

Minutes for the January 26, 2000 GSG Meeting

Eszter Hargittai, GSG Chair, began the meeting at circa 6:00pm. The Assembly faced one of the busiest agendas ever tackled during a GSG meeting.

Item 1: Issuing of Labels

The meeting began with the distribution of address labels for the invitations to the Y2Kupid event. Assembly members collected the labels and used them to address envelopes. By working in parallel, an otherwise massive task was completed in just an hour or so.

Item 2: Approval of the Minutes

After the circulation of the attendance sheet, the Assembly voted to approve the minutes of the December meeting.

The recording secretary stated that he would be recording the evening's meeting on tape. This prompted the Assembly to discuss whether recording the proceedings would be acceptable.

% The recording secretary explained that the only purpose of an audio recording is to improve the accuracy of the minutes. While general ideas are often not difficult to capture in the written record, numerical data and names often have been incorrectly reported.

% The Press Secretary, Beverley McKeon, suggested that simply composing the minutes directly after the meeting would suffice to generate an accurate record.

% Steve Miller suggested that if an audio record of GSG proceedings were to be made, the Assembly might stipulate that particularly sensitive discussions not be recorded. It was agreed that these matters would be off the audio record.

% The Assembly put the matter to a vote, and it was decided that the audio recording could resume.

[To reassure the reader that the audio records will not be put to ill use, it is emphasized that tapes will be guarded under lock and key. In addition,

no one will be given access to the cassettes. To further minimize the probability of distributing the recorded material, the tapes of each meeting will be recorded over at the next meeting.

Finally, sensitive discussions will be kept off of the audio record. Any Assembly member can request to have the recorder turned off at any point during the meeting.]

Item 3: Election of the new GSG treasurer

Due to a heavy academic load, Greg Bedard has stepped down from his post as Treasurer of the GSG. The GSG expressed appreciation for his work and looks forward to having him back as an active participant next year.

As the election process began, Steven Miller and Karthick Ramakrishnan were nominated for the position of treasurer.

Both Steve and Karthick furnished brief speeches describing their previous experience.

Jim Vere directed the Assembly to vote via secret ballot. Karthick was elected to the position of GSG Treasurer.

Item 4: Committee and Project Reports

Noting the vacancies on many of the committees, Eszter urged representatives to volunteer for the unstaffed committees. [see details below]

Priorities Committee of the CPUC
Steve Garcia provided a report on the actions of the Priorities Committee. The committee is comprised of faculty, staff, and students.

% One function of the Priorities Committee is to determine the best manner in which to use a budget surplus, if one exists. In the event of a deficit, the Committee determines how best to rectify the situation.

% The University ran a 2 million dollar surplus this year.

% A variety of requests for portions of the surplus were weighed by the Priorities Committee. Steve's report considered requests benefitting graduate students.

Steve stated as part of a response to a question that the committee has a good rapport with Dean Wilson and is sensitive to the needs of graduate students.

& One request was for assistance in setting up Centennial Fellowships. The hope, with the fellowships, is to provide for stipends that will make Princeton attractive to stellar recruits. Steve indicated that 4 - 5 of the fellowships will be awarded in the natural sciences, while another 4 - 5 will be given in the humanities and social sciences.

& The second request was for stipends for terminal master's students. The intention is to make it easier for departments to remove students deemed to be weak from their programs. At present, fear of losses in funding inhibits the removal of weak students. To remedy the problem, the graduate school has asked that the funds associated with the exiting student be used to fund students filling the vacant position. It has also been requested that a portion of the funds be used to provide career services for the departing student.

Steve expressed confidence that the terminal master's program will not lead to the ejection of qualified students.

& The Graduate School evidently also has asked for financial assistance in minority graduate student recruitment. In particular, funds would be used to bring minority students to the campus prior to admission. The idea is to provide the minority students with an opportunity to give Princeton serious consideration.

