working with the career office. We will be meeting with the career office.

There's two final notes. All of the vacancies have been filled, snaps to Alex. Alex will begin reaching out to Institute Reps this week to have that communication be a regular thing.

On a final note, Fall Festival happened, and I heard a lot of good things about it. Snaps to our events committee chair who is not here.

9 42 U.A.S. 2.1: Bill to Reutilize the Former Game Room Based on Student Opinion

Jonté C.: Now we are prepared to move on to 42 U.A.S. 2.1 - introducing legislation. When I call questions, I stand. When you guys address the assembly, please also stand. I'll pass it onto Betsy to introduce it.



Betsy R.: *Reads the text* I guess I can just explain why we chose that order. It seemed like last time many of our constituents wanted food options and lounge space. I think this combines it pretty popularly. It was also by far the most popular for me. In general people also wanted food. We put the Game Room third because it is sort of a unique place. We put the twenty-four hour lounge last, although some students seem to want that.

Jonté C.: We'll start discussion.

Alec L.: Who will be Space Planning chair, now that it is vacant?

Vrajesh M.: We're currently working on recruiting a Space Planning chair. In the mean time, Sammi and I will handle the issue.

Laura M.: I was concerned about the second point. Why do we want a sandwich shop?

Betsy R.: It was just an example to understand what's we meant.

Tim J.: I would like to note that if you guys have any other ideas you should voice them now. They'll most likely consider the ideas we put up here. I think coffee shop should go up there as a bullet point.

Tim R.: When we originally wrote this, we looked at the coffee shop. I don't think it was very clear, but we were trying to use examples.

Suan T.: One of our students suggested she wants an Asian pastry or something.

Jonté C.: Point of information - the way I'm running things, I'm trying to not bias the assembly in one way or another.

Rachel M.: I'm not sure we really have enough background to have an order of preference at this point. In terms of off campus, I'd think the fourth one would be first and the food places would be further down. The lounge spaces would be more useful. Therefore, I move to amend the bill by striking "in order of preference".

Jonté C.: We will now begin discussion and start a subqueue.

Betsy R.: I mentioned that we'll be taking further surveys, is that what you're talking about?

Rachel M.: I feel like we shouldn't put out preliminary weak remarks that we don't have sufficient research on yet. I'm sure the space planning chair will do a great job.

Janet L.: I think that the the second 'that' clause should be first because that makes more logical sense. I also think that we should say that it is not restricted to these choices.

Almas A.: I don't agree with the order that those things we're written in. We should probably hold a survey first. For example, I feel like the Game Room is not a very big priority. I think that the fourth thought should be moved up.

Jonté C.: The question before the assembly is whether or not to remove the order of preference clause. Please try and stick on that.

Will S.: I am not totally opposed to these suggestions. I'm going to keep in mind that we're tasking Space Planning to do something. I support making these amendments, I would also caution you to avoid changing this bill to ambiguity so that Space Planning has nothing to work with.



I think we should strike all the bullet points, if you wanted to do that.

Tim R.: I call the previous question.

Seconded.

Jonté C.: The question is whether or not we will strike the order of preference. Are there any objections to voting? Seeing none, we'll go to voting.

Alex D.: Divide the body.

Jonté C.: Would those in favor of striking please raise your hand, etc...

Motion passes 15 to 2.

Jonté C.: Just a reminder, we're discussing the entire bill now.

Tim J.: I'd like to motion to amend the bill to add a bullet point that indicates explicitly a coffeeshop that is going into the late hours of the night.

Besty R.: I think instead of having a bullet point that says a coffeeshop explicitly, it can be incorporated into the first bullet point.

Tim J.: I wanted a coffeeshop because coffee shop isn't explicitly food. A coffee shop doesn't entail as much food.

Alec L.: Point of information - is that the position you want to amend it at? 4th?

Tim J.: Yes, the text in italics is what we're working on.

Jonté C.: Do you continue to submit your motion to remove the bullet point? I'm going to require you to remove this bullet point first, and then incorporate it in a separate motion.

Rachel M.: I agree that we should follow what Tim has now based on what I've heard from Sivakami.

Will S.: Motion to call the question.

Jonté C.: The question has been called, the question is whether or not we will amend the bill to add the bullet point where it is located currently on the screen. All in favor? Etc.

The amendment passes with 13 to 6.

Alex D.: I move to amend the first 'that' clause to change to 'on replacements to the former game room including consideration of the following five options.' Also, insert "including alternatives to these five options."

Jonté C.: Point of order - we can amend before I repeat it.

Will S.: I call the question.

Seconded.

The motion is to amend the bill as shown.

Jonté C.: Are there any objections to voting?

Janet L.: Yes, can we replace current with former?

Alex D.: Yes, that was in my original statement.



Almas A.: All of these suggestions are allowing them to do whatever they want with the space. We're giving them so many options, then won't they just do whatever they want?

Alex D.: We're giving the Committee on Space Planning more options. I think this is fine because I think the Committee has more time to talk to undergrads.

