

GSG Assembly Meeting July 9, 2003

Outline and Summary

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Previous Minutes: The minutes of the previous two meetings were approved with amendments.

3. Officers' Reports

1. Parliamentary Secretary's Report: New Assembly members were introduced, and Representatives were asked to send information on their election procedures to the parliamentary secretary.
2. Corresponding Secretary's Report: Summer office hours were announced.
3. Treasurer's Report; funding requests: An ice-cream social organized by the Graduate School was funded at \$75. A request from the Queer Graduate Caucus (QGC) was tabled till next meeting.
4. Social Chair's Report
5. Chair's Report

4. Voting Matters

1. Greening Princeton: A report on the serving of organic food in University dining units, prepared by "Greening Princeton", was endorsed by the GSG Assembly.
2. PriComm Proposals: Assembly approved the sending of letters to administrators, asking them to submit several proposals to PriComm, on behalf of the GSG.
3. GSG mugs: The ordering of 500 GSG mugs, as gifts for incoming students, was approved.

5. Committee Reports

1. Campus Relations
2. Health-Care
3. Housing
4. Information Technology
5. International Students' Concerns

6. Transportation and Parking

6. Other Business: A proposal of standing rules was introduced, for discussion in the next meeting.

7. Scheduling of Next Meeting and Adjournment: The next meeting will be on August 13.

Attendance

Officers present: Chair Bill Jordan; Assistant Chair Eric A. Adelizzi; Parliamentary Secretary Leonard F. Pease III; Corresponding Secretary Nicole Esparza; Press Secretary Meredith Safran; Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida; Treasurer Eitan Bonderover; Social Chair Sinéad Mac Namara.

Representatives present: Aleksandar Donev, ACM; Huiyan Yang, proxy for Anita Adhitya, AOS; Sinéad Mac Namara, CEE; Jack Tinsley, CHE; Jia Su, CHM; Jessica H. Clark, CLA; Brigitta A. Lee, EAS; Tanjim Hossain, ECO; Fei Sun, ELE; Meredith Safran, proxy for Kerry Bystrom, ENG; Juliet O'Brien, FIT; Lior Silberman, MAT; Michael Ludkovski, ORF; Jason Casellas, proxy for Andrew Erickson, POL; Kim Montgomery, PSY. Philippa Townsend, REL; Nicole Esparza, SOC; Kate Bartkus, proxy for Leslie A. Medema, WWS.

Delegates present: Fei Sun, Association of Chinese Students and Scholars (ACSS); Huiyan Yang, Butler Apartments; Aderemi Artis, Black Graduate Caucus (BGC); Lior Silberman, Graduate College (GC); Radhika Wijetunge, Lawrence Apartments; Leonard F. Pease III, Off-Campus; Heather White, Women's Center.

Councilors present: Brigitta Lee (EAS), CPUC and CPUC Executive Committee; Lior Silberman (MAT), CPUC; Leonard F. Pease III (CHE), CPUC Priorities Committee; Jason Casellas (POL), CPUC Rights and Rules Committee.

Others present: Lisa M. Sherov, GC residence life coordinator; Victoria Garcia, for the Association of Princeton Graduate Alumni (APGA); Lei Xu (ELE), chair of the International Students' Concerns Committee; Kai Chan (EEB), Greening Princeton; Marissa Baskett (EEB), Greening Princeton; Cathy Kunkel (MAE), Greening Princeton.

Representatives absent: Riaz Tejani, ANT; Gregory D. O'Mullan, EEB; Michael K. House, GER; Karoline Cook, HIS; Meredith Galanter Hastings, GEO; Brendan McAndrew, MAE; David Shrom, MOL; Tamar Friedmann, PHY; David R. Smith, PPL; Patrick Gerland, OPR; Cole M. Crittenden, SLA.

Delegates absent: Weining Man, Council of International Graduate Students (CIGS).

These representative seats were vacant: ARC; ART; AST; COM; COS; MUS; NES; PHI; SPO.

These delegate seats were vacant: Hibben/Magie Apartments; Millstone Apartments.

Minutes

I. Call to order

The Assembly of the Graduate Student Government held its regular monthly meeting on July 9, 2003, at Frist 309. GSG Chair Bill Jordan called the meeting to order at about 6:05pm.