Although it may seem puzzling that the minority recruitment takes place prior to the actual admission of a student, Steve explained that in the recruitment is intended to take place on the weekend that graduate departments typically notify students whether they have been accepted. Evidently, similar recruitment weekends are conducted at the same time by some of the other Ivy League universities.

& The Priorities Committee determined that it will

supply about 50% of the funds needed for the Centennial Fellowships. While the terminal master's degree program made no request for funds initially, the committee was enthusiastic about providing the \$60,000 needed for subsequent years.

It was determined that the Minority Recruitment program will be funded, but from a different source.

& Career Services requested and received money to be used to hire additional staff.

& The library will be given funds to enhance their Acquisitions Budget.

& The Frist Campus Center will be funded.

& Faculty and staff shall receive a raise, while the undergraduate financial aid package will be augmented.

Campus Center Committee

Eszter announced that the Frist Campus Center has a new director who is sympathetic to graduate student concerns.

Three students have volunteered to join the Campus Center Committee. They are

Cindy Tobery
Nathan Marsh
Karthick Ramakrishnan

USG Outreach

Responsibilities include occasional attendance at the Undergraduate Student Government meetings. Once every two weeks was suggested.

Evidently, the USG has been receptive to input from graduate students in attendance. Though already a member of the Campus Center Committee, Karthick has agreed to join the USG Outreach project as well.

Campus Safety

Cindy added the Campus Safety Committee to her duties as a member of the Campus Center Committee.

Fire Code Committee

Eszter mentioned that for quite a while, no graduate student has served on the Fire Code Committee. Heather Van Buskirk

survey if they haven't yet done so. (The survey can be accessed at the URL <http://www.princeton.edu/~gsg/health.html>)]

% Cristen Howley will check in a week to see how many replies have been received.

% Karthick suggested that at that time, another email be sent to graduate students requesting that they complete the survey. The hope is to catch students as they return.

% The University survey shall also be issued soon. Cristin urged everyone to fill out this survey as well, since it will also have an impact on graduate student health care.

% Important remarks were made concerning departmental mailing lists. Some, but not all of the departments have lists available for use by graduate students. Remarks posted on the list are received by all students within the department.

Evidently, departments in possession of such a list are

- Computer Science
- Mathematics
- Molecular Biology
- Office of Population Research
- Physics
- Politics
- Sociology

Representatives from departments not listed above are asked to approach the Department Secretaries/Directors of Graduate Study to request access to the list.

Following Karthick's suggestion, a letter will be composed by the GSG asking that the departments listed above supply the desired lists.

Item 5: Correspondence

As a counterpart to what already exists for undergraduates, graduate student leaders at The University of Pennsylvania have suggested that leaders of graduate organizations at the Ivy League universities meet to share ideas. Details to follow.

Item 6: Report of the Treasurer

As his last official act, Greg composed a very nice summary of the budget.

Due to the transition in Treasurer position, Eszter presented the most recent funding requests.

% The first, provided by Karthick, is for the Hibben-Magie "Spring Fling". Karthick furnished a description of the event. Evidently, social events at the apartment complex are quite sparse. The "Spring Fling" attempts to help fill the vacuum.

The Fling will begin with a family oriented event at 8PM. Additional festivities will take place at 10PM. Karthick expressed confidence that the event will be well attended, while Eszter cited the great need for events of this type at Hibben/Magie.

The Assembly readily agreed to furnish the requested \$300.

% The Association of Chinese Students and Scholars asked the GSG for \$250 to aid in funding a spring event at Chancellor Green Cafe. The event will take place on February 5 and will include games, a line dance, and a dragon dance.

The speaker expected the event to be well attended. In particular, he anticipates ~300 graduate students to attend.

Again, the assembly swiftly voted to provide the \$250.

Item 7: The Y2Kupid Event

Ann Morning has been de facto chair of the Y2Kupid dance, and has been responsible for a large share of the effort that has gone into the upcoming social function so far.

