

GSG • Assembly Meeting • July 12, 2006

• [Outline and Summary](#) • [Attendance](#) • [Minutes](#) • [Summer Letter Writing Proposals](#) •

Outline and Summary

1. Call to Order and Assembly Business
1. [Approval of Minutes \(May, June\) - Shin-Yi Lin](#)
2. Decision Items
 1. [GSG Summer Letter Writing Campaign](#)
3. [New Business](#)
4. Reports
 1. [Chair - Shin-Yi Lin](#)
5. [Adjournment](#)
6. (Next meeting August 9, 2006 at 6pm in Frist 309)

Attendance

•**Representatives present**• Neven Fuckar, AOS • Juan Norgues, CEE • Robert Scogna, proxy for Swaroop Chatterjee, CHE • Xiaoling Ang, ECO • Anita Adhitya, GEO • Lindy Baldwin, HOS • Shin-Yi Lin, MOL • Daniel Raburn, PPL • Susan Robison, PSY • Julia Belopsky, proxy for Cori Anderson, SLA •

•**Delegates present**• Dante Ricci, BUT • Neven Fuckar, GCO •

•**Councilors present**• Chair Shin-Yi Lin, CPUC, CPUC Executive Committee • Parliamentary Secretary Dan Raburn, • Treasurer Alex Ntelekos •

•**Others present**• Dean Lisa Schreyer, Graduate School •

•**Representatives absent**• Katherine Bold, ACM • Ricky Martin, ANT • Marion Riggs, ART • Adam Dunn, CHM • Jake Mackey, CLA • Chris DeCoro, COS • Clara Tuan, EAS • Adrian De Froment, EEB • Ilias Tagkopoulos, ELE • Megan Ewing, GER • Jesse Salazar, HIS • Robert Harron, MAT • Samir Soneji, OPR • Steve Hassani, PHY • Brookes Brown, POL • Harvey Stark, REL • Kenneth Jamison, SOC • Frankki Bevins, WWS •

•**Delegates absent**• Tian Xia, ACSS • Weining Man, CIGS • Bernice Rosenzweig, BGC •

Marcelline Block, HIB • Jennifer Jordan, LAW • Steve Hassani, MIL •
•**Councilors absent**• Kellam Conover, CPUC • Jeff Dwoskin, Facilities • Leslie Hinkson,
CPUC • Luke MacDonald, CPUC • Medini Pedmanabhan, CPUC • Guillaume Sabouret,
CPUC, CPUC Executive Committee • Karin Sigloch, CPUC, CPUC Rights and Rules
Committee, Health and Life • Sara Nephew, CPUC Governance Committee • Diana Hill,
CPUC Judicial Committee • Fatema Gunja, CPUC, CPUC Priorities Committee • Ian
Parrish, CPUC, CPUC Priorities Committee • Josh Friess, CPUC Resources Committee •
James Bickford, CPUC Rights and Rules Committee • Canturk Isci, Academic Affairs •
Steve Hassani, Academic Affairs •
•**Representative seats vacant**• ARC• AST• COM• ENG• FIT• MAE• MUS• NES• ORF•
PHI• SPO•
•**Delegate seats vacant**• Women's Center • Off-Campus Representative •

Minutes

I. Call to Order and Assembly Business

The meeting commenced at 6:13 pm.

We did not have quorum for this meeting. Shin-Yi Lin proposed that Assembly make informal decisions with the hope that, when we have quorum, Assembly can approve the decisions made at today's meeting after the fact. We performed all votes by voice vote.

A. Approval of Minutes (May, June) - Shin-Yi Lin

Ms. Lin received corrections from Anita Adhitya and Cori Anderson. They were editorial changes (e.g., typos, misspellings). Some ambiguities in the June minutes that could not be resolved were edited out. Assembly approved both sets of minutes with corrections.