II. Approval of Previous Minutes

Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida started by asking those present if they knew who decides the content of the minutes. There being no answer, he stated that it is Assembly: once the secretary completes the draft minutes and presents them to Assembly, his duty is completed; any member of Assembly can then propose amendments, and it's up to Assembly to decide on them. Mr. Boavida then asked what should go into the minutes. His answer: only decisions of Assembly (i.e., the text of motions, and the result of the vote); no debate, no discussion, no seconds, no record of diverging votes. In particular, the minutes are not supposed to be a transcript. Firstly, because such minutes would be useless (finding Assembly's decisions would be impossible). But secondly, Mr. Boavida observed, because people usually write at 50 words/minute and usually speak at 150 words/minute. So, if he was to record every exact word, his minutes would be thrice as long as they currently are (60 pages instead of 20), which would be remarkable, for he had written 4 of

the 5 longest GSG sets of minutes. And he had only written 4 sets of minutes... (While he has not changed his mind, the recording secretary recognizes that a few details on current policies tend to be very useful in a few months or years, and so his account of the meeting will not be a mere list of motions.)

Mr. Boavida then circulated fliers describing the different amendments proposed, and proceeded to discuss the minutes of the May 14 meeting, which had not been approved in the previous meeting [Minutes 6.11.2003, II]. After the meeting, he talked with Fei Sun to clarify what were Mr. Sun's objections. It turned out that Mr. Sun hadn't realized that Mr. Boavida had added a sentence describing Mr. Jordan's agreement, nor that the minutes had not been approved. Mr. Sun told him that Mr. Jordan's agreement had closed the discussion, and seemed to agree with Mr. Boavida's new amendment. Subsequently, Mr. Jordan had also agreed to it. As to the minutes of the June 11 meeting, Mr. Sun and Mr. Boavida had exchanged some proposed amendments, but Mr. Sun had asked Mr. Boavida not to present them. However, he had then sent a new proposal to Assembly. Mr. Boavida was surprised with the addition of a new conversation between Mr. Sun and Eric Adelizzi. Mr. Sun's other objection seemed unfounded to Mr. Boavida, who explained the uses of the past perfect tense.

Meredith Safran asked Assembly's opinion on the amendments. Indeed, she emphasized that neither the Executive Committee nor Mr. Boavida had any authority to make decisions on that matter.

Mr. Sun stated that he had only proposed a minor modification of the June minutes, and he clearly remembered what he had said. His words were omitted, and the true meaning was not in the proposed minutes. He had discussed the details with Mr. Boavida privately, but couldn't get an agreement. He had told Mr. Boavida his exact words as well as his intention, and thought that his last proposal was clear. He remembered Mr. Adelizzi's words and what he meant, because he didn't know minutes could be postponed. He added that Mr. Adelizzi had stated that minutes might have to be postponed, and then he also stated that he understood Mr. Adelizzi's words didn't mean he was in favor of that. As to the other point, he had not asked for a correction during the meeting, he had just presented a fact: it seemed that the Executive Committee had three different views.

Mr. Sun had also read the proposed standing rules the Executive Committee had sent in advance, and they stated that the recording secretary could make tape-recordings. He proposed that the recording secretary make tape-recordings, so that everyone's exact words can be determined. Ms. Safran suggested that such discussion be postponed, for the topic under discussion was the approval of the minutes. Mr. Jordan stated that there can't be debate without a motion, and asked for one.

Mr. Adelizzi moved (and was seconded) that the minutes of the May meeting be approved as originally presented, without amendments. Jack Tinsley agreed that people want not to be misunderstood; however, if it doesn't make a difference, he saw no point in discussing details. Ms. Safran saw some value to the amendment, for her point (expressed in that amendment) helped clarify Mr. Sun's intentions. Further, she recalled making that point. Mr. Jordan also recalled having agreed. Mr. Adelizzi asked leave from Assembly to withdraw his motion (no one objected), and moved (and was seconded) that the minutes be approved with that amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Adelizzi then moved (and was seconded) to approve the minutes of the June meeting with the last amendment Mr. Boavida had proposed to Mr. Sun. Ms. Safran asking the differences, Mr. Boavida stated that, as far as he could tell, Mr. Sun had added two additional sentences at the end of the first paragraph, and changed the beginning of the second. Mr. Adelizzi stated he didn't recall that alleged intervention of his, for he was surprised when David Smith moved to table the discussion (later in the meeting), and Mr. Adelizzi had voted against. Mr. Adelizzi's motion was voted on, and passed with one opposed.

III. Officers' Reports

Before proceeding with the agenda, Mr. Jordan introduced Victoria Garcia, from the APGA, to Assembly members. Ms. Garcia expressed APGA's desire to develop closer ties with the GSG.

A. Parliamentary Secretary's Report

Parliamentary Secretary Mr. Pease introduced Jack Tinsley (CHE), the newly elected Representative who would replace Mr. Adelizzi. Emily Snow (MUS), had resigned as Representative; they are looking for a new Representative, and if needed the GSG will provide logistic support. Mr. Pease suggested that Assembly members try to convince potential candidates to run. Finally, Cynthia Rudin (ACM) had resigned, and Aleksandar Donev was the new Representative.