Ann discussed the financial and logistical aspects of the Valentine's Dance to be held at the Stevenson Club on February 12. The Club House is expected to be a very suitable and elegant location for the event.

Eric Adelizzi was commended for his excellent job on the "Love-Match" questionnaire.

Adds have been posted in a variety of campus locations to advertise the questionnaire and the Y2Kupid event.

Regarding the budget, several large costs couldn't be avoided. Among these expenses are the public safety proctors

needed to monitor the party, the reservation of the Stevenson Club House, and the compensation of the Disc Jockey. To lessen the financial burden on the GSG, Ann has approached the Graduate College House Committee for additional funds. Some of the local restaurants also have been asked to serve as cosponsors. The approximate cost of the event to the GSG will be \$2700.

Eric Adelizzi's suggestion that the cash bar be made self-financing met with general approval, and Ann agreed to mention the suggestion to Lauren.

Ann summarized some of the remaining tasks needed in order to make Y2Kupid a reality.

% The representatives received additional posters to place in their departments. It was suggested that computer labs are a strategic location to display the posters.

% 100 questionnaires have been completed. If as least as many attend the Valentine's dance, the event will be a success.

Actually,

it is thought that a larger number can be expected since some of the students reluctant to respond to the questionnaire may nevertheless appear on February 12.

% A sign-up sheet was circulated to garner assistance from the Assembly for the February 12 date.

% A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the Disc Jockey for the Y2Kupid event.

& Though the Woodrow Wilson school has typically hired a New York City Disc Jockey, the NYC DJ charges a hefty fee of \$700. To save about \$300, Lauren Hale has given serious consideration to hiring an undergraduate to fill the position for \$100 per hour.

& While the undergraduate's qualifications as a Disc Jockey are unknown, he expressed confidence that he could provide the requested diverse musical range.

& Ann agreed to look into the matter, to learn more about the DJ's prior experience.

Item 8: Arranging the February GSG Meeting

After brief discussion, Thursday February 24 was set as the date of the next GSG meeting. Eszter's unavoidable absence on Feb. 23 prevents the customary choice of Wednesday. [Please see end of Minutes for actual meeting time.]

Item 9: Recent Issues Surrounding the Debasement Bar

This item was the lengthiest on the meeting's agenda. The length of this section is regrettable, but necessary in order to faithfully record the discussion on this important matter. [Special thanks are due to Steve Miller for his contribution of detailed notes of the speeches of the five invited speakers and subsequent discussion.]

The section on the Debasement Bar can be divided into roughly three parts.

First, the content of the five speeches is summarized. Second, discussion in reaction to the speeches is recorded. Last, conversation in which the discussion turned toward a plan of action for the GSG is presented.

As the discussion surrounding the D-Bar is lengthy, it seems prudent to supply here a brief summary of the D-Bar crisis and how it arose. Decisions made at the meeting are presented before the description of the lengthy discussion. The recording secretary apologizes for subsequent repetitions, but these were necessary to provide an accurate account of the discussion.

% As stated in the minutes of the previous meeting, one source of the current D-Bar difficulties is the simple fact that the State of New Jersey has decided to increase the rigor with which club license laws are enforced at the University. Thus, legal counsel for the University has recommended that the University be in full compliance with the laws by February.

A club license, owned by the Debasement Bar, gives the club the right to admit and serve alcoholic beverages to its members and to the guests of members. No other individuals can be admitted or served.

Thus, when February arrives, unless changes are made, the D-Bar staff will be permitted only to serve and admit residents of the Graduate College, the Annexes, and guests of the preceding two categories of students.

% Another source of trouble that was alluded to during the meeting is alleged misconduct on the part of the D-Bar staff. Examples include the serving of alcoholic beverages to minors and continuing to serve alcohol past 2am.

Reports of misconduct may have prompted scrutiny from the Administration. As was discussed during the meeting, the Administration may be using the legality discussed above to penalize the staff of the D-Bar. This possibility, however, has not been officially confirmed by the Administration of the Graduate School.

