

# GSG Assembly Meeting – March 12, 2003

## Outline and Summary

### 1. Call to order

### 2. Approval of Previous Minutes

### 3. Officer Reports I

1. Parliamentary Secretary Report: The Parliamentary Secretary introduced three new members of the Assembly.
2. Treasurer's Report, funding requests: It was decided to transfer \$2500 of the standing surplus to the University endowment. It was decided to fund the "Graduate Engineering Council - 2nd Annual Graduate Student/Alumni Mixer" by \$300, and the Queer Graduate Caucus (QGC) Milkshake Social and Wine and Cheese Social by \$300 total (possibly subject to revision). The QGC "Fabulous Dance Party" will be discussed in the next meeting. The QGC "3rd Annual Queer Policy Series" was funded by \$300.

### 3. Chair's Report

### 4. Old Business

1. Officer Elections Committee Report: The committee reported on the officer elections, and the Assembly decided there had been no quorum, and elected the same candidates.
2. Parking & Transportation Committee Report
3. International Students Concerns Committee Report
4. Information Technology Committee Report
5. Post-Enrollment Committee Report
6. By-Law Amendments Introduced Last Month: Three By-Law amendments were approved: on the temporary appointment of officers, on the abolition of runoff elections for officers, and on a change to the graduate U-Councilors election.

### 5. New Business

1. Introduction of (more) By-Law Amendments: Two By-Law amendments were proposed: on recognizing some academic programs, and on the endowment.
2. Judicial Committee Representative Election A representative for the CPUC Judicial

Committee was elected to complete the term.

3. DGS letters: Concrete decisions were made on informing the departments about the GSG, and ensuring the Representatives are really elected.
4. Voting Power of Special Interest Groups
5. Elections & Encouraging Candidates
6. Announcement of CPUC Elections: The CPUC Elections were announced.
6. Scheduling of Next Meeting
7. Adjournment

## Attendance

Officers present: Chair Scott Miller; Parliamentary Secretary Lior Silberman; Corresponding Secretary Eric Adelizzi; Treasurer Donnell Butler; Social Chair Sinéad MacNamara, also social chair candidate.

Representatives present: Huyian Yang, proxy for Anita Adhitya, AOS; Sinéad MacNamara, CEE; Eric Adelizzi, CHE; Jessica H. Clark, CLA; Brigitta A. Lee, EAS; Gregory D. O'Mullan, EEB; Bill Jordan, ELE, also chair candidate; Juliet O'Brien, FIT; Meredith G. Hastings, GEO; Michael K. House, GER; Karoline Cook, HIS; Brendan McAndrew, MAE; Lior Silberman, MAT; Alan Tormay, proxy for Emily Snow, MUS; Michael Ludkovski, ORF; Jason Casellas, proxy for Andrew Erickson, POL; David R. Smith, PPL; Philippa Townsend, REL; Cole M. Crittenden, SLA; Nicole Esparza, SOC; Leslie A. Medema, WWS.

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

Councillors present: Scott Miller (CHE), CPUC and CPUC Executive Committee; Brigitta Lee (EAS), CPUC and CPUC Executive Committee; Lior Silberman (MAT), CPUC; Anthony Fiori (WWS), CPUC and CPUC Priorities Committee; Huyian Yang (AOS), CPUC; Heather White (REL), CPUC Judicial Committee; Leonard F. Pease III (CHE), CPUC Priorities

Committee; Jason Casellas (POL), CPUC Right and Rules Committee.

Others present: João Pedro Boavida (MAT), acting recording secretary and recording secretary candidate; Eitan Bonderover (ELE), treasurer candidate; Lisa M. Sherov, GC residence life coordinator; Lei Xu (ELE), chair of the International Student Concerns Committee; Cemile "Blue" Guldal (MOL), Queer Graduate Caucus (QGC); Genevieve Aguilar (WWS), QGC; Caroline Nguyen (WWS), D-Bar czar; Natasha Z. (POL).

Officers absent: Press Secretary Meredith Safran; Recording Secretary Anita Adhitya.

Representatives absent: Cynthia Rudin, ACM; Riaz Tejani, ANT; Zach Riddley, ARC; Tanjim Hossain, ECO; Kerry Bystrom, ENG; David Shrom, MOL; Patrick Gerland, OPR; Tamar Friedmann, PHY; Cara Talaska, PSY.

Delegates absent: Rahul Deshpande, Council of International Graduate Students (CIGS).

The following representative seats were vacant: ART; AST; CHM; COM; COS; HOS; NES; PHI; SPO.

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

## Minutes

### >I. Call to order

GSG Chair Scott Miller called the meeting to order at about 6pm. Considering that the acting Recording Secretary (proxy for Ms. Adhitya) was a newcomer to the Assembly, Mr. Miller asked for all members to identify themselves when speaking. The secretary notes that no one did so, and he is indebted to Messrs. Adelizzi and Silberman for their help.