Mr. Pease then wished to address some details of parliamentary procedure; his topic was election methods. He observed that the most elementary method is a voice vote: the chair asks for ayes and those in favor answer, the chair then asks for nays and those against answer. As this method is effective only if one side of the question has clearly more votes, it's more common to use a hand vote. Finally, if there is still any doubt, it's possible to hold a roll call vote, when each member is called in turn to express his or her vote.

Mr. Pease then observed that anyone can, as a point of order, ask if a quorum was present. The quorum depends on the kind of vote: for votes in meetings, only Active seats are counted [Constitution, VI-3]; for email votes between meeting, all voting seats are counted [Constitution, VI-5]. Anyone can question the presence of a quorum; however, if such absence is determined, the Assembly can only adjourn, or receive reports.

Mr. Pease then proceeded to a recurring topic: Representatives had been asked [Minutes 5.14.2003, III.A] to provide information on the election procedures on their departments. He observed that terms can last no longer than 15 months [Constitution, IV-10; see also By-Laws I-6]. He further stated that the GSG currently has no list of such procedures, and that he had received only about 5 answers. So, he suggested two alternatives: either those representatives would promise to send him that information within 2 weeks, or he would ask all representatives present, one-by-one, what were the procedures in their departments. Everyone preferring the first choice, he adverted all that if he didn't receive all answers then he would implement the second alternative in the next meeting. In answer to a question, it was established that the following representatives had already sent information: ARC, CEE, CHE, CLA, ECO, FIT (work-in-progress), GEO, MAT, ORF, SOC. Mr. Sun asked Mr. Jordan to send the information since he was elected (as ELE rep) recently and didn't know the procedure. Mr. Pease stated the current representative should send the procedure. Mr. Jordan agreed to give the information to Mr. Sun after the meeting. Mr. Sun seemed to

accept such arrangement.

B. Corresponding Secretary's Report

Corresponding Secretary Nicole Esparza reminded Assembly members that GSG committees now have mailing lists. She had added several new committee members to the lists, and asked members who had not received confirmation to contact her. She added that people interested in joining GSG committees should contact her, to be added to the mailing lists.

Ms. Esparza added that the Executive Committee had changed the office hours for the Summer: they would be held on Mondays 11:30am-1:30pm, Tuesdays 1:30pm-2:30pm, or by appointment.

C. Treasurer's Report

Treasurer Eitan Bonderover had sent his report in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Bonderover first observed that there had been one request made by the Graduate School more than one week before, but less than two. So, he asked if there was any objection to the consideration of the request. Mr. Adelizzi and Lisa Sherov, in representation of the Graduate School, stated that they didn't need confirmation before next month, but if the GSG provide funding in the current meeting, that could be advertised. Sinéad Mac Namara observed that the reason why such restriction was decided [Minutes 10.9.2002, 5.1] was the fact that at times the treasurer needs to ask additional information from the requesting groups, and much time may be needed. Mr. Pease objected to the consideration of the request, and a vote was held. Only one person objected.

Mr. Adelizzi and Ms. Sherov explained that the request was for an ice-cream social, to be held in August. About 100 graduate students were expected, the total budget was \$150, the Graduate School was asking \$75. Ms. Mac Namara moved (and was seconded) to fund the event by \$75.

MOTION: to fund this ice-cream social by \$75. PASSED.

Mr. Bonderover added that there had been an additional funding request, received less than a week in advance, and which did not make into his report. He asked if there was any objection to its consideration, and observed that it would always be considered in the next meeting. Mr. Pease observed that there being objections, approval by 2/3 was needed [By-Laws IV-3]. Mr. Tinsley asking why it was different now, Lior Silberman explained that in this case there had been less time, and so it was not only a standing rule which was being waived, but a By-Law. Mr. Bonderover explained that the request was for additional funding for the QGC Summer barbecue, which had been funded in the previous meeting [Minutes 6.11.2003, III.B]. They had originally asked for \$80. However, more people than expected showed up, and they were requesting an additional \$45. Mr. Pease objecting to consideration of this request, a vote was held and failed. Mr. Bonderover concluded that the request would be tabled till the following meeting, and observed that the group had three months after the event to present receipts [Minutes 4.10.2002, 5.1]. Mr. Artis pointedly left the meeting after the vote concerning the additional funding for the QGC summer barbecue.

On the topic of receipts, Mr. Sun observed that original receipts were required both by the GSG and the Graduate School, and suggested that the GSG accept copies. Ms. Safran suggested that such discussion be postponed to the following meeting, when the standing rules will be discussed.