II. Decision Items

A. GSG Summer Letter Writing Campaign

Ms. Lin said: *Starting in 2003 (as far as I can tell from the minutes), the GSG has written letters during the summer to administrators regarding various graduate student issues.*

We choose August for these letters because administrators submit requests to the Priorities Committee (PriComm) in September. The following groups can submit PriComm requests: Dean Russel (Graduate School), VP McKay (Facilities), VP Dickerson (Campus Life), VP Leydon (Computing), Karin Trainer (Library), Executive VP Burstein (Administrative and Support Services), Dean Dobkin (Faculty Staffing), VP Sullivan-Crowley (Faculty and Staff Salaries), Dean Malkiel (Undergraduate Financial Aid). However, our issues are often addressed without needing to involve a PriComm request. Last week, the Executive Committee sent out a global to all graduate students asking them for ideas. In the past, we have asked for requests through Assembly but we've found that information doesn't get to the graduate student body as well during the summers. We received almost 20 emails. Along with ideas that Exec itself already have, we have organized these ideas into 19 proposals. The vote will be a resolution - where abstentions will count as a no. Things to consider when deciding whether we should approve these issues for the letter writing campaign: 1) Is this an issue that most graduate students would agree is important? 2) Is this issue appropriate for the formal letter writing campaign, or should it be addressed through Exec or a Committee Chair (or the GSLI)? 3) Is the proposed solution an effective way to address the issue? 4) You do not need to consider the language of the proposal. The Exec Committee is in charge of writing up these letters and determining which administrators should receive them. 5) There is no limit to how many letters we write.

The proposals for the summer letter writing campaign were sent to Assembly beforehand ([PDF file](#)).

1. Expand summer gym hours

Ms. Lin reiterated a concern that had come up at previous Assembly meetings (e.g., [see 2004's minutes](#)) that students wouldn't really make use of expanded gym hours. Xiaoling Ang asked if there was any way to move around the hours such that there was no service during the middle of the day, but expanded service before or after work. But Ms. Lin noted that staff use it during the day. Julia Belopsky agreed that the gym was not just for students. Ms. Lin remembered that there was a summer daycare program at the gym that would also prevent Dillon closing during the day. Regarding weekend hours, Lindy Baldwin asked if the gym could open earlier on the weekends, as it doesn't open until noon. She also asked if we had proposed changes to machinery in the past, in particular

replacing stairmasters with elliptical machines. Ms. Lin replied that we have not done so in the past but had worded requests to ask generally for more space and equipment. Juan Norgues returned to the issue of weekday nights, commenting that the early closing conflicted with dinner plans and supporting the request for expanded gym hours. Susan Robison said she thought that the hours were sufficient and did not think this was worth writing a letter about. A voice vote showed that Assembly did not support this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

2. Provide programming time for Housing Office to streamline draw process;
3. Improve organization and additional staff for graduate housing in the Housing Office;
4. House a higher percentage of graduate students

About #2, Dean Lisa Schreyer noted that the current policy was to give priority to incoming students, which could be in conflict with the retaining principle. She suggested that this letter was not a simple request for programming time, but was rather a request for a change in housing policy. For example, a change in policy towards an absolute retain-based algorithm could create problems in at the Graduate College: If any student successful in the draw could retain their dorm room at the GC, it is likely that not all incoming students who would want to live in the GC could live there (NB: current policy is that any first year student who wants to live in the GC can live there); this change could therefore have an effect on the first-year experience for graduate students. Ms. Belopsky voiced a concern that not everybody would be happy with their first apartment and would want to retain. Ms. Baldwin noted that the details of the algorithm were not the issue here, but whether we write a letter to support the program writing. But Ms. Schreyer disagreed, saying that the request doesn't make sense unless Assembly considers whether it truly wants to support an absolute retain-based policy (NB: At the moment, anyone who is successful in the draw can retain their housing -- except for those wishing to live at the GC). Ms. Belopsky re-stated Ms. Schreyer's opinion that this letter was more about whether we should adopt a retain-based policy than whether we should write a letter for a programmer. She expressed support for a retain-based system.

Alex Ntelekos brought up proposal #3: he criticized the Housing Office for responding to student complaints with the excuse of the office being understaffed. Ms. Schreyer replied

that two additional full-time graduate housing staff are going to be hired. She also said that they had looked for someone to head the graduate housing part of the Housing Office, but that nobody had applied for the job last year. As mentioned at the [last Assembly meeting](#), the Housing Office has decided to re-organize its internal structure and re-advertise the position (which is slightly different than it was last year). Ms. Lin suggested that the additional staff would make things faster. However, she noted that there was only about a two-week window with respect to assignments for move-in, move-out, incoming students etc., so that improvements on the efficiency with which the Housing Office made housing assignments was limited.