### >II. Approval of Previous Minutes

Meredith Safran had asked that her abstention in the vote for funding the cricket televising be recorded. Bill Jordan moved to approve the minutes with this correction. The motion passed.

## >III. Officer Reports

### >A. Parliamentary Secretary Report

Parliamentary Secretary Lior Silberman informed the attendants that the Assembly had been joined by three new members: Leonard Pease (Off-Campus Delegate), Jessica Clark (CLA Representative), and David Smith (PPL Representative).

Mr. Silberman added that discussion on membership would continue later.

### >B. Treasurer's Report, funding requests

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Treasurer Donnell Butler suggested that it would be convenient to transfer some of the surplus to the endowment. More specifically, he proposed to transfer \$2500 of the about \$5000 current surplus. He also explained that there had been dues refunds (probably due to errors of the Registrar, to in absentia students, etc.). He stated, in answer to a question, the surplus was currently about \$5015.

Eric Adelizzi furthermore explained that there has been a large surplus for the past 2.5 years and that that money is in the GSG's University Account, accruing no interest. At the Centennial of the Graduate School, the University agreed to allow the GSG to participate in the endowment with only \$2000, instead of the usual minimum \$50000. [investment approved by the GSG on 3.29.2000, see Minutes, Item 6; see also in href="#Va-2nd">V.A below the text of proposed Amendment X] We get 4.5% back as annual dividend, and Mr. Adelizzi recalled that he had recently read that the Princeton endowment grew 15% a year over the last 20 years. At the moment we are getting about \$90/year. This is an investment in the long run, and is important, for it is difficult to increase dues.

Mr. Butler reiterated that, as the surplus keeps growing, such an investment is important, for

it is a safety net which allows us not to increase dues. And the dues are in fact losing their value, because of inflation. Considering all this, he moved to transfer \$2500 to the endowment.

Michael Ludkovski inquired whether there were other investment alternatives. Mr. Butler suggested that the University might not approve. Mr. Adelizzi added that the GSG could possibly access the principal in an emergency, by leave of the Graduate School, and that he was unaware of any penalties for withdrawal.

Aderemi Artis, worried about unscrupulous investments in the past, asked if we have access to all the investments. Mr. Miller explained that that's why there is a CPUC Committee on Resources. Furthermore, he added, Elliot Ratzman is our elected representative there and never expressed concerns.

Mr. Artis insisted that there had been problems in the past, related to bad labor practices. Mr. Silberman suggested that that would be a bad reason not to participate in the endowment. Mr. Artis replied that at least it would be the ethical choice.

At this point, Mr. Adelizzi reminded the Assembly that the money in our University account existed only on paper, and while we do not use it, it is basically invested in the University's endowment for the University's benefit; transferring the money to the GSG's endowment would merely ensure that the GSG, rather than the University, derive the financial benefit.

Mr. Silberman suggested that we are part of the University anyway, and seconded Mr. Butler's motion. The chair asked if the Assembly wanted to continue debate; no one wanting to debate, he put the motion to a vote.

MOTION: to transfer \$2500 of surplus to the University endowment. PASSED. Mr. Artis, Mr. Ludkovski, Gregory O'Mullan, and Philippa Townsend opposed.

Mr. Butler proceeded to report on the funding requests. The first funding request was for "Graduate Engineering Council - 2nd Annual Graduate Student/Alumni Mixer". The Treasurer's advance report on this request read thusly:

Graduate Engineering Council - 2nd Annual Graduate Student/Alumni Mixer

Request:

1\_Organization\_Name: Graduate Engineering Council

2a\_Contact\_Person\_Name: Sinead Mac Namara

[contact email removed by the recording secretary]

3\_Event\_to\_be\_funded: Grad Student/Alumni Mixer

4\_Date\_of\_event: march 27th

5\_Expected\_GS\_Attendance: 100

6\_Requested\_Amount: \$300

[PU account removed by the recording secretary]

9\_Event\_description: 2nd Annual Graduate Student/Alumni Mixer

#### Preliminary Budget

Refreshments \$300

Dinner \$500

Advertisement \$150

Equipment Rental \$150

Total \$1100

The Graduate Engineering Council hosted this event last year. We had 25

or so alumni and industry representatives come to meet with graduate students from all of SEAS (School of Engineering and Applied Sciences)

and discuss their career paths outside of academia (what they do - how

they got their jobs etc). It was very successful last year, we had almost 100 attendee's. We expect to have the same this year and ask the

GSG for \$300.