D. Social Chair's Report

Social Chair Ms. Mac Namara had no report to make. However, she observed that the GSG should hold an event during the Summer, and it being likely before the next meeting, she asked suggestions. She observed that as the dance in September would be an important event, she was looking for some smaller event for August. As there would be the Graduate School/GSG ice-cream in August, a different event should be arranged. She also asked for volunteers.

Several suggestions were made. Mr. Silberman suggested a food reception, as the one held by the Graduate School in the Friend Center. Ms. Safran suggested contacting Associate

Dean of Engineering for Graduate Affairs E. David Mendez, for he had in the past invited the GSG to hold a meeting in the E-Quad and offered pizza; Ms. Safran also suggested a games event. Brigitta Lee observed that she was trying to set up an email list of post-docs [see her report below, href="#Va">V.A] and suggested a joint event with post-docs and graduate students. Ms. Mac Namara had considered some food event during the final of the softball tournament; however, Scott Miller had told Ms. Safran that professor Kornhauser already organized such a party at his house. Juliet O'Brien suggested cocktails.

E. Chair's Report

Mr. Jordan observed that President Tilghman would come to the Assembly meeting in October, and suggested that till then we think what we want to tell her. He added that the Executive Committee would meet with the president on July 29.

In September, the guest would be Kathleen Mannheimer, from career services. She had come to a GSG meeting [Minutes 12.12.2001, III.A], and, on being told that post-enrolled students were not included in the University mailing lists (and thus were excluded from the regular mailings sent by career services), found a way to reach those students.

Mr. Jordan concluded his report, by stating that he would replace Mr. Miller, former GSG chair, as one of the graduate student representatives in the APGA.

IV. Voting Matters

A. Greening Princeton

Mr. Jordan introduced Kai Chan, from Greening Princeton. Mr. Chan had asked Mr. Jordan to forward a proposal to Assembly, in advance of the meeting. Mr. Chan stated that the report had been prepared by students and administrators, and asked support for Dining Services to serve more organic food, fair trade coffee, antibiotic-free meat, and eco-friendly seafood. Greening Princeton had held educational events, and a special dinner. They had also conducted a survey from March to May, whose results, Mr. Chan continued, revealed much interest on these options. Throughout the year Dining Services took steps toward these

ends, but they had no more funds, and so they would ask the Priorities Committee (PriComm) for additional funds. The report included major recommendations, no high costs are expected, and board rates would not increase. The USG had already endorsed the report, and Greening Princeton was seeking GSG's endorsement.

Huiyan Yang observed that some students are not in the meal plan, and that we should assure fairness. Mr. Chan stated that we should not make such considerations, for that's the mission of the PriComm. To that, Ms. Yang answered that the GSG represents all graduate students. Marissa Baskett observed that in the previous year a new position of Community Programs Coordinator had been created; it benefited students living in the apartments and had no benefit for residents of the Graduate College. Ms. Baskett also observed that Frist was already serving some organic food and fair-trade coffee.

Mr. Donev asked whether the endorsement was being sought for the report or for the funding request. Mr. Chan clarified that it was one and the same thing; the report asked for funding and included some research. Mr. Silberman attempted to move (but was not seconded) to endorse the request, on the condition that its priority be discussed later. In fact, he thought that we should first study all requests to PriComm we want to support, and prioritize them. Mr. Chan observed that endorsement would in no way signify a high priority. Heather White expressed her expectation that the more requests we make, the more likely more of them will be approved, and in that spirit moved (and was seconded) to endorse the report.

Mr. Pease asked whether the campaign for less waste of food had been successful. Mr. Chan stated there were no results yet, but it seemed the change had been significant. However it wasn't certainly a reduction from 50% to 10%. Mr. Pease added that he had discussed this with administrators, and they were willing to adopt the recommendations if there was a decrease in waste. Mr. Chan concurred, but as more meals were being served, there was no extra money.

Mr. Pease proceeded to explain that increases in board were decided by PriComm. If the costs of service increase, faculty representatives in PriComm would likely support an increase of board rates. Currently the rates of increase are set at 2% for board and 5% for room. PriComm decides whether to change these rates, and such decision is independent of

Dining Services's opinion. Mr. Tinsley thought that if there's support from graduate students, we should consider endorsing. He asked whether the increases could be negotiated. Ms. Baskett emphasized that the report explicitly asked that board rates be not increased. Mr. Chan added that the support requested was of the order of \$50,000 (\$7/student), comparable to the cost for the new position at the apartments. Mr. Adelizzi asked where the support would come from: fees?, tuition?, decrease in other services? Mr. Chan believed it would come from the endowment. Mr. Pease clarified that if the endowment income increases, then that would be the case, otherwise, the money will necessarily come from an increase in the rates of increase of tuition. Mr. Silberman thought that we should consider whether we have other needs. Mr. Chan suggested a qualified endorsement, making explicit the GSG had other priorities. Ms. Mac Namara moved (and was seconded) the previous question, and this motion passed. Ms. Safran asked, as a point of order, whether Ms. White's motion was for such a qualified endorsement. Ms. White stated no qualification was implied.