% In order to handle the D-Bar crisis, several strategies have been suggested. The first is simply to wait for the February deadline to pass and to do nothing in the meantime.

In a separate conversation with Ulli Struve, it was revealed that the Administration presently plans to install a card reader admitting only Graduate College and Annex residents.

Another possible scenario is the distribution of stickers to affix to ID cards indicating membership in the GC/Annexes.

In the case of the cardreader, it was claimed during the meeting that the reader will lack the ability to track the movement of students into the D-Bar. In both cases, graduate students who aren't residents, the Administration asserts, can readily gain admission as guests.

During the meeting, some members of the Assembly challenged the claim that the change in February will take place in a smooth and inobtrusive manner. To some, the card reader can only serve as a dampening influence. Others complained about the necessity that nonresidents find a resident host. The requirement that nonresidents have hosts is seen by some as a strong inhibition.

% The second possibility for reacting to the D-Bar situation

rests largely in the hands of Graduate College and Annex residents. The idea is to amend the Graduate College House Committee constitution.

& The proposed constitutional change would make all graduate students members of the Graduate College House. However, as is required by law, the change would make all Princeton Graduate Students voting members of the GC House.

* To circumvent the problem of having nonresidents able to vote on matters that really only concern the GC residents, GC House leaders have proposed a double tiered system. In the two tiered system, GC/Annex residents will vote on all matters.

In the case of nonresidents, voting shall be restricted to social matters.

* As is discussed below, the GC House Committee leaders have had difficulty obtaining permission to meet with the University legal counsel. This effectively prevents us from learning whether the dual - tiered system is a legal option.

* To obtain answers to many of the pressing questions surrounding the Debasement Bar, a fact finding committee has been formed. The membership of the committee is:

Eric Adelizzi
Cristin Howley
Simon Keller
Nathan Marsh
Don Priour

% At present, the Graduate Student Government has resolved that the D-Bar should be accessible to all graduate students. It has issued letters to Dean Wilson and Dean Montero of the Graduate School and to Ulli Struve, Residence Life Coordinator of the GC, informing them of the resolution. The GSG has also formed the fact finding committee mentioned above.

The GSG has tabled the matters of whether or not to issue a petition or hold a public meeting until the next meeting of the GSG.

In addition, the GSG has at present determined not to take a

position regarding the proposed amendment to the Graduate College House Committee constitutional amendment. The resolution issued by the GSG is displayed in full detail below.

RESOLVED, the Graduate Student Government supports the D-Bar being legally and freely open to all graduate students without restriction. We see this as a serious issue impacting on graduate student life, and we urge the administration to work with the graduate student body to achieve this goal.

I Five Speeches Concerning the Status of the Debasement Bar.

The five speakers, in order of appearance, are: Adrian Banner, Chair of the Graduate College House Committee; Jason Brownlee, Assistant Chair of the Graduate College House Committee; Simon Keller, a former bartender at the D-Bar; Jim Vere, Representative Secretary for the GSG; Eszter Hargittai, Chair of the GSG. In addition, Scott Harper, former GSG Chair and former Bar Czar, and David Baker former GSG Treasurer and former Bar Czar were invited to comment on the matter. Each speaker was allotted five minutes.

Adrian Banner:

Adrian Banner has been in contact with the Graduate School administration to find a means of allowing all graduate students to visit the D-Bar. Unfortunately, Adrian's conversations with members of the administration yielded information, but little or no progress toward a solution. As Adrian stated, there are two intertwined problems that now plague the D-Bar. The first is a legal problem connected with the D-Bar license. The current club liquor license only permits members of the Graduate College and annexes to attend the D-Bar. Princeton's legal council has advised that it enter compliance with the club license laws by February. Another challenge the D-Bar faces is the decision made by the administration that it enter compliance with the club license laws

by February.

A proposed means of enforcing the membership restriction is the installation of a card reader at the entrance to the D-Bar. Non GC residents would only be admitted as guests of residents, requiring that

they be the responsibility of resident D-Bar patrons.