Recommendation: Approve. This is the first request ever received by the

GSG from the GEC. Budget is reasonable. Request is reasonable based on

number of students expected to attend. Graduate Student Estimate is reasonable (based on prior year figures).

Mr. Butler asked Brendan McAndrew to present the request. Mr. McAndrew explained that

the idea was to invite alumni and industry representatives for networking and to talk with students. About 100 graduate students were expected. The GEC was asking \$300 from the GSG.

Mr. Silberman asked if GEC had approached the Association of Princeton Graduate Alumni (APGA), to what Ms. MacNamara answered that they had supported.

Radhika Wijetunge moved to approve the request, Mr. Ludkovski seconded.

MOTION: to fund "GEC - 2nd Annual Grad Student/Alumni Mixer" by \$300. PASSED.

The second advance funding request, "Council for International Graduate Students (CIGS) - Cricket world cup watching (food)", had been withdrawn.

Then came the late requests. The Queer Graduate Caucus had filed an electronic application on March 9, which ran thusly:

1\_Organization\_Name: Queer Graduate Caucus

2a\_Contact\_Person\_Name: Blue

[contact email removed by the recording secretary]

3\_Event\_to\_be\_funded: 1)Milkshake Social, 2)Wine&Cheese Social,  
3)The

Fabulous Dance Party

4\_Date\_of\_event: 1)3/4/03, 2)10/4/03, 2/5/03

5\_Expected\_GS\_Attendance: 50,100,200

6\_Requested\_Amount: \$100,\$200,\$360

[PU account removed by the recording secretary]

9\_Event\_description:

1)Milkshake Social

April 3rd, 2003, 4:30-6pm

BevLab at Frist Campus Center

Expected Attendance: 50

Proposed Budget:  $\$4.25 \times 50 = \$212.50$

Amount Requested:\$100

Co-Sponsors: Women's Center, SHARE, FFR(off-campus)

Description: QGC would like to provide a cool friendly environment in the

warm Spring for a small get-away from stress.

## 2)Wine & Cheese Social

April 10th, 2003, 8pm

Off-campus location

Expected Attendance: 100

Proposed Budget: \$150 (wine), \$150(cheese & fruits & non-alcoholic drinks)

Amount Requested: \$200

Co-Sponsor: FFR (off-campus)

Description: In light of the well-attended successful wine & cheese social

last semester, QGC will provide the LGBTQ community and friends with another

one, upon requests from the community. Our aim is to facilitate a social

atmosphere for LGBTQ graduate students and allies for a happier and better

life at Princeton.

## 3)The Fabulous Dance Party

May 2nd, 2003, 10pm-2am

D-Bar

Expected Attendance: 200

Proposed Budget: \$500 (\$440 alcohol, \$60 decorations)

Amount Requested: \$360

Co-Sponsors: FFR (off-campus), GC House Committee

Description: The recent Valentines Party attracted about 200 people - we had

expected only a mere 100! We would like to end the school year with a bigger

and better dance party, for all those who wish to shed the stress and tire

of the whole year with some fabulous music in equally fabulous style!

Cemile "Blue" Guldal spoke for the QGC.

Their first request was for a milkshake social. The idea was to provide a friendly atmosphere for LGBTQ and friends. The event will be held for the first time, and the plan is to do it every year or every two years. It will be at the BevLab, which is quite expensive (\$212 for 50



people). They were asking \$100 from the GSG. They had asked the Women's Center, the International Center and FFR for co-sponsorship. The International Center refused, and FFR wants other possible co-sponsors to be asked first.

Their second request was for a wine and cheese social, to be held in an off-campus location. Both the Women's Center and the International Center had refused to co-sponsor, because of the presence of alcohol. The Graduate College House Committee will be approached. The total budget was \$300, they had \$100 from FFR, and were asking \$200 from the GSG.

Their third request was for the Fabulous Dance Party, to be held at the D-Bar. She suggested that for the recent Valentine's Party they had expected 100 people, and 200 came. They ran out of alcohol, it was a great success, and there was a great demand from both LGBTQ and straight people. The total budget was \$500, they were asking \$360 from the GSG.

As to the Milkshake Social, Mr. Silberman asked if they had tried to get a discount at BevLab. Ms. Guldal said they were trying, but had had no answer yet.

As to the Fabulous Dance Party, Ms. Guldal stated that the QGC had spent almost all of its budget for alcohol with the Valentine's Dance. Ms. MacNamara said that this was not allowed, and that the GSG had always been made to obey the University's policy that half of spending must be on food and non-alcoholic beverages. Ms. Guldal suggested that this might not be the case for events at the D-Bar. Lisa Sherov explained that the D-Bar serves food, so that satisfies the requirement that food be available where alcohol is served. Ms. MacNamara asked Ms. Guldal whether she had indicated on the event registration form that the alcohol was going to be free. Ms. Guldal said she had. Ms. Sherov said she had not. Apparently, the form was somewhat ambiguous and Ms. Guldal had intended to indicate this.