MOTION: to endorse the report by Greening Princeton. PASSED.

Mr. Chan thanked the GSG for its endorsement, and left a copy of the report for the GSG records. Mr. Adelizzi asked Assembly's consent to enter his opinion into the minutes, and there were no objections. Mr. Adelizzi sent it to the recording secretary for inclusion in the minutes:

I thank the Assembly for allowing me to place into the minutes my remarks regarding the motion to attach the GSG's name to Greening Princeton's proposal for "organic" foods in the dining halls. I was very disappointed that debate was curtailed before the Assembly even addressed the substance of the motion. The Assembly debated for some time who would pay for "organic" foods and how this would affect the board charges of graduate students living in the Graduate College. However, the Assembly did not even discuss the desirability of the main proposal. The proposal

contains several troubling aspects, and I would have counseled against GSG endorsement if I had had the opportunity.

I will begin with the Greening Princeton survey. When the survey was conducted, I exchanged several letters with the survey organizers and Stu Orefice, the Director of Dining Services. I objected to the wording of the survey, which allowed respondents to praise the alleged healthfulness of "organic" foods but did not allow respondents to state that they considered the farming practices involved to be less healthy. As a second example, respondents were not allowed to object to the notion of "antibiotic-free meat" in the dining hall; they were merely asked whether they were interested in the possibility or not. Since I do not believe that the survey was unbiased, I oppose the Graduate Student Government attaching its name to the survey. I frankly admit that I do not understand the presentation of weighted data in several parts of the survey report.

My primary objections, however, are to the report itself, the recommendations of which were barely mentioned in the Assembly meeting.

1. The first policy endorsed is that the University should purchase only so-called "fair trade" coffee. The "fair trade" coffee system is in reality a socialist cooperative system. It places price controls on coffee beans, and consumers therefore pay significantly more than the prevailing rate. The "fair trade" system requires coffee importers to establish long-term relationships with producers, a monopolistic tactic that this not in the best interests of consumers, nor of would-be

coffee producers. Most troubling of all, in order to obtain "fair trade" certification, farmers must enroll in farming cooperatives. I refer members of the Assembly to Greening Princeton's report for all of these facts, and others. It appears to me that "fair trade" is a euphemism for "controlled trade through socialist cooperatives". These methods of coffee production raise costs for consumers significantly. Further, by stifling open competition, they promote inefficient farming practices and are, in the long run, damaging to the producers themselves.

2. The next recommendations regard the purchase of "organic" foods. Again, the methods of production of these foods are inefficient, which is why they cost more. Encouragement of these farming practices are bad for the economy since they frustrate efficiencies of scale.

3. Also included in the recommendations is a proposal that Princeton purchase more food produced locally. Greening Princeton may very well be correct that food grown locally and shipped shorter distances is fresher and reduces transportation-related pollution. However, the pollution reduction is a false saving. As their report correctly points out, farms are closing down in New Jersey as the land is being urbanized (and suburbanized) and an increasingly large proportion of our food is being produced in the midwest, where land is cheaper and farms are bigger. Nevertheless, if suburbs and commuters are pushed further away from our population centers, food may get to market faster, but people will require larger amounts of transportation to get to work. The preservation of the small New Jersey family farm is a romantic ideal, but the reason

these farms are closing down is that large-scale farming on cheaper land is -- again -- more efficient. The farmers themselves sell their land for development because they would rather collect the real estate profit than continue quixotically struggling to produce food on small, inefficient plots of land. While I certainly don't object to purchasing locally grown food, I object to paying what amounts to a subsidy for inefficiency and receiving in return nothing but the warm knowledge that the New Jersey family farm continues to exist -- at least until property values go up a little bit more.

Similar arguments can be made against some other proposals contained in the report endorsed by the GSG, but I will not go into them further here.

I hope that all of the members of the Assembly who voted to endorse the proposal have actually read the entire proposal; those that have will see that similar objections are applicable to other proposals.

