

GSG • Assembly Meeting • January 14, 2004

• [Outline and Summary](#) • [Attendance](#) • [Minutes](#) • [Funding Schedule Proposal](#) • [Tutorial on the new Housing Draw](#) •

Outline and Summary

1. [Call to Order, Introductions, and Approval of Minutes](#): Three members were introduced to Assembly.
2. Reports
 1. [Chair's Report](#)
 2. [Parliamentary Secretary's Report](#)
 3. [Social Chair's Report](#) (Valentine's Dance)
 4. [Transportation and Parking Committee Report](#) (P-Rides shuttle)
3. New and Old Business
 1. [Funding Requests](#): The ACSS "Spring Festival Party" was funded at \$250.
 2. [Funding Schedule](#): Assembly endorsed a new funding schedule proposal by the Executive Committee.
 3. [Graduate Student Life Initiative 2003](#)
 4. [Health and Wellbeing Taskforce](#) (update on the preliminary report)
 5. [New Housing Lottery](#)
4. [Adjournment](#): The next meeting will be on February 11, 2004.

Attendance

• **Representatives present** • Aleksandar Donev, ACM • Peter Locke, ANT • Irina Marinov, AOS • Sinéad Mac Namara, CEE • Jack Tinsley, CHE • Jessica H. Clark, CLA • Brigitta A. Lee, EAS • Jonathan Vogel, ECO • Christiane I. Meyer, EEB • Fei Sun, ELE • James Bickford, ENG • Valerie Dionne, FIT • Karin Sigloch, GEO • Jane Murphy, HIS • Chris Wyckham, MAE • Thomas Horine, MAT • Shin-Yi Lin, MOL • Annika Peter, PHY • Jonathan Eastvold, POL • Ian Parrish, proxy for David R. Smith, PPL • Kim Montgomery, PSY • Susan Gunasti, REL • Debbie Becher, SOC • Newsha M. Dau,

WWS •

• **Delegates present** • Fengyun Cao, proxy for Yuan Liu, Association of Chinese Students and Scholars (ACSS) • Huiyan Yang, Butler Apartments • Weining Man, Council of International Graduate Students (CIGS) • Leonard F. Pease III, Off-Campus •

• **Councilors present** • Parliamentary Secretary Leonard F. Pease III, CPUC, CPUC Priorities Committee • Corresponding Secretary Nicole Esparza • Press Secretary Meredith Safran • Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida • Social Chair Sinéad Mac Namara • Brigitta Lee, CPUC, CPUC Executive Committee • Ian Parrish, CPUC, CPUC Executive Committee • Fei Sun, CPUC Governance Committee •

• **Others present** • Tom Jenkins, vice-chairman of the Children and Dependents Committee • Lisa M. Sherov, GC residence life coordinator • Beth McKeown, community programs coordinator • Anita Adhitya (GEO) • Paul Calamia (COS), Butler Committee • Jeff Dwoskin (ELE) • Joshua Friess (PHY) •

• **Representatives absent** • Michael K. House, GER • Donna A. C. Sy, HOS • Andrew Moroz, ORF • Cole M. Crittenden, SLA •

• **Delegates absent** • Aderemi Artis, Black Graduate Caucus (BGC) • Lior Silberman, Graduate College (GC) • Radhika Wijetunge, Lawrence Apartments • Heather White, Women's Center •

• **Councilors absent** • Chair Leslie Medema, CPUC, CPUC Priorities Committee • Aderemi Artis, CPUC Resources Committee • Meredith Galanter Hastings, CPUC Judicial Committee • Lior Silberman, CPUC, CPUC Rights and Rules Committee • David R. Smith, CPUC Rights and Rules Committee • Rob Sobak, CPUC • Joseph P. Valentino, CPUC •

• **Representative seats vacant** • ARC • ART • AST • CHM • COM • COS • MUS • NES • POS • PHI • SPO •

• **Delegate seats vacant** • Hibben/Magie Apartments • Millstone Apartments •

Minutes

I. Call to Order, Introductions, and Approval of Minutes

The Graduate Student Government held its regular monthly Assembly meeting on January 14, 2004, at Frist 309. Parliamentary Secretary Leonard Pease called the meeting to order at about 6:07pm.

Mr. Pease introduced some new Representatives: Thomas Horine (MAT), Shin-Yi Lin (MOL), and Christiane Meyer (EEB).

Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida proceeded to the minutes. He stated that there were a few minor typos, as well as some suggested revisions, which he described. He recalled that Meredith Safran had been scheduled to report on a meeting with Public Safety and SHARE in the end of the previous meeting [[Minutes 12.10.2003, IV.F](#)]. As the meeting was running late, Ms. Safran offered to type up her report and send it to Assembly by email. Although the report did not happen during the meeting, Mr. Boavida thought it should be included in the minutes' package. It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved with the modifications just discussed, and that motion carried without opposition.

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report

Mr. Pease reported on behalf of Chair Leslie Medema.

Mr. Pease reported on the resignation of Eric Adelizzi as assistant chair.

As to the recent activities of the Executive Committee, the committee met twice since the previous Assembly meeting. The committee had been working on an extensive survey [[Minutes 8.13.2003, IV.B](#)], which was almost ready to go out. James Bickford had volunteered to help run it. As to the informal survey on children and dependents [[Minutes 12.10.2003, IV.B](#)], Ms. Medema had already received the questions, but Mr. Pease hadn't

received them yet.

Mr. Pease noted that discussions with the office of the vice-president for administration regarding prox-card access for post-DCC students had been initiated and were on-going.

Finally, Mr. Pease pointed out that the position of treasurer was still vacant, and there had been no candidates. It was noted that self-nominations are allowed.

B. Parliamentary Secretary's Report

Mr. Pease reminded all present that two important elections are coming. The Officer Elections will happen in the first days of March [[Minutes 11.12.2003, V.D](#)], and Mr. Pease encouraged all to nominate candidates for the different positions (nominations should be sent to <gsg@>). Mr. Pease added that, in April, the GSG Assembly appoints the graduate student representatives to the Council of the Princeton University Community (CPUC), and nominates representatives to the different CPUC committees [details on the council and its committees were discussed in Minutes 4.9.2003, [V](#) and [VII](#)].

C. Social Chair's Report

Social Chair Sinéad Mac Namara reported on the preparations for the Valentine's Dance, which will be jointly organized by the GSG and the Queer Graduate Caucus (QGC) [[Minutes 8.13.2003, II](#)].

As last year, the dance will be at the Frist Multi-Purpose Room (B level). Ms. Mac Namara stated that last year the event had gone well, and the staff at Frist was very helpful. The total budget is \$3,000. The GSG has budgeted \$1,000 [[Minutes 10.8.2003, VIII.A](#)], and the QGC will contribute \$300. The organizers had also approached Dean Montero (associate dean of the Graduate School for graduate student life), Janet Dickerson (vice-president for campus life) and the director of Frist Center, and together they would sponsor the event in the amount of \$1,800. The APGA had also been contacted, and Ms. Mac Namara was expecting to hear from them soon. At this point, Ms. Mac Namara invited suggestions.

She continued, adding that the GSG typically runs a computer survey where people could list their preferences, and would be matched to other students (would had also submitted preferences). The software exists from previous years, and is ready to be used. However, volunteers are needed to run it. Jonathan Vogel asked whether students were charged for that service. Ms. Mac Namara stated that the GSG doesn't charge for participation in their events. Of course that is always a possibility, but she cautioned that it would likely change the character of the events.

Ms. Mac Namara proceeded by noting that she would hire people to check IDs, but volunteers were needed to help setup and cleanup, and so she started circulating a sign-up sheet. In answer to a question, she stated that the event would be over at 2:00am, and clean-up would likely take until 2:30am. Finally, she pointed out that, when approving the budget, Assembly had approved \$1,000 for this event. However, she was under the impression that Assembly needed to reaffirm this approval. Aleksandar Donev moved (and was seconded) that Assembly reaffirm the approval of an expense of up to \$1,000 for the Valentine's Dance. The motion carried with none opposed.

D. Transportation and Parking Committee Report

Ms. Mac Namara then reported for the Transportation and Parking Committee. She noted that the P-Rides shuttle would soon be one year old [[Minutes 2.12.2003](#), IV.A]. Laurel Harvey (general manager for administration) was organizing and funding a celebration, which will include gifts to the drivers.

Newsha Dau asked whether it was possible to assess whether the shuttle was being used. Ms. Mac Namara stated that the drivers keep records of how many people step in or out, at every stop. So, we have very detailed statistics. We also have the feedback that riders send to <shuttle@>. Ms. Mac Namara noted that there had been four changes in the schedule, and all them increased the ridership (which was now up to about 3,500 trips/week). As to the Blue Line (to lot 21), the ridership was low. However, having that shuttle is politically helpful for the University, because it automatically assures parking for new buildings. Currently, the Green Line (to graduate housing) shuttle starts running every 40 minutes (as opposed to every 20) at about 7:30pm. It is likely that we'll be able to get an extra four hours of driver's time, which may allow the shuttle to run every 20 minutes up to about 9pm and every 40 minutes up to midnight.