Ms. MacNamara summed up, saying that the GSG could not co-sponsor the event as budgeted, and suggesting that QGC talk with F. Joy Montero, associate dean of graduate student life. Ms. Guldal accepted the suggestion.

Ms. MacNamara also stated that the event as planned conflicted with the planned

APGA/GSG barbecue [Minutes 2.12.2003, III.D.2; see also [IV.B](#) below]. Ms. Guldal explained that she had been unaware of this at the time the QGC event was planned and that she would attempt to find another date. Ms. MacNamara asked her to wait because the APGA said they might request another date for the barbecue. Ms. Guldal and Ms. MacNamara agreed to coordinate so that the two events did not occur at the same time.

At this point, Mr. Butler observed that more than 50 people were expected, but the budget didn't provide for a proctor. Ms. Guldal stated there would be one. Ms. MacNamara suggested it would be about \$56/hour. As this event will be after the next meeting, Mr. Miller suggested continuing the discussion in the next meeting, with more information. Ms. Guldal agreed.

Mr. Silberman recalled that we had already funded the QGC a few meetings ago [Minutes 1.8.2003, 5.2].

Mr. Butler thought the budget for milkshakes was too high, and asked how much the GCHC paid for them. Mr. Silberman didn't have precise numbers, but it was about \$5 for 1 gallon of ice-cream, and very little for milk and fruits. Ms. Guldal concurred that BevLab is really expensive.

Meredith Hastings reminded the Assembly that we should pay \$3/graduate student. Mr. Butler clarified that his point was that he didn't agree with the budget. Mr. Artis stated that that was irrelevant. Mr. Butler insisted that it was indeed relevant.

Mr. Silberman then inquired about the costs of Butler's Wine and Cheese Night. Huiyan Yang stated that the budget had been \$600 and the GSG had given \$300 [Minutes 9.18.2002, 5.1.2.3]. She added that wine and cheese events are very expensive.

At this point, Ms. MacNamara moved that we approve funding, and there was a second.

**MOTION:** to fund both the milkshake social and the wine and cheese social, with a \$300 total, in the understanding that this value will be revised if a discount is arranged with

BevLab. PASSED.

Mr. Miller stated that another request had been made the day before, clearly too late [By-Laws, IV.3], and the Treasurer didn't have the time to study the request. Leonard Pease reminded the Assembly that we were well over time. A member of the Assembly said that it was the business of the Assembly to discuss these things and that therefore the Assembly should proceed. Mr. Miller asked whether anyone objected to proceeding; no one did.

Genevieve Aguilar, in a very soft voice, presented the funding request for the "3rd Annual WWS Queer Policy Series". It will be held at WWS, for the second time. It's a series of events on several topics, of which the secretary only managed to hear "death penalty" more than once. Funds had been secured from WWS. They were asking \$500 from the GSG.

Ms. MacNamara asked how many attendees were expected. Ms. Aguilar said that 20 to 40 people were expected at each one of the events. Ms. Guldal added that about 100 people fit the room, and dinners will be for 40 people at least.

Mr. Silberman stated that the request was exaggerated. Given that the GSG traditionally funds social events rather than political events, he inquired what would be the social component. Heather White stated that the Assembly had discussed this at a previous meeting and had agreed to fund political events. Mr. Silberman disagreed: what the Assembly had done was declare a particular event, that some considered political, to be a social event [Minutes 10.9.2002, 5.1].

In answer to Mr. Silberman's question, Ms. Aguilar stated that there would be dinners, and a movie would be shown.

Ms. Sherov asked whether the dinner on March 28 listed was the one to be held at the GC. The secretary didn't manage to hear the answer. Mr. Butler reminded the Assembly of the milkshake social to be held on March 27.

Ms. MacNamara asked what was the total budget, to what Ms. Aguilar replied it was \$2500.

Ms. MacNamara also asked about the co-sponsorship budget.

Mr. Silberman suggested that we fund two dinners at \$75 each. To this Ms. White added that the events are open to all students, and we should encourage participation. Mr. Miller suggested that all GSG sponsored events must be open to all graduate students. Mr. Silberman reminded members of the Assembly that the estimate was about 30 participants.

Ms. White suggested that we should realize that it's reasonable to accept different demands from different groups. Mr. Butler disagreed, pointing that although what's reasonable is different for different groups, we must be equitable. The guideline of \$3/person/event may not be fair, but it is equitable. Mr. Silberman added that we have had an increasing stream of requests, but Mr. Butler was of the opinion that that was positive.