I therefore wish to go on record as objecting to the GSG's endorsement of socialist and monopolist coffee production and inefficient farming practices. It is my hope that the Assembly will give fuller consideration to such matters in the future and will not curtail debate before the substance of a proposal has been discussed. While the issue of funding is important (especially as residents of the Graduate College are likely to be saddled with higher board costs if this proposal is adopted), members of the Assembly should look further than their wallets when voting

to endorse social and economic engineering.

I again thank the Assembly for their kind permission to include my remarks in the record.

B. PriComm Proposals

Mr. Pease introduced the next topic. As had been announced in the previous meeting [Minutes 6.11.2003, VI.B], it was time to start thinking of PriComm requests. The Executive Committee had considered several ideas, listed in a [slide](#) presented by Mr. Pease. Mr. Pease explained that the Executive Committee (and any volunteers) would write letters to administrators in the next few days, asking support for requests considered worthy by Assembly. Ms. Safran clarified that neither the GSG nor its representatives in PriComm can make requests directly to PriComm. However, we can ask administrators to make requests on our behalf.

Michael Ludkovski asked if it was possible to estimate the relative costs of each request. Mr. Pease stated that the costs won't be known before November, for (Ms. Safran added) only if an administrator decides to make a request he will estimate its cost. Kim Montgomery asked whether we could rank the requests. Mr. Pease stated that that could be done, but the list prepared by the Executive Committee was in no special order. Mr. Silberman suggested that the relative priorities should be debated; Mr. Pease suggested that that can be debated later, and any preferences will be conveyed to PriComm by the GSG representatives there. Ms. Lee asked whether only a general sense of what is important was being sought; Mr. Pease confirmed. Mr. Pease pointed out that such discussions are details of the proposals but currently the Assembly only need to answer "yes" or "no".

Mr. Adelizzi introduced the first request. He observed that when Stevenson Hall was closed, graduate students had been promised that they would be allowed to use their meals plans at Frist as usual, simply by swiping the card. However, allegedly because Frist would become too crowded, Dining Services never implemented that policy. The director of Frist Center, Paul Breitman, was receptive to the request. However, it's not clear whether Dining Services would be. Mr. Pease observed that in the previous year Frist Center had gotten support of

the order of \$300,000. Mr. Adelizzi also introduced the request for better Summer dining options at Frist. In answering to a question, Mr. Adelizzi answered the GSG has already contacted Frist on the first and second matter, but Frist didn't have enough money to implement them.

Radhika Wijetunge asked about the USG dinner proposal. Mr. Pease compared it with the high tables at the GC, where both graduate students and faculty or administrators participate. The USG idea seemed similar, but would be open to whole campus community. Ms. Mac Namara observed that the proposal had been presented by the undergraduate U-council at the previous CPUC meeting (May 5), and (Ms. Safran pointed out) had drawn support from several administrators. The proposal was the undergraduate U-council's attempt to attack the issue of intellectualism, and involved the guarantee that at the time of those dinners no classes or other activities could be held. It was widely supported by the undergraduate population, and it was an opportunity for improving graduate/undergraduate relations.

As to health care, it was observed that during the Summer, or during breaks, students often have no alternative rather than going to the Princeton Medical Center. Last year, the director of health services, Daniel Silverman, asked this on our behalf, but the request was not granted. We can ask again this year. Better access to physical therapy was also in the wish-list. Mr. Sun was under the impression that physical therapy was provided by an external contractor; Ms. Esparza confirmed, and stated that it would be useful if University Health Services provided that service, as they had done in the past.

As to the next request, Mr. Pease stated that Dean Russel had asked \$125,000 spread over 5 years, for stipend increases in the social sciences and humanities, but only half of the request was granted. The idea was to ask him to ask the other half. Mr. Pease mentioned briefly the following request, for changes in the rents of new Lawrence apartments [see [href="..../05/#IVb"](..../05/#IVb)>Minutes 5.14.2003, IV.B for background].

Ms. Safran explained the subsequent request, for prox-card access to the annexes. She stated that in practice the doors could not be locked (for there was no inter-communication system, and so the only way to know there are guests is to have the door open). Mr. Silberman observed that the undergraduate annex in Dickinson Street has prox-card access.

Mr. Sun asked whether the proposal was for all annexes, or only for temporary ones, observing that a new one had just been created. Mr. Silberman recommended against installing prox-card access in temporary annexes, for they would likely be converted back to faculty housing. Jessica Clark observed that, temporary or not, graduate students live there now, and she couldn't even understand why there was a need to request that minimal safety in the first place. Ms. Safran also introduced the following requests, for secure storage in Firestone, and 24-hour access to study spaces. Mr. Bonderover suggested including Frist in that access. Mr. Pease observed that Firestone closes early in the Summer, and will likely be renovated in the next decade.