Mr. Donev asked whether there were plans for weekend service. Ms. Mac Namara stated that she hoped that would ultimately be possible. However, she pointed out that the Public Safety night shuttle (now renamed P-Rides Express) was still running. People should call 8-RIDE or 8-3134 (details of the service can be found in the main shuttle page, currently at <http://www.princeton.edu/pr/visitors/shuttles>). Moreover, on weekends after the Dinky stops running and up to 2:30am, P-Rides Express will collect people at Princeton Junction.

Irina Marinov asked whether there were plans to have the shuttle go to Forrestal Campus. Ms. Mac Namara stated that had been a goal from the beginning [[Minutes 10.9.2002](#), 6.1, and [Minutes 11.13.2002](#), 4.2.1]. When meeting with administrators, the topic is always brought up by the committee. Ms. Mac Namara pointed out, however, that administrators were not very enthusiastic about the idea, and that the schedule would likely be restricted to one trip to Forrestal in the morning, one back-and-forth (from Forrestal to main campus, and back) around lunch time, and one trip back to main campus in the evening. In the worst case scenario, a shuttle would have to be started when the University seriously starts considering expansion across the lake. Chris Wyckham stated that he worked at Forrestal (and as such was allowed to park on main campus) and noted that since the new parking policies [[Minutes 7.9.2003, V.F](#)] were instituted, the parking situation in the main campus had improved. Ms. Mac Namara asked to be informed in case people know of students working at Forrestal who are not allowed to park on main campus.

III. New and Old Business

A. Funding Requests

Nicole Esparza stated that a funding request had been received the day before. In accordance with the By-Laws [By-Laws IV.3], she asked whether Assembly wished to consider it. Mr. Wyckham inquired as to the identity of the group making the request. Ms. Esparza stated that the Executive Committee, after considering similar events in the past, had realized it was fairer if the decision to hear the request was made blindly, without reference to the requestor. Mr. Donev moved to hear it, there was a second, and the motion carried without opposition.

Fengyun Cao presented the request on behalf of the Association of Chinese Students and Scholars (ACSS). She apologized for submitting the request late. The event is the “Spring Festival Party”, and will be held on January 31st in the Carl A. Fields Center. There will be performers from other universities, such as the University of Pennsylvania or Rutgers University. A total of 300 people from the University and the community are expected, including about 200 graduate students. The total budget is \$1,970, and ACSS was asking the GSG to cosponsor at \$350.

Ms. Esparza stated that in the previous year we had funded this event at \$700. Our total cosponsorship budget is \$2,640 [[Minutes 10.8.2003, VIII.A](#)], and we had informally allocated \$660 for each quarter [[Minutes 10.8.2003, VIII.B](#)]. So, far in the current quarter (November through January) we had allocated \$475. Weining Man pointed out that ACSS often applies for GSG funding, and this time they had already cut the request down because of the GSG’s tighter budget, and had tried other sources. Jonathan Eastvold asked whether there was some connection between this event and the “Butler Chinese New Year” [[Minutes 12.10.2003, III](#)]. Ms. Cao stated they were unrelated. She also stated that non-Chinese students are welcome to the spring Festival party. Ian Parrish and Mr. Donev moved to fund the event at \$350.

Ms. Dau noted that the two events mentioned catered to the Chinese students, and asked whether other groups shouldn’t be supported too. Ms. Man listed off other groups (e.g., Turkish students) that the GSG had funded before. Someone replied that the GSG should support all active groups, and (later on) Debbie Becher pointed out that just because two events are especially attractive for an ethnic group, it doesn’t mean the same people will be attending both events or that the events should receive less support.

Mr. Eastvold asked whether this event could be combined with the Butler event. Mr. Donev thought it isn’t the GSG’s business to orchestrate other groups’ events.

Mr. Wyckham noted that, of the \$660 allotted to this quarter, only \$185 were left. It was also noted that there are typically less events in the Summer. Ms. Safran noted that it wouldn’t necessarily be fair to assume that. Karin Sigloch suggested that we could fund give all the remaining \$185 to this event.