Mr. Silberman exemplified that the wine and cheese social had just been funded with \$200 and would serve more students. David Smith then seconded Mr. Silberman's motion of funding these events by \$150, but the Assembly ignored him. Mr. Artis suggested that the total attendance (for all events together) would be some 100 people. Ms. Aguilar suggested it could be even 160.

At this point Mr. Miller tried to restore respect for the parliamentary process, and reminded the Assembly there was a motion to be discussed. Mr. Smith concurred, by moving the previous question. Mr. Artis complained that there should be more discussion, and Mr. Miller explained that the Assembly can accept or reject the motion. Mr. Artis asked for more debate.

Mr. Adelizzi then asked by how much we had co-sponsored the QGC this academic year. Mr. Butler stated that we had already funded them by \$860. Mr. Adelizzi concluded that with the new funding request, we would be funding the QGC by more than 10% of the GSG total budget and close to one-third of the co-sponsorship budget for the year. [The total budget is \$9090, with \$3480 for co-sponsorship; see Minutes 10.9.2002, 7.1.]

Ms. Guldal argued that she had already explained [Minutes 1.8.2003, 5.2] that it is difficult for the QGC to get funding from other sources. Ms. Townsend suggested that if they are a

more active group, we should support them, at least in principle. Mr. Adelizzi clarified that he didn't dispute that we should fund them; he was only worried about the total amount.

Mr. Artis proposed that we fund by \$500. Mr. Smith insisted that we return to the previous question. Mr. Miller asked the Assembly to vote on funding by \$150.

MOTION: to fund the "3rd Annual Queer Policy Series" by \$150. FAILED.

Mr. Artis moved that we fund them by \$500. Mr. Adelizzi moved that we fund them by \$300, in which he was seconded by Mr. Silberman.

MOTION: to fund the "3rd Annual Queer Policy Series" by \$300. PASSED.

It was already said that the Treasurer hadn't had the time to process this request, and thus hadn't forwarded the electronic application to the Assembly beforehand. Said funding request read thusly:

1\_Organization\_Name: Queer Graduate Caucus  
2a\_Contact\_Person\_Name: Genevieve Aguilar  
[contact email removed by the recording secretary]  
3\_Event\_to\_be\_funded: 3rd Annual Queer Policy Series  
4\_Date\_of\_event: March 24-28  
5\_Expected\_GS\_Attendance: 100  
6\_Requested\_Amount: 500  
[PU account removed by the recording secretary]  
9\_Event\_description: The 3rd Annual Queer Policy Series seeks to inform and engage the Princeton Community on LGBT policy issues and provide a forum for discussion. The series has invited experts in the field to explore and present international and domestic issues of that affect the LGBT community.

Below is a list of events and budget. We anticipate 100-125 participants throughout the week of events.

### 3RD ANNUAL WWS QUEER POLICY SERIES

March 24th - March 28th, 2003

#### SUMMARY OF EVENTS

March 24th

International Human Rights Panel

Speaker: International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission

This presentation will explore recent campaigns to expand LGBT civil rights

in other countries and their implications for domestic policy.

Details: TBA. The presentation will be followed by a dinner.

March 25th

The Death Penalty and Queer Communities

Speaker: Amnesty Outfront Project

This presentation and discussion will look at the prison industrial complex

and its impact on the queer community.

Details: TBA

March 26th

Political Debate: Log Cabin Republicans vs. Stonewall Democrats

Speakers will debate key political issues in national arena

affecting the

LGBT community. It will open to a general discussion on the current issues

affecting LGBT individuals.

Details: TBA

March 27th

Local Queer Politics

Speaker: Stacey Sobel, Executive Director, The Center for Lesbian and Gay

Civil Rights

A presentation discussing the challenges and successes of working in the

queer community in Philadelphia and how politics has shaped the environment for LGBT issues locally.

Details: 4:30 - 6:00 PM, location TBA. The presentation will be followed

by a dinner.

March 28th  
In the Life

A viewing of a national television series that reports on gay and lesbian issues and culture followed by a discussion on its role in shaping public opinion on LGBT issues. IN THE LIFE is America's only nationally televised gay and lesbian cultural newsmagazine dedicated to chronicle the history and contemporary experiences of the gay and lesbian community.

Details:

5:00 - 7:30, location TBA. The film will be followed by a dinner.