Mr. Bonderover introduced the following request, for extended gym hours in the Summer. Messrs. Donev and Silberman observed that that is more important in the weekends. Mr. Adelizzi observed that the point had been previously raised with athletics, who increased service by one hour. Mr. Bonderover also introduced the request for more field space, wiring and wireless in common spaces, and for a sidewalk connecting Hibben-Magie and Alexander Street. Mr. Silberman observed that a sidewalk and lighting along Faculty Road, to Butler Apartments, was also needed. Mr. Sun asked how long Hibben-Magie would be used for graduate housing, but Messrs. Adelizzi, Bonderover, Pease and Silberman were distinctly pessimistic in that respect.

Mr. Jordan introduced a request which had not made into the list: itemized deductions in each paycheck, clearly presented. He had discussed that with people in payroll, who told him that the system had no space for additional details [Minutes 10.9.2002, 7.2].

Mr. Adelizzi explained the last two requests, briefly summarizing the text in the slides. As to the GC parking fee, Mr. Donev and Ms. O'Brien asked where the money goes to; Mr. Adelizzi explained that both housing and Public Safety stated they didn't receive it, and Mr. Silberman added that it goes into a common pool, to satisfy other budgetary needs. The other request introduced by Mr. Adelizzi was for funding for maintenance of stained glass windows, statues, arches, etc., which was systematically postponed, for lack of funds.

Mr. Pease asked whether there were any additional suggestions. There being none, he moved (and was seconded) that letters in support of these requests be prepared by the Executive Committee and sent to the relevant administrators.

MOTION: for the Executive Committee to prepare (and send to the relevant administrators) letters in support of these requests. PASSED unanimously.

Mr. Jordan invited any volunteers to help preparing these letters.

C. GSG mugs

As it was growing late, and a decision was needed on the T-shirts, Ms. Esparza asked to report immediately. No one objecting, she started her report.

In the previous meeting [Minutes 6.11.2003, IV.A], referring to the GSG T-shirts, Ms. Esparza had stated she would look into prices for other items, and report back to Assembly. She had asked information about items at about \$2/unit, and presented 3 possibilities: 2 different models of bottles, or 1 model of mug. She pointed out again that the goal was to increase visibility of the GSG. She proposed that 500 units be ordered, and showed also the estimated costs for each item.

Ms. Safran asked what was the budget. Mr. Bonderover stated that, although we currently have a surplus which could be used, if this is to be an annual expense it must be budgeted. So, he suggested \$1,000 has a reasonable amount.

Mr. Silberman moved (and was seconded) to buy 500 mugs (the third possibility, at \$1,015 total). Mr. Ludkovski asked whether this decision was only for this year, or for all coming years. Mr. Bonderover stated that the expense would be included in the budget (that would be an increase from \$300 to \$1,000), which is approved annually. Ms. Safran observed that if the gifts are successful we may get more design submissions in coming years. Mr. Sun asked what was the unit price. It was \$1.79/unit, and the total included setup costs. Mr. Silberman suggested to buy two years' worth of mugs, but the cost reduction was not significant. Lei Xu suggested that we could rather buy 200 items of each of the possibilities, but the setup costs were different for each item and the quantity discounts would be less; so the costs would increase.

MOTION: to order 500 GSG mugs. PASSED unanimously.

V. Committees' Reports

Mr. Jordan observed that, although he listed all committees and committee chairs in the agenda, it doesn't mean that all will report in all meetings. Rather, it's a way of assuring everyone knows what are the committees and who are their chairs, along with always giving them an opportunity to report.

A. Campus Relations

Ms. Lee, chair of the committee on campus relations, issued a call for volunteers. She had contacted Dean Russel, and they would meet to exchange ideas. She hoped to work on outreach to undergraduates, seek input from assistant masters, consider mentoring/tutoring initiatives, and increase awareness by graduate students of undergraduate activities and groups (namely by encouraging involvement in the student activities fair). She also hoped to outreach to post-docs; she was currently working on setting up an email list.

B. Health-Care

Ms. Esparza reported that Donnell Butler had resigned as committee chair, so the committee was looking for a new chair. She also wished to state that Dr. Silverman was willing to improve services for graduate students, and would likely support our requests to PriComm.

C. Housing

Mr. Adelizzi, chair of the committee on housing, reported that that the committee would closely follow the experiments on the new room draw system. He also reported no answer had being received to the letter on the rents at new Lawrence [Minutes 5.14.2003, V.B]. Mr. Silberman suggested an additional PriComm request: renewing the request for more graduate housing staff (in the housing office).