A possible means of averting the changes described above is for the GC House Committee to alter its constitution in such a way that all graduate students become members of the Graduate College House Committee.

Although Adrian has already drafted an amended version of the constitution,

he expects that passing the amendment will prove difficult. It is expected,

he says, that the matter will be put to a vote around February 15.

If the amendment passes, it is believed that it will be a legally sound solution. However, a more desirable situation is a tiered membership in which non Graduate College residents vote on issues related to social matters, but do not vote on internal housing matters that only concern GC and annex residents. Adrian indicated that his attempts to discuss the tiered membership idea with Princeton University legal counsel have not

born fruit. Indeed, he has been unable even to set up a meeting with the counselors.

Unfortunately, owing to previous violations on the part of the D-Bar,

a year's time will be needed to establish a "track record". The violations have evidently included the serving of liquor to individuals

younger than 21 and also include serving liquor past 2 A.M.

Adrian then turned to the matter of petitions. The worst impact a petition had, he said, would be to offend the administration sufficiently

that a voice of support would be lost to the graduate students. A petition might also cause enough publicity to result in a state investigation and the loss of the D-Bar's club license. However, Adrian seemed less emphatic about this possibility than others had been at the December meeting of the GSG.

Jason Brownlee:

Jason began by emphasizing that the status of the Debasement Bar is not merely a GC issue, but a matter which affects the entire Princeton graduate student community. The D-Bar, he stated, is "a unique

contribution to our lives", certainly a graduate student issue.

Jason proposed a set of measures aimed at informing the graduate student body and enabling it to react to the D-Bar crisis in a unified way. The speaker stressed that action prior to the administration's change in policy is essential.

Jason urged that the GSG formulate a position on the status of the D-Bar. He suggested a petition sent by graduate students in support of access to the D-Bar, but not assuming an adversarial stance toward the deans. Jason broached the idea of holding a public meeting. By inviting the graduate deans, the hope is to foster a dialogue that will

answer pressing questions regarding possible solutions to the D-Bar crisis. Lastly, Jason recommended that what information is available be communicated to the entire graduate student community. To accomplish this end, he suggested that the information be distributed via massive surface mailings and/or by email.

Simon Keller:

In a manner similar to Jason, Simon asserted that action prior to the February deadline would be most effective. Simon began his speech by expressing the opinion that the impending administration's policy change regarding the D-Bar has been prompted as much by a desire to penalize the D-Bar's past violations as a need to adhere to legal constraints. As stated earlier, the violations include the serving of liquor to minors as well as serving beyond 2 A.M. Particular note was made of tension between a former Bar Czar and the graduate school administration.

Simon emphasized that operating in this manner to penalize the the D-Bar staff does not merely punish the Bar staff. It unfortunately also negatively impacts all of the graduate students who visit the D-Bar.

Simon discussed solutions of the D-Bar crisis. He urged that the graduate student community do what it can to appear less as a rabble and more as an organized force. Simon requested that the GSG send the graduate deans a letter, and asked that it be sent soon.

Jim Vere:

Jim cautioned that perhaps some of the actions previously suggested are premature. Jim warned that we cannot ask the Administration to "break the law". Instead, he suggested, it is better that the

University

legal counsel be given an opportunity to review the legal ramifications of an ammendment to the GC House Committee constitution. Jim indicated

that such a review is presently in progress and stated that Dean Montero

has promised us that she will get back to us on this matter.

Waiting for word from the University counsel may enable us to determine

the legality of this avenue of solution.

Another concern voiced by Jim is that it is not clear that the students

living at the GC and annexes will accept the proposed amendment. Jim suggested that we wait to act until after the February 15 vote. He underscored the need to gather additional facts before acting on

limited

information.

Eszter Hargittai:

Eszter's remarks suggested a position similar to that assumed by Jim.