There was some talk about whether it would be better to discuss the proposed funding

schedule first [see [III.B](#) below]. Mr. Eastvold moved to table the current motion (on funding the “Spring Festival Party”) until after that discussion, there was a second, and the motion carried without opposition. (For the benefit of the reader, the recording secretary will continue chronicling this funding discussion, not without noting once more that the funding schedule was discussed at exactly this point in time.) The discussion on the “Spring Festival Party” was resumed right after the discussion on the funding schedule.

Messrs. Parrish and Donev asked Assembly’s leave to change their proposed funding from \$350 to \$250. Ms. Lin suggested that that would be penalizing the group for coming at the end of the quarter. Mr. Parrish stated that he had changed his mind after realizing that the original request was for more than 50% of the quarterly cosponsorship budget, which he thought would not be appropriate. There were no further objections to this change. Ms. Dau moved to fund at \$185, noting that recently we had not fulfilled a smaller request by a group who wanted to buy jerseys to play soccer [[Minutes 11.12.2003, IV.A](#)]. Mr. Parrish didn’t take it as a friendly amendment. Mr. Pease ruled that, as there was a pending motion, Ms. Dau’s motion would have to be considered as a motion to amend. Mr. Pease put that motion to amend to a vote, and it did not carry. He then put the main motion to a vote:

MOTION: to fund the ACSS “Spring Festival Party” by \$250. CARRIED with none opposed.

B. Funding Schedule

Mr. Boavida summarized the [proposal for funding schedule](#) that the Executive Committee had prepared, following up on discussions in Assembly [[Minutes 10.8.2003, V.D](#)]. The committee was concerned with several issues: making it easier for Assembly to evaluate all requests on an equitable basis, simplifying the bureaucracies of the discussion, and trying not to force the groups to plan too far ahead.

The committee had originally considered quarterly funding meetings, but realized that they would fall over already busy meetings (e.g., the CPUC elections in April can last very long) or right in the middle of breaks (e.g., January or July). So, they decided to propose four-month terms instead. Moreover, they were also proposing that all requests

submitted for a meeting be discussed at the same time (as opposed to the current practice of voting on each request at a time). Ms. Safran went to one of the blackboards to demonstrate how that could be done. She wrote the total amount of our cosponsorship budget, the total already spent, the difference, and the difference divided by the number of terms left (the presumed maximum we want to spend for the new term). Ms. Safran then drew a table with a few (fictitious) requests, and filled it with (fictitious) details on each request (see point II.3 in the proposal): the amount requested, the total budget for the event, the cosponsorship already secured, the total cosponsorship already provided by the GSG (to that group, in the current fiscal year), and the values recommended by the treasurer. She noted that Assembly could always reserve a small amount for requests that would come later during the term; in fact, the last row of the table could be used to list that amount. In fact, the plan was not meant as a set of rules, but rather as a set of informal “best practices” that would in no way limit Assembly’s freedom.

Finally, it was noted that if this proposal was put in practice, the next term would be from March through June, and so the funding requests should be discussed in February. If Assembly endorsed the plan, the Executive Committee would contact all registered student groups (and not only the ones that recently came to the GSG) to apprise them of the new schedule.

(For the benefit of the reader, the recording secretary will attempt to organize the points made by topic. Although on occasion this will disrupt the narrative conventions, the secretary hopes it will help isolate the issues that Assembly felt deserve caution in the future.)

Ms. Lin was concerned that it might be difficult for groups to plan their budgets four months in advance. Ms. Esparza suggested that when students apply for grants they have to prepare the requests on a yearly basis. Mr. Donev stated that the difficulty was not necessarily planning the budget, but rather having ideas for events. On the other hand, it’s difficult to predict that far in advance the cosponsorship amounts that can be secured from other sources. Mr. Eastvold noted that we may not need exact numbers, especially because our contribution will often be a small part of the event. Mr. Boavida stated that it was natural that the groups would not know all details about the event too much in advance, and we might need to allow some flexibility. However, we could ask them to provide a short update on the final details in the meeting right before the event. Jeffrey

Dwoskin stated that at Rutgers funding was given twice a year, and some money was kept aside in case it was needed. Although afterward there was no control of the details, that would make sense. Mr. Parrish added later that we have no alternative, and stated that at MIT funding requests are handled once a year.

Ms. Safran stated that the difficulty for the GSG was not so much the small events, but the large requests that can not be predicted and make it hard to manage our budget. On the other hand, these large events are exactly the ones that should be planned two or three months in advance. Mr. Donev suggested that it might be useful to consider that requests over \$100 would correspond to large events.