Parliamentary confusion

Daniel H.: I just want to say that this doesn't go to the Space Planning Committee and die. You can still take input from your constituents and bring them to Space Planning.

Jonté C.: The question is whether or not we want to amend the bill as shown.

Amendment carries 13 to 0.

Will S.: I would like to motion to end debate - call the question.

Jonté C.: The question has been posed to approve the bill as follows. All those in favor of closing discussion please raise your hand. Seeing no objections, those in favor of passing this legislation and bringing it in as UA Senate policy.

Bill passes 16 to 0.

10 42 U.A.S. 2.2: Bill to Amend the Bylaws on Parliamentary Procedure

Krishna E.: *Reads the text of the bill.*

Will S.: I don't think there's much else to say. I think you've heard on the email list. I think Tim Jenks will like to motion to postpone the bill. I think it can be done now in session.

Krishna E.: I think that this is going to be portrayed as a large alteration of the existing structure. It's not. It's made to facilitate the bylaws. It's made to alter the rules of order. Instead of waiting for a Senator to bring up a motion, it just says that Jonté can say that he wants to make an alteration, and if 5 people object, it won't pass. I think we did things today that would've been out of order. It's for small things like that it would've been really effective and it just happens unless people object.

Alex D.: I move to spell specifically correctly and to add "following additional subsection." Please also spell flexible correctly and "Robert's" correctly.

Jonté C.: The amendment passes.

Alex D.: I move to replace 'unnecessary' by 'confusion' over.

Jonté C.: Are there any objections?

Krishna E.: I think that it should be unnecessary and confusion over.

Jonté C.: Are there any objections to voting?

Krishna E.: Point of information - can I amend the amendment? Withdrawn.



Jonté C.: Seeing no objections, this amendment passes.

Tim J.: I motion to postpone this bill to next week because this is an amendment to the bylaws and we have to wait for next week.

Jonté C.: The question was postponing the bill to next week. Seeing no objections on calling the vote to postpone, we will now vote...

Motion passes 18 to 1.

Alright, the bill is postponed to next week.

11 Additional Nominees to Institute Committees

Alex J.: The Provost sent out an email announcing two new student reps. We conducted interviews next week to fill those spots. Tim Jenks was the nominee. I can tell you he is the most qualified candidate. This is the one committee we're recommending him to. The other spot has yet to be filled. I move that we approve Tim Jenks to the Faculty Study Group on Educational Opportunities.

Jonté C.: The motion has been called as above. Discussion? All those in favor? Etc.

Motion passes.

12 Discussion

Jonté C.: Athena Printing.

Krishna E.: I move to postpone this to 42 UAS 3 to have meaningful discussion on mailing list.

Will S.: I call the question.

Jonté C.: The motion has been called...

The motion passes.

Jonté C.: Enrollment. You guys heard in the State of the Institute that we're definitely going to be increasing enrollment. The number, I believe, is an additional 250 in addition to the students this year. Ask for more questions, but think about that question. I'm not sure if we'll pose this question now. Any burning questions?

Other issue and topics?

Rachel M.: I move to talk about 2.3.

Alec L.: Due to the short amount of time left and the current state of everyone's minds, I apologize but I call for orders of the day and to postpone this discussion till next week.

Jonté C.: All those in favor of suspending the bylaws to bring up new business, please raise your hand. Alright motion fails.

Motion fails 2 to 10.



Jonté C.: The orders of the day have been called, what that means to me is to close discussion until next week. Vote...

Motion to close discussion passes.

13 Closing Remarks

Jonté C.: I know it's been kind of rough dealing with Parliamentary style. We'll be going over this and Robert's Rules at the retreat.

Tim J.: Please notify me before midnight or when I sleep if you want to come tonight. Email me if you want to come. It leaves at 9 AM on Saturday and ends at 5 PM on Sunday.

Vrajesh M.:

(Short off the record.)

A note on legislation - things like grammar can be fixed afterwards. We don't have to make a point during session.

Also, different issues need different amounts of reaching out. You guys all seem to want like a referendum, but you guys should represent your students. You don't need to take everything back to your people, it will leave a lack of trust from the people.

Speaking of surveys, please give those surveys to the students. You can use whatever method you want to get that feedback. You need to show up with a packet that will say these are from Baker or McCormick, etc. Since we didn't announce a topic, we would like to have you look at these surveys and think of topics. It should only be 60-90 seconds. I think it should be pretty feasible to get over the course of the next few days. You'll see that the questions are broad-ranging. We'll need those responses to set the priorities of Senate.

Questions on the survey?

Jonté C.: I'll think about doing what's best over what is right for the next meeting. Reach out to constituents and come to the retreat to enjoy a three day weekend.

14 Closing Roll

The following members *left early*:

Owen Derby, Senator for Fraternities

15 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:16 pm.



UNDERGRADUATE ASSOCIATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

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

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai
UA Secretary General