#### BUDGET

Item	Unit Cost	Units	Subtotal	
Food				
	Refreshments	30	\$200	
	Lunch	30	\$250	
	Dinner			
	March 24th	30	\$200	
	March 27th	30	\$600	
	March 28th	30	\$200	
Advertising/Publicity				
	Film		\$10	
	Printing		\$50	
	Information Packet		\$250	
Transportation				
	From Philadelphia	\$60	1	\$60
	From NYC	\$30	3	\$90
University Services				
	Media Services		\$100	
	Building Maintenance		\$100	
Participant Honorarium				

Speakers	\$200	3	\$600
----------	-------	---	-------

TOTAL			\$2,660
-------	--	--	---------

## >C. Chair's Report

Mr. Miller told the Assembly that there had been two Executive Committee meetings per week, including the "Meet the Candidates" Forum. The agenda for this Assembly meeting was discussed, and the need for point href="#Vb">V.B (election of a representative to the Judicial Committee) arose. The problem is that the current representative in the CPUC Judicial Committee is unavailable, and someone must complete the term. Mr. Miller asked members of the Assembly to consider serving on the committee, and added that he would return to this later in the meeting. [more details in V.B below]

## >IV. Old Business

### >A. Officer Elections Committee Report

Mr. Silberman, ex-officio chair of the Officer Elections Committee, admitted there had been no announcement of results, and proceeded to explain the reasons. The problem is the practical impossibility to know the size of the Graduate Student Body (GSB). In fact, there were precisely 200 votes, and all candidates got a majority of approvals over disapprovals (more than 75% in all cases):

200 votes cast.

Numbers are Approval/Disapproval/Abstention.

Chair: Bill Jordan (168/13/19)

Parliamentary Secretary: Leonard F. Pease III (152/18/30)

Press Secretary: Meredith Safran (163/9/28)

Recording Secretary: João Pedro Pereira Boavida (149/16/35)

Treasurer: Eitan Bonderover (158/13/29)

Social Chair: Sinéad MacNamara (165/13/22)

The difficulty was in determining if this is a quorum. The GSB includes all full-time enrolled students (and this includes in absentia students), students on leave of absence who paid



dues the previous year, and post-enrolled students who paid dues [Constitution, III] . But there are no reliable statistics of this, especially for students in absentia or on leave of absence. A related problem exists with identification in the WebSurvey system, and the title="Office of Information Technology">OIT list of students is probably not up-to-date. In fact, one student was unable to vote, and had to be added manually to the list. Mr. Silberman further explained that the electronic balloting had been used in the two previous elections, and that the Elections Committee had done everything in the same way.

As to clear facts, 1896 students paid dues, but the opening enrollment was 1997. There is exactly 1 post-enrolled student who paid dues. The number of students on leave is unknown, as is the number of students who left Princeton after the academic year began. David Redman, associate dean for academic affairs, had been contacted the day before, but had not yet replied.

Mr. Silberman suggested that the Assembly can either ratify the election results, or vote for officers. Mr. Miller clarified the two options: (1) accepting that a quorum was met and ratifying the results, or (2) declaring that a quorum has not been met and proceeding to elect officers.

Mr. Adelizzi moved that the Assembly decide there was no quorum and elect the same officers who were chosen by the voters. Mr. Silberman seconded. Mr. Miller suggested that some debate might be appropriate.

Mr. Artis incredulously asked if the Assembly can elect the Officers. Messrs. Adelizzi, Miller and Silberman stated that it is indeed possible [By-Laws, III.5g]. And they also reminded the Assembly that the elections were not contested.

MOTION: that there was no quorum, and that the candidates be elected. PASSED. Ms. MacNamara wished her abstention to be recorded. There were four votes in opposition.

Mr. Silberman then announced the new officers: Chair Bill Jordan, Parliamentary Secretary Leonard F. Pease III, Press Secretary Meredith Safran, Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida, Treasurer Eitan Bonderover, and Social Chair Sinéad MacNamara. He added that

the Elections Committee will try to find a way to avoid these problems in the future.

Mr. Miller further added that no one had been nominated for Corresponding Secretary, and as such Mr. Adelizzi would continue in office till the Assembly elects a new officer. Mr. Adelizzi invited potential candidates to approach him to discuss the duties of the post. The Assembly was silent. Ms. MacNamara suggested it was an opportunity for interested students to get involved. The Assembly remained silent. Mr. Miller reinstated that interested students should approach Mr. Adelizzi, and suggested that representatives could try to convince students in their departments. Mr. Adelizzi closed by saying he would be happy to continue in office for a month or two if necessary.

## >B. Parking & Transportation Committee Report

In her capacity as chair of the Parking and Transportation Committee, Ms. MacNamara stated that the ridership numbers for the new shuttle had been rising steadily. The larger vehicle is about to be replaced by a second bus with standing space, so capacity will effectively increase (but not much). Extending shuttle service into the evening, or discussing the night shuttle (and its drivers) with Public Safety, were under consideration. The committee will meet with Laurel Harvey, from the Office of the Senior Vice President for Administration, in the week after Spring break.

Mr. Artis had heard there was talk about changing the schedule, and asked more information. Ms. MacNamara explained that that possibility would be considered later, but there was student support: the email sent out to the GSB had many more people responding in favor of making the schedule earlier than in favor of retaining the current schedule.