Jane Murphy asked whether there were guidelines for the treasurer's recommendations. Ms. Safran stated that the GSG would give up to \$3 per graduate student in attendance when we had an irregular surplus. The treasurer would also take into account whether the event had been successful in the past. Ms. Becher suggested that it would be useful for Assembly to have a set of guidelines that can be used in the new context. Mr. Boavida suggested that, when holding the funding discussion for the next term, Assembly would end up finding it's own guidelines. That information could be easily recorded in the minutes, and taken into account in the future.

There was a suggestion to include a column for event attendance. Ms. Marinov stated that we should be careful about the size of the groups. She noted that she belong to a Romanian student club that organized an event last year. They ended up not applying for GSG funding because they thought being a small group would make it harder. It was pointed out that the size of the group shouldn't matter, but rather the student attendance (as events should be open to all students).

Mr. Bickford moved the adoption of the informal plan, in which we was seconded by Mr. Donev. Jack Tinsley emphasized that we need a funding structure, and we need to free time in the meetings to discuss other matters.

MOTION: to approve the Executive Committee's proposal of funding "best practices".
CARRIED with none opposed.

The discussion on the funding request resumed after this vote [[III.A](#) above].

C. Graduate Student Life Initiative 2003

Mr. Boavida introduced the next topic. He told Assembly that the GSG had started producing the GSLI (Graduate Student Life Initiative) in order to have detailed information on the GSG's concerns and activities in one document. The previous GSLIs had been readied around March 2001 and November 2002, and shared with several administrators. Work on the GSLI 2003 had started in April [[Minutes 4.9.2003, X.C](#)], and some drafts were ready by the end of the Summer [[Minutes 9.10.2003, IV.E](#)]. Mr. Boavida noted that officers comprise a sizable fraction of the committees' membership, and so further reports were delayed. However, right at the end of 2003, the missing reports were completed. As soon as their academic commitments would allow them, the Executive Committee would convert the files to a convenient digital format and forward them to Assembly. Mr. Donev asked whether it would be possible for Assembly members to comment on them and give suggestions, and Mr. Tinsley suggested that it would be useful to set a deadline for comments for the committees to have time to process them. Ms. Esparza suggested that two referees per report would be enough. Mr. Boavida suggested that it would be useful if the referees had not been involved in the writing, for it was important that the reports were clear for people outside the GSG, who are not involved in the projects. In closing, Ms. Esparza stated that the details would be sent to Assembly soon.

D. Health and Wellbeing Taskforce

Mr. Parrish reported that the Taskforce on Health and Wellbeing [[Minutes 8.13.2003, V.A](#)] had released its interim report a few hours before. He stated the document was 25 pages long, and worth reading. He also noted that this was an important taskforce, as illustrated by its membership, which includes four vice presidents or vice provosts of the University. He invited people to participate to the focus groups that had been announced some days before, and note that one such group had already been canceled by lack of participation. He concluded by noting that two changes recommended by the taskforce had already been approved by the University: extension of health coverage to domestic partners, and well-babycare for children of graduate students. The exact details are in the report. The taskforce's webpage (at the time of this writing) is <http://www.princeton.edu/hwbtf/>.

E. New Housing Lottery

Ms. Safran presented a [detailed tutorial](#) about the new draw [[Minutes 12.10.2003, IV.E](#)], and how it had been negotiated. The draft had been circulated in the Executive Committee, with Lior Silberman (acting chair of the Housing Committee) and Jeff Johnson (president of the Butler Committee). After Ms. Safran concluded, Paul Calamia (who identified himself as a member of the Butler Committee who had joined the graduate housing policy group on December 30) complimented her for the time taken to prepare the report, and for its thoroughness and fairness. Several points were discussed after the presentation. (On occasion, the recording secretary will not follow strictly the narrative sequence, in order to have all discussion on one topic grouped together.)

Mr. Tinsley asked if the new system tried to achieve equal proportions of students with and without families housed. Mr. Donev (who is a member of the graduate housing policy group) stated that that was a University policy, which the group did not change. Although the current system cannot implement that policy, the new system will very likely do it. In case the new system favors single students over families, the housing office will correct manually (which is possible in the new system) to assure a roughly equal proportion.

At about this point, in reply to Ms. Safran's comments to the effect that Representatives and Delegates should inform their constituents about what's going on in the GSG, Mr. Tinsley stated that he tries to type up a short summary of the meetings, and stated that a "lazy-eye" style (consisting in marking the most important points in bold) seems to be effective at getting people's attention.