Returning to #2, Ms. Lin clarified that a retain-based system might mean that first year students may not be guaranteed housing at the Graduate College. Ms. Baldwin asked if the hypothetical retain system would only apply to the Graduate College. Dean Schreyer noted that it would not. Nevin Fuckar suggested that if we were to support this proposal, Assembly needed a clear policy or at least a simulation to determine how this would play out. Ms. Robison noted that all graduate students know that the Housing Office is a problem, and suggested that instead of Assembly arguing about these details, we should just write to ask for more money for graduate housing in general. Ms. Schreyer disagreed, saying that the issue on the table is what students are truly willing to give up if they want to move less during their graduate career. Mr. Ntelekos understood that discussing these policy shifts was important, but that first and foremost, the limited housing staff has made the assignment process even more problematic than normal. Ms. Lin responded to Mr. Fuckar's comment about running a simulation. While graduate students could volunteer to do these simulations, wasn't it the Housing Office's responsibility to determine what situation is best? Ms. Lin suggested that, with the degree of complaints that were occurring, it was incumbent on the Housing Office to make the necessary changes. Ms. Adhitya asked if there was a middle ground: those who want to retain can, those who wish to change housing go into the draw. Dean Schreyer replied that this would still mean switching from a year-based priority to a retain-based priority. Ms. Lin suggested that the GSG could run a survey amongst graduate students. Based on this survey, the Housing Office would have a better idea of what changes, if any, are needed in housing policy. It is after all possible that the current system is the best situation if we take everyone's competing interests into consider. As for the summer letter writing campaign, she suggested that we write a general letter of complaint, leaving out any specific policy recommendations. A voice vote showed that Assembly supported this modified proposal

for the letter writing campaign.

5. Separate Graduate College rent increases from UG room and board increases;

6. Graduate College summer rents should reflect room size;

7. Graduate College spring semester rent charges should be spread out over five months

Ms. Ang believed that #5 and #6 were important issues, but that #7 was not. Regarding #7, she noted that if the change was implemented, those staying at the GC in June would then have to pay both the June rent, and the partial rent for the previous month. Ms. Adhitya wondered whether these were real PriComm requests as they did not request funding. Ms. Lin replied that #5 would probably reduce the university's revenue and would therefore cost money to implement; she was unsure about #6. A voice vote showed that Assembly supported proposals #5 and #6, but did not support proposal #7 for the letter writing campaign.

8. DCE tuition should not be significantly increased.

Ms. Baldwin stated that she thought this was one of the most important of the suggestions. A voice vote showed that Assembly unanimously supported this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

9. Increased P-rides express service

Ms. Lin said that Mr. Dwoskin, who was absent at this meeting, had suggested this particular proposal for adding another van to the weeknight after-hours service in the hours that the P-rides already runs. The purpose of this proposal is to reduce the waiting times for the van so that it could be used by graduate students more often. Anecdotally, she has heard that students who would normally use P-rides during late nights decide not to because the wait ends up being longer than the travel time. As a result, students may feel unsafe walking home but do it anyway out of convenience. Ms. Lin specifically asked if a day-time weekend P-rides service would be welcome, noting that this could be a service largely used by graduate students, who often need to get back on campus during the weekends for research purposes (NB: P-rides express runs during late weeknights during the academic year). She was under the impression that a P-Rides van during the

weekend had been discussed years ago, but that we couldn't find willing graduate student drivers. There was no general consensus about whether weekend service was needed. A voice vote showed that Assembly supported this proposal (for one more van during normal P-ride express operating hours) for the letter writing campaign.