She also suggested that immediate action is premature. She reiterated the idea that the root of the Graduate School's concern over the D-Bar is simply that New Jersey serving laws have not been taken seriously. In particular, she explained, minors have been served alcohol.

Eszter's particular message concerning the proposed amendment to the

GC House constitution is that the amendment is really a major change for

the GC House Committee. She felt that the best approach is to allow the GC and Annex residents to choose for themselves whether or not to accept the amendment. Eszter didn't deem it appropriate for the GSG

to

make a statement on a matter that really concerns primarily GC residents.

Eszter emphasized that in February, it is not policy that will change,

but instead the enforcement of extent policy. Perhaps the change in how

the policy is regarded by the administration will have a negligible impact on visitors to the D-Bar. We should, Eszter said, wait several weeks beyond the February change and see how things develop. Then, she suggested, calling a public meeting might be a reasonable step to take.

Scott Harper:

In his speech, Scott also advocated a "watch and wait" stance. He felt that a graduate student petition is a good idea, but suggested restraint in all other avenues. Scott cited tension between a former Bar Czar and the Administration as a cause for the impending change in the way the the D-Bar policy is handled. Scott posed three questions to the assembly. He first asked what will be needed to obtain a revised license. Scott then asked what is the minimal action that will satisfy the administration and comply with the laws. Lastly, Scott asked what the potential difficulties are of making all graduate students members of the Graduate College House Committee.

David Baker:

David, having witnessed the serving of undergraduates at the D-Bar, cited this occurrence as a major source for the administration's present concern. He suggested that the "guest - book" scheme proposed by the administration might not be as intolerable as has been suggested. Dave also advocated a "Watch and Wait" stance.

II Open Discussion

Following the seven speeches, open discussion began. Beverley McKeon agreed to act as moderator.

Adrian Banner was the first to respond. He emphasized that things the policy shift will have a noticeable impact upon the D-Bar. Adrian cited the possible installation of ID card readers as an example of potential negative developments.

Karthick wondered if the card reader shall have the ability to take names. A member of the assembly stated that the card reader, if installed, will not be able to keep a permanent record of who enters the D-Bar.

Adrian estimated that 60 - 70% of the D-Bar clientele consists of graduate students not living either in the GC or in annexes. Thus, a massive guest list would be required. The GC House Committee chair downplayed the need for a card reader, citing the recent successful effort to render the D-Bar inaccessible to undergraduates.

Adrian then furnished the fact that 2/3 of the GC House members must vote for the amendment in order to alter the constitution. Adrian indicated that the Deans have met on the constitutional change.

However,

Adrian and Jason have not been able to obtain consent from the administration to meet with the University Legal counsel.

[As stated above by Adrian, it is estimated that the majority of the D-Bar clientele is comprised of nonresidents. It was reported at the meeting that Bar Czar Amlan Majumdar has performed estimates on the financial impact of change in policy enforcement on the D-Bar.

Amlan's

estimates have varied widely, and range from mild to severe. In the most severe case, the D-Bar would have to close down two days during each week to reduce operating costs to acceptable levels.]

Jason stated that the constitutional change might be a legally viable solution. The idea is that a list of all graduate students would be submitted to the control board following the constitutional change. Jason felt that we might profit in asking non - GC residents what they think about the matter. After all, he explained, they also are impacted by the proposed constitutional change.

Eszter reminded the assembly that is very important that we make a decision on what action(s) to take.

Simon stated that changing policies toward students older than 21 is of no use in preventing underage drinking. Simon moderated his stance somewhat by asserting that it might be best to gather more information before attempting a public meeting. The matter, he said, is largely in the hands of the administration since it controls access to University Counsel.

Karthick suggested we think of the D-Bar as a concern for graduate students, not just GC residents. He advocated the proposed House Committee amendment as a proper avenue. Karthick recommended waiting to see if the amendment passes. If it passes and the graduate deans accept this mode of solution, then the matter is resolved, he says.