Mr. Tinsley then asked whether the child bonus would be kept in this year's draw. Mr. Donev stated that it would continue. Huiyan Yang (a member of the Butler Committee) stated that she didn't know about the meetings, but maybe Mr. Johnson knew. Referring to the child bonus, she stated that there were no people with children in the policy group, and they just don't understand the personal hardship. Messrs. Donev and Boavida (another member of the policy group) stated that the chairs of all residential committees were invited to all meetings, but usually no one from Butler Committee came.

Joshua Friess stated that previously, when ranking the applicants for apartment housing,

the years of study of roommates were averaged. That created a disincentive for students with lower years of study to let older students take advantage of that to get housing. Mr. Friess stated that removing that disincentive would make it harder for families to get housing. Mr. Donev stated that letting students list several preferences would make it impossible to implement any averaging. Of course artificial formulas could be devised, but they would likely not be simple and its meaning would not be clear. Mr. Boavida added that because housing will correct manually to assure an equal proportion of housing for families or singles, the removal of that disincentive would only affect singles, who can all choose their roommates (as opposed to students with families that have a fixed family). Later on the meeting, there were some more contributions to this topic. Ms. Esparza stated that it was not clear whether picking roommates could be considered gaming. She exemplified that in the previous year she applied together with her domestic partner, and didn't even know that together they were counted as a third year couple (she was a second year, and her domestic partner was a fourth year). Ms. Safran stated that she thought it unlikely that younger students would pick different roommates on a broad scale just to allow older students to have a better chance. She noted that the decision on who to live with is a serious one that students will have to live with for the whole year. Mr. Tinsley stated that he didn't consider that second years rooming together with fifth years can be considered cheating, for that was always allowed in the rules for the draw.

Discussion moved on to hardship. Lisa Sherov noted that any students who consider they would face hardship if they would not get on-campus housing can apply for hardship. In reply to a question about whether there would be enough space left for hardship applicants, Mr. Donev stated that housing for successful hardship applicants would be put aside before the actual draw started. Tom Jenkins noted that some spouses stay at home to take care of their children, because the couple can not afford daycare. He asked whether such factors would be taken into account. Ms. Sherov stated that there is no check-list that the hardship committee goes over. Each case is different from all others. If applying for hardship housing, students should explain their situations. Ms. Sherov noted that decisions are almost always unanimous, and the group is sympathetic toward students' difficulties. Mr. Eastvold expressed concern about how difficult it was to get hardship housing, and about the bureaucracy that would entail. Ms. Huiyan stated that very few people obtain it. Ms. Sherov stated that the number of applicants was also very low. Although she didn't remember exact numbers, she stated that last year about 9 out of about 12 students had gotten it. Ms. Sherov also noted that there is no limit on the

number of hardship allowances that can be granted. Later on (after Ms. Sherov had had to leave) someone asked what a successful hardship application looks like.

Mr. Eastvold also suggested that there could be some automatic retention of the apartment. It was clarified that there had always been such a retention. Of course, to qualify for that retention students had to apply for the draw and be successful for that kind of housing.

Mr. Bickford asked whether changes could still be adopted. Mr. Donev stated that the system was already being implemented, and that if something goes wrong it will be fixed. Later on, at the end of the discussion, Mr. Boavida stated that Mr. Silberman had asked him to report that housing was planning to send an email to all students with a draft of the new rules and a link to the online forms. The intention is to have as many people as possible test the forms and spot any possible problems in time. At the same time, all that data will be used to test the allocation algorithm as well as simulate the draw, in order to detect potential problems well in advance (in time to find solutions). Mr. Donev emphasized that it's important that as many people as possible test it and provide data.

Ms. Becher commented on the distinction between families and singles. She stated that the Graduate School had a different definition than housing, and that actually for housing the criteria were much easier to fulfill. She suggested that it might be useful to uniformize the criteria, and that might be an easy way to avoid some of the fraudulent behavior Ms. Safran had alluded to. Mr. Donev stated that the criteria for housing are actually decided by the Graduate School. Mr. Parrish noted that the University may want to include heterosexual couples not yet married in their concept of family (for the purposes of housing). Incidentally, that might turn out to be more space effective. Ms. Becher restated her point.

IV. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Pease adjourned the meeting at about 8:30pm. The next meeting will be on February 11, 2004, at 6pm, in Frist 309.

Submitted 2.1.2004,

João Pedro Boavida
Recording Secretary
Amended and approved 2.11.2004