10. Reduced OIT Fees

Ms. Robison expressed support for this. Ms. Belopsky was concerned that it would be too hard for OIT to distinguish between two machines belonging to the same student or two machines belonging to different students (the idea is that students would manipulate the system such that two students would only sign up for one account). But Ms. Ang said that some students legitimately have two computers, noting that she knew people in that situation in her department. There was some ambiguity about what the cost for an extra connection was; \$15/month was suggested. Ms. Ang stated that the Economics department is currently paying for the extra access (partly because the second laptop is often for teaching purposes) but that not all departments could afford this for their students. Ms. Baldwin suggested a compromise, limiting the number of devices registered to each student to 2-3 (instead of an unlimited number of devices). Ms. Ntelekos suggested waiving the cost of network access for all students. Regarding this specific proposal, he thought that there aren't that many people who had two devices. Regarding Mr. Ntelekos' suggestion of free network access for all students, Ms. Lin stated that this would be an incredibly large request, as the policy would probably also need to be changed for undergraduate students. Mr. Norgues wondered what the problem was with submitting a huge request. While there is no specific problem, Ms. Lin stated that the current budget is tight and so there probably won't be the funds needed to implement this now. Ms. Baldwin suggested that, even if the money is not currently available, it might be worth bringing this issue up now. Ms. Lin wondered if a free usage situation exists at peer institutions, because it would be easier for us to convince the university if our peer institutions were doing this. Mr. Ntelekos stated that he thought that \$15/month was too high a cost, but Ms. Belopsky cited University of Pennsylvania when she argued that Princeton's service was affordable. Ms. Lin suggested that instead of writing a letter, the Executive Committee should discuss this issue with OIT (e.g., what are the costs exactly, how many students are paying for dual/triple access, what is feasible, what our peer institutions' policies are) and that perhaps next year we could make a bigger push with more convincing arguments. A voice vote showed that Assembly did not support this

proposal for the letter writing campaign.

11. Address the discrepancy between full teaching loads under DCE versus lecturer status

Mr. Ntelekos mentioned that the last time that Dean Russel was at Assembly, he was already aware of this issue. As a result, he didn't feel that it was necessary to write a letter about this. A voice vote showed that Assembly did not support this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

12. Provide Frist dining options during the summer

Dante Ricci asked what would be required to modify Cafe Vivian such that it could be open independently from the rest of Frist. Ms. Lin said that, according to the research of last year's Executive Committee, this would require an extra door to close off access to the main building, handicap accessibility (which the other opening to Cafe Vivian has), and a bathroom (which could also be accommodated without additional renovations). While she has discussed this issue with Tom Myers, Director of Frist, and believes he is in support of this proposal, there haven't been formal evaluations of the space to determine whether this would truly be "up to code". A voice vote showed that Assembly supported this proposal for the letter writing campaign; there was one nay vote.

13. Improve lighting, campus safety, and sidewalks;

14. More blue-light phones

Ms. Lin stated that we have been writing about this issue for several years now, but that it continues to be one of the top concerns amongst graduate students. Ms. Baldwin noted that at least one student has been hit by a car along Alexander Road. Ms. Schreyer stated that there had been at least five incidents in recent history. A voice vote showed that Assembly unanimously supported proposals #13 and #14 for the letter writing campaign.

15. Improve the quality of GC food

Ms. Schreyer said that a renovation of Procter Hall servery is part of the multi-phase Graduate College renovation plans, but that funding is currently a limiting factor because the cost will be very high. The plan is to expand the dining hall and to bring it in line with

the marketplace -style changes that are happening on the undergraduate level. Mr. Raburn asked if funds would go into running the Graduate College in general if funds were requested. Ms. Schreyer noted that we could ask specifically for funds to be directed to the servery. A voice vote showed that Assembly supported this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

16. A university-wide push for sustainability

Ms. Lin said that she had recently been on the Dartmouth campus and their environmental awareness was much more visible (e.g., Dartmouth composts their food waste, they had more signage and greater accessibility to recycling bins). She noted that, although one could recycle at Princeton, in general this was not actively encouraged across campus. Mr. Ntelekos said that this issue of sustainability was not limited to recycling. He believed that this letter would be focused on increasing awareness and marketing. Ms. Adhitya expressed support for addressing environmental education and awareness. She noted that there was not a culture of environmental awareness at Princeton. Mr. Raburn suggested that this was an important issue to maintain interest in. A voice vote showed that Assembly supported this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

17. Campus Bar

Mr. Fuckar wondered if there would be a liquor license issue. Ms. Lin informed Assembly that the liquor license for the pilot program was revoked after the first trial night. Mr. Raburn thought the issue was about whether it was a weekly event. Dean Schreyer stated that the permits were revoked because the licensing board hadn't realized that this was a trial for a future campus bar; they had thought it was only for a short-term event. Ms. Belopsky noted that, although she enjoyed a drink, she thought this was not necessarily good to promote on campus. She pointed out that there were a large number of pubs that were technically off-campus but were still very close to campus. Ms. Robison suggested that on-campus pubs would minimize driving while intoxicated. Mr. Ntelekos mentioned the undergraduate-graduate relations aim of the campus bar. Ms. Belopsky again emphasized that the East Pyne was not far from Nassau Street. She thought that while an on-campus bar might improve relations with undergraduates, an on-campus bar would separate the university community from the rest of Princeton. Mr.