Juliet O'Brien reported that, because of the new Lawrence construction, students had recently been demanded to move there cars from the parking lot. Only one week notice had

been given, which made it an impossible request for students who left for the Summer. She had also been told that the terms of the notice were particularly rude. Ms. Wijetunge stated the the Lawrence Committee had complained to housing and facilities. They replied that they needed the lots clear to continue construction. Mr. Adelizzi asked that the correspondence be forwarded to him, so that the Housing Committee can investigate.

D. Information Technology

Mr. Bonderover, chair of the committee on information technology, reported that the wiring of Butler was progressing. Ms. Esparza observed that, although the wiring is being done, it will be only activated when all of it is completed. Ms. Lee had heard of people who were already being charged. Ms. Mac Namara doubted that the activation would really happen by the first day of the semester, for the same had been promised when Hibben-Magie was wired, and it took a few weeks.

E. International Students' Concerns

Mr. Xu, chair of the committee on international students' concerns, reported that the committee was preparing a survey on the Princeton Oral Proficiency Test (POPT). There had been several meeting with Associate Dean David Redman, the McGraw Center, and the Princeton Survey Research Center. The survey was almost ready, and hopefully would start soon.

Mr. Xu issued a call for volunteers for the committee. The committee was especially needing students in the social sciences and humanities.

F. Transportation and Parking

Ms. Mac Namara, chair of the committee on transportation and parking, wished to thank Ms. Safran and Mr. Adelizzi for having successfully negotiated the administration's parking proposal with General Manager for Administration Laurel Harvey [Minutes 5.14.2003, IV.A; Minutes 6.11.2003, V.A], and secured most of GSG's goals. Specifically, there will be an appeals committee for the special exemptions; 10 people will comprise that committee, 5

of whom will be students appointed by the GSG. A written guarantee that the parking situation will revert to its current state (should the shuttle be discontinued at the end of the next academic year) was also secured. The only exception is the temporary spots along FitzRandolph: we will keep those spots till a (planned) sidewalk is built in their place. Mr. Adelizzi added that when those spots disappear, more spots will be reserved at Lot 21, and a shuttle system will be arranged.

Ms. Mac Namara added that the committee had been present at a meeting with a consultant. The intention was to study possibilities of integration of the current three shuttle systems (P-rides, Tiger Tram, and the night shuttle), as well as the likely to appear (but not yet for sure, Mr. Adelizzi emphasized) shuttle between Lot 21 and main campus. Ms. Mac Namara reported that the administrators present had told the consultant that graduate students were the top priority when it comes to parking.

Mr. Tinsley asked whether there would be something more formal than the Q&A document prepared by administration. Ms. Mac Namara stated that that was all; and Mr. Adelizzi observed that it's not always possible to hold administrators to the word of their predecessors. Ms. Mac Namara emphasized that if the current plan didn't work, the administration would look into other solutions, and enforce some other plan. Mr. Adelizzi added that there was an intention to create an Administrative Process Team, to try to address consistently the parking situation for faculty, staff, and students, with one coherent set of regulations. Ms. Safran added that Donald Reichling (from Public Safety) was in the appeals committee, and was very sympathetic toward students' concerns.

VI. Other Business

Mr. Adelizzi, on behalf of the Executive Committee, introduced a [proposal](#) for standing rules of the Assembly. Till now, those results were buried in the minutes; so the Executive Committee had compiled all previous rules, and prepared a proposal of new standing rules. He emphasized there is no need for completeness. The proposal had been sent shortly before the meeting, but was only to be discussed within a month. He observed that some committees had expressed a need for clearer guidelines on their missions, and the Executive Committee had attempted to provide mission statements, and was especially

interested in knowing the committees' opinion on that.

As time was running out, Mr. Jordan asked Mr. Sun whether he wanted to discuss the judicial opinion [Minutes 5.14.2003, III.A] in the current meeting or in the following. Mr. Silberman suggested that it could be discussed and voted by email. However, Mr. Sun preferred to have it discussed in the next Assembly meeting. Ms. Mac Namara restated the invitation for Mr. Sun to come to office hours discuss that or any other questions. She observed that it might be better to make sure we all fully understand the matter at hand and the procedures involved, to avoid unnecessarily long debates on small issues that can be off-putting to less involved Assembly members. Mr. Sun asked when office hours are held, and Ms. Esparza stated they happen on Mondays 11:30am-1:30pm and Tuesdays 1:30pm-2:30pm, or by appointment.

VII. Scheduling of Next Meeting and Adjournment

Mr. Jordan announced the next meeting was scheduled for August 13, at 6pm, at Frist 309. The meeting was adjourned at 8pm.

Submitted 7.21.2003,
João Pedro Boavida Recording Secretary
Amended and approved 8.13.2003.