Mr. Artis then asked by how much would the schedule change. Ms. MacNamara relieved him, by revealing it would be anticipated by no more than 15 minutes. That way, from both the GC and Butler Apartments two shuttles would arrive to main campus before 9am, thus effectively increasing morning capacity. Mr. Miller added that that change was planned for after the Spring break. Ms. MacNamara stated that, although she had gotten no confirmation yet, she had been told the same.

Ms. MacNamara used the occasion to report in her capacity as Social Chair. The APGA will hold an evening barbecue in the GC (for lack of a better alternative). She invited suggestions by email or then.

### >C. International Students Concerns Committee Report

In his capacity as chair of the International Students Concerns Committee, Lei Xu reported that on February 24 the committee had met with Miki Mendelsohn, English Language Program (ELP) coordinator, and Georgia Nugent, dean of the McGraw Center for Teaching and Learning.

The ELP has been progressively reduced from 3 weeks to 3 days. Before, students had more time to adjust, now it's harder. The Directors of Graduate Studies (DGSs) would like students to have another chance. On the other hand, students are required to take language classes, otherwise they can't take the Princeton Oral Proficiency Test (POPT). In fact, this requirement is more flexible now.

He continued, explaining the POPT is very important, but the students can not challenge the results. Moreover, different departments have different policies on when it's reasonable to pass the test, and some students need a lot of time to improve. He ended on a positive note, saying that the ELP will meet with the DGSs to discuss the POPT, and that the POPT will be discussed with students to find what are the problems.

At this point Mr. Silberman added that there are regular meetings between McGraw Center and the DGSs to discuss the SPEAK test. Mr. Xu confirmed.

### >D. Information Technology Committee Report

Mr. Miller reported for the Information Technology Committee. As to the installation of DormNet in Butler Apartments, he reminded the Assembly that he had previously reported [Minutes 2.12.2003, IV.E] that two possibilities were then under consideration: either installing two network jacks in one bedroom (for \$15/month), or one in each of the two bedrooms (for \$20/month). The committee later realized that the first option was in fact only

one jack in only one bedroom. But also, another possibility materialized and got consensus: one jack per bedroom plus another in the living room (\$19/month).

Mr. Ludkovski asked if any dates were known. Mr. Miller answered that installation was expected for the summer.

### E. Post-Enrollment Committee Report

Mr. Miller told the Assembly that we had misunderstood some changes in housing. The GSG had been under the impression that post-enrolled students could apply for housing just like all other students [Minutes 10.9.2002, 6.2], but it transpired that is not the case: title="Degree Candidacy Continuing">DCC students can apply only for the DCC wait list (which comes after the regular wait list). In fact, this doesn't change anything, except for hardship applications (post-enrolled students can't apply) and for drawing priorities in residential housing committees. Mr. Silberman added that it also had implications on drawing these students into multiple occupancy rooms.

Mr. Jordan, who had been a member of the Provost's Committee on Post-Enrollment, added that, according to his notes, all students would be allowed to participate in the draws. But there were no official minutes, and his personal notes wouldn't probably have much weight.

Ms. MacNamara added that the GSG had written a letter (dated 10.7.2002) detailing the GSG's interpretation of the changes, and in their answer (dated 10.9.2002) the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School had not disputed the Executive Committee's understanding. In fact, Mr. Miller added, they didn't even mention that. When the Provost visited the GSG in September [Minutes 9.18.2002, 4] the post-enrollment handbook was not yet written. But now it was, and in fact it is consistent with their position.

Mr. Silberman concluded that the situation was now worse than before, for only DCC students could now apply for housing. Fei Sun stated that the webpage said it will work just like the current priority system. Mr. Silberman said that Patricia McArdle, assistant director for graduate housing, had instructions to follow the handbook. Mr. Miller suggested that we investigate. Nicole Esparza explained that the webpage explicitly mentions a wait list. [From

the href="http://facilities.princeton.edu/housing/b\_graduate/draw/">Graduate Draw Handbook: "DCC status has been added this year ... This status will allow you to sign up for the housing DCC wait list ... Please see the General Apartment section for more information on this DCC sign up process. If you do obtain housing through this status, your rental rate will remain at the student rental rate for that area. title="Enrollment Terminated; Degree Candidacy Continuing">ETDCC wait list will continue in its previous form."]

Mr. Miller continued saying that he had emailed Jed Marsh, associate provost, who suggested that Dean Montero should be approached. Dean Montero said she would try to contact Mr. Marsh to learn the details. The day before she hadn't been able to contact him yet. Mr. Miller asked for suggestions.