Norgues stated that he thought that there were no Nassau Street bars that have the atmosphere or objective of the proposed on-campus bar. Mr. Ricci thought that he did not think that an on-campus bar would encourage over-drinking, especially as it would be well-regulated (as opposed to the eating clubs). He suggested it would be an opportunity to socialize beyond the usual social boundaries. Ms. Belopsky re-iterated that she thought a bar on campus territory would be problematic; she wondered if we could relocate the same event to a bar on Nassau Street. A voice vote showed that Assembly supported this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

18. Hardship DCE funds for Humanities students

Mr. Fuckar asked why only humanities students were considered here. Ms. Lin stated that the requestor believed that they would be most likely to be under hardship. Ms. Lin wondered if this issue was already being addressed in other ways (e.g., if AI positions were a more viable option for post-enrolled students, then humanities students could elect DCE instead of ET-DCC). Ms. Robison was concerned that 'hardship' was a somewhat nebulous concept, making it difficult to distribute funds fairly. A voice vote showed that Assembly did not support this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

19. Increase hardship funds for medical expenses

Ms. Schreyer informed Assembly that she hadn't been aware that this was a problem. The only thing she thought might cause problems is that Dean Montero often has to pace her support so that there is money for requests that arrive later in the year. Mr. Fuckar asked if one could re-apply. Ms. Lin suggested that instead of writing a letter, the Executive Committee should discuss this issue with Dean Montero (e.g., what is the allocation process, can students re-apply at the end of the year, how many students take advantage of this fund). A voice vote showed that Assembly did not support this proposal for the letter writing campaign.

Ms. Lin summarized the letters that Assembly supported for the letter writing campaign: Housing improvements (do not suggest specific policy changes, only articulate current issues); GC rent problems (disassociate GC dorm annual increases from undergraduate room and board increases, summer rents should not be a flat rate but should reflect room size); DCE tuition should not be increased; P-Rides services should be expanded; Frist

renovations to allow Café Vivian to be open independently; Improved lighting, campus safety, sidewalks and blue-lights along Alexander and Faculty Roads; Improve dining at Procter Hall; University-wide push for sustainability; Campus Bar.

III. New Business

There was no new business.

IV. Reports

A. Chair's Report

Ms. Lin did not have a make-up report for the June meeting she missed because the content of the report was covered was already discussed during the June meeting, [see Discussion points](#)).

Ms. Lin made the following Chair's report for the July meeting: *The Executive Committee has met twice since our June meeting. We have been busy compiling and organizing the summer letter writing campaign letters and getting the GSLI 2006 written. The top goals of the GSG this year: 1) Increased participation and general awareness of the GSG (e.g., we are considering monthly e-bulletins), 2) Pushing ahead on better social options for graduate students on central campus.*

Ms. Lin solicited opinions about whether there was truly a desire for graduate student social options on campus. Ms. Ang mentioned that, at her undergraduate university, there was a mixed-student (e.g. mixed-year) event called the President's Ball every year. She believes that this kind of undergraduate-graduate interaction has to be encouraged by higher-ups in the university to be successful. Ms. Baldwin suggested examining options for expanding hours at Chancellor Green. Ms. Robison stated that she thought we should think more specifically about what our objectives are. She suggested that those who wanted to get involved with undergraduate life, find ways to do so. Ms. Robison thought that the Graduate College was a good nexus, especially for incoming students. She thought that, although it was a good idea to incorporate everybody (e.g. undergraduates and graduates), she did not feel a personal need for a place on central campus because she found the Graduate College to be a great place to socialize. Ms. Robison also suggested

that our efforts should be focused on promoting what we already have. She noted that the first year of graduate school was the most critical time for friendship formation. Ms. Ang asked if increased shuttle service could be provided for special events, e.g. the Graduate College Formal, as a way to encourage non-GC first years to socialize with GC students. Ms. Lin suggested contacting the shuttle committee. Ms. Schreyer noted there were budget limitations, but thought that it would otherwise be feasible if funds could be found. Mr. Ricci again expressed his support for the campus bar, suggesting that this was the kind of central campus space that was needed for graduate students.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:39 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita Adhitya