If the administration expresses skepticism, then Karthick suggests that the graduate students as a body point out the dichotomy of the Eating Clubs and the Debasement Bar. While the D-Bar is presently receiving a great deal of scrutiny, the eating clubs are paid relatively little heed despite their private and informal existence.

Steve Garcia wondered if possibly the administration has been motivated by a desire to move graduate business to the Frist campus center. He cited the dining services "point system" as an example of an effort to encourage undergraduate students to patronize the soon - to - be operational Frist center.

Cristin Howley indicated that she agreed with Karthick's remarks. She

inquired how the administration intends to handle the D-Bar when February arrives and what form the new rules will take.

Convinced that the enthusiasm for keeping the D-Bar open to all graduate

students will lose steam after the February deadline, Cristin encouraged a mass email.

Eszter reiterated Dean Montero's plan to use either a card reader or a sticker system. The sticker, affixed to the ID card, indicates that the

student is a resident of the Graduate College or Annexes.

Eszter emphasized that, contrary to what may have been assumed, she is

indeed in favor of all Princeton graduate students having access to the

Debasement Bar. However, she said she felt the Aens are aware of graduate students' wishes. In fact, it is Eszter's opinion that the Administration is acting to penalize the D-Bar for its earlier failure to comply with the serving rules.

Nathan Marsh stated that the GSG, as a body, needs to formulate a policy

on the D-Bar. He recommended that the GSG take two actions. First, Nathan

suggested, the GSG should resolve that it is best for the D-Bar to be open

to all graduate students. Second, Nathan recommended that, by way of petition, we communicate to the administration that the graduate

community

stands behind the goal of having the D-Bar remain open to all graduate students.

Jason Brownlee furnished some vital information on the Frist Campus Center. Alcoholic beverages, in the form of beer and wine, will be available at the campus center. Jason mentioned that, according to Stua Orefice of Dining Services, the graduate students on the Campus Center Committee had characterized the Frist Center as a place to go "every once in a while". He emphasized that it will by

no

means function like the D-Bar.

Jason urged the GSG to authorize a committee to meet with the deans and learn more about the situation. He also suggested that we develop

a

petition.

Heather Van Buskirk stated that a petition is premature. She said that we should be careful to avoid irritating the administration.

III Discussion Leading Toward Actions by the GSG

Eric Adelizzi spoke next, and used the chance to outline a list of actions that the GSG might take. The options Eric listed are listed below, and were recorded on the black board for the benefit of the assembly. Subsequent discussion focused largely on which of the

measures

to adopt and how to implement the actions the assembly voted in favor of

of taking.

GSG Resolution

Letter from the GSG

Formation of a Committee

Petition

A GSG conducted Public Meeting
(Jason recommended the public meeting)

GSG participation in the referendum to amend the
GSG constitution via

(a) A statement to in the information packet to be
provided to all GC/annex residents

(b) GSG participation in a potential public meeting
at the Graduate College hosted by the House Committee.

It was determined that the GSG would issue a resolution advocating
that

the D-Bar be open to all graduate students. Eric Adelizzi provided
the

initial text of the resolution, and after some modification, the
assembly

approved the final version. It is included in these minutes below.

The GSG Resolution Regarding the Debasement Bar

being RESOLVED, the Graduate Student Government supports the D-Bar

legally and freely open to all graduate students without
restriction. We see this as a serious issue impacting on
graduate student life, and we urge the administration to work
with the graduate student body to achieve this goal.

Next, the assembly toyed with the idea of appointing a special
committee. Adrian and Jason quickly agreed to work with the
committee, should it be formed.

After some discussion, the assembly voted to form a committee.
However, it stipulated that the committee would act only in a
fact - finding capacity, and that it would not independently take
action.

The fact finding committee contains the following members.

Eric Adelizzi
Cristin Howley
Simon Keller
Nathan Marsh
Don Priour

Subsequent discussion determined that the committee will also be
allowed to attend this Monday's Graduate College House Committee
Meeting.