Mr. Adelizzi summarized the changes actually made by the Provost's Committee on Post-Enrollment following their half a year working on the issue. He stated that graduate students in their first year of post-enrollment could not get a student ID, park on campus, and access athletic facilities at a discounted (faculty/staff) rate. Some bureaucratic hurdles to library access had been removed. The post-enrolled surcharge on housing had been removed, but apparently only for DCC students.

## >F. By-Law Amendments Introduced Last Month

Mr. Adelizzi, on behalf on the Executive Committee, then reintroduced the three by-law amendments which had been first discussed in the previous meeting [Minutes 2.12.2003, V.A; their texts were included in said minutes].

Mr. Adelizzi introduced the first proposed amendment (on the appointment of temporary officers), which he deemed uncontroversial. Mr. Smith asked if there was a time limit, and if the Assembly must approve these officers, to which Mr. Adelizzi answered that the Chair must inform the Assembly immediately, and the Assembly can vote in the following meeting. Mr. Smith then asked if (under this amendment) the Assembly could remove an Acting Officer, and Mr. Adelizzi confirmed the Assembly could remove an acting officer by electing a regular officer. Mr. Smith asked whether the Assembly could remove an acting officer without naming a replacement, and Mr. Adelizzi clarified it could under the standard

judicial procedures. Mr. Miller added that acting officers would have no vote in the Executive Committee. To avoid any doubts, Mr. Adelizzi read relevant parts of the text of the amendment.

Ms. MacNamara moved to approve the amendment, and Mr. Silberman seconded.

MOTION: to approve the amendment "VI. Establishment of procedures for temporary appointment of officers". PASSED.

Mr. Adelizzi then introduced the second proposed amendment (abolishing run-off elections for officers).

MOTION: to approve the amendment "VII. Abolition of runoff elections and establishment of a first-past-the-post system for election of officers". PASSED. Mr. Artis and Jason Casellas wished their disapproval to be recorded.

And at last, Mr. Adelizzi introduced the third amendment (changing the CPUC elections to conform to CPUC by-laws). Jessica Clark asked what is the CPUC. Mr. Miller explained succinctly [see V.B below for more details]. Mr. Silberman moved to approve, and was seconded by Ms. MacNamara.

MOTION: to approve the amendment "VIII. Alteration of CPUC Election System to Comply with the CPUC Charter". PASSED.

## >V. New Business

### >A. Introduction of (more) By-Law Amendments

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Mr. Adelizzi introduced two further proposed amendments. According to the Constitution [VI.10], they will be voted within a month.

The first amendment would recognize three programs which had till then been erroneously seen as departments; in fact, all them had been represented in the Assembly even though

they should not have been. Mr. Adelizzi tried to explain the distinction between programs and departments.

The proposed text of the amendment, which had been sent in advance to the Assembly, by email, was:

#### AMENDMENT IX. Recognition of Programs

Explanatory Statement. The GSG Constitution grants representation in the Assembly to all departments and separate representation to all programs recognized in the By-Laws. By custom, the Program in Applied and Computational Math, the History of Science Program, and the Office of Population Research have had seats in the Assembly. It has come to the attention of the Executive Committee that none of these entities are actually departments. This amendment grants these programs official recognition and the right to send representatives to the Assembly, basically confirming the de facto state of affairs.

Text of the Amendment.

To By-Law Article I, Paragraph 3, shall be added, in the list of academic programs recognized as separate academic units, in alphabetical order, Applied and Computational Mathematics, History of Science, and Population Research.

Ms. Wijetunge inquired whether there were more such programs. Mr. Casellas mentioned Political Philosophy. Mr. Adelizzi further explained that programs who wish to be considered independent academic units can petition, and the Assembly decides on a case-by-case basis [Constitution, IV.2]. Ms. Wijetunge then asked if these programs had petitioned. Mr. Adelizzi explained that these programs already had seats in the GSU times, and the status quo continued in the GSG, no one realizing that they were not departments. Ms. Wijetunge then asked, as if suggesting there's no point discussing anymore, if they couldn't

simply petition and that's all. Messrs. Adelizzi and Silberman replied that the By-Laws still had to be amended.

Mr. Casellas then asked where is the line between departments and programs, and Mr. Adelizzi agreed that it is always a qualitative matter. To what Mr. Artis added that it is just the same with special interest groups, and that the GSG should act consistently with special interest groups and these academic programs. Ms. MacNamara tried to explain that that wouldn't be practicable.

Mr. Miller attempted to close debate, but Mr. Adelizzi continued that the Constitution mentions academic programs. Mr. Miller, looking emphatically at Mr. Adelizzi, attempted once again to close debate, but this time Huiyan Yang tried to explain that there's a clear distinction between those two kinds of groups: the University calls Student Organizations to some, and Academic Programs to the others, and the Constitution is clear