Though committee members will be permitted to express their own opinions at the meeting, the assembly decided that committee members should preface their remarks by saying that their statements are in no way the opinion of the GSG.

The letter was the third item to be discussed. The idea, as articulated by Simon Keller, was to send a letter to the graduate Deans containing the GSG's resolution.

% While it seemed quite likely that the assembly would vote to issue a letter, vigorous discussion ensued about the content of the letter.

% There was sentiment expressed that the GSG endorse the proposed constitution to the GC House constitution. Though neither Adrian nor Jason recommended a particular course of action, Adrian urged the GSG to consider carefully in reaching a decision.

% However, Eszter and Jim countered by stating that the constitutional amendment is an internal decision that is best left in the hands of the Graduated College and Annex residents.

% Ultimately, the assembly voted not to take a position on the constitutional amendment. Eric Adelizzi was appointed as scribe, and the letter was drafted. It was approved by the assembly, and except for minor spelling errors that were corrected via email correspondence, it appeared as shown below.

Dean {y}
Dean of {z}
Nassau Hall

Dear Dean {y}:

At our January meeting, the Graduate Student Government passed the following resolution:

RESOLVED, the Graduate Student Government supports the D-Bar

being

legally and freely open to all graduate students without restriction. We see this as a serious issue impacting on graduate student life, and we urge the administration to

work

with the graduate student body to achieve this goal.

We have also formed a fact-finding committee composed of Cristin Howley, Nathan Marsh, Simon Keller, Don Priour, and Eric Adelizzi, to study the issues involved and we ask that you meet with them and cooperate in their inquiry.

Sincerely,
The Assembly of the Graduate Student Government

cc: Dean {x}
Ulrich Struve, Residence Life Coordinator

Next, the GSG assembly considered the possibility of holding a public meeting. Again, discussion was spirited. The idea of the meeting is to invite the deans of the Graduate School to speak in a public forum and listen to graduate student concerns regarding the Debasement Bar.

% Simon warned that, very simply, a bad public meeting is bad. If we were to hold a public meeting prior to the February deadline, then it should receive a great deal of effort.

Finding % Karthick advised waiting for the information from the Fact Committee to "percolate down" before calling for any type of public meeting.

one % Cindy suggested that the Graduate College public meeting be the public meeting, freeing the GSG from the need to organize a meeting of its own.

% Jason countered by saying that if the GSG hosts a public meeting, then a broader range of graduate students will be in attendance.

% Karthick expressed his support for a public meeting prior to the February deadline. He warned that "institutional inertia" makes it difficult to overcome policy decisions. Hence, he argued, sooner was a better time than later to organize a public meeting.

% Sentiment opposing an immediate public meeting prevailed, and the assembly voted to table the matter until the February 24 meeting.

Finally, the possibility of a GSG petition was discussed. If issued, the petition would be distributed via the departmental representatives.

% Ann Morning felt that a petition is not a powerful tool at present.

She also opposed the idea of multiple petitions. Karthick expressed his agreement, saying that petitions spaced a month apart may cause students to "burn out".

% Simon requested an immediate petition, arguing that pressure spread over a long period of time is ineffective.

% Jason also advocated that a petition be developed soon. He touted the petition as an effective way to make student voices heard.

Jason also cautioned the assembly about the phenomenon of "institutional inertia". Once established, he said, policy changes are difficult to undo.

% Ultimately, sentiment in favor of waiting for additional information caused the assembly to vote to table further discussion on the petition issue.

As the petition issue was being tabled, Eric completed a preliminary draft of the letter which the GSG shall issue. For the sake of diplomacy, it was determined that each dean will be addressed personally. Each dean will be advised via the "CC" notation of the mailings to the other dean and to Ulli Struve.

With the letter solidified, adjournment followed at 9:30pm.

The next GSG meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 15 at 6:00pm in the Office of Population Research, Located at 21 Prospect Street. (The building is identified by the prominent cannon facing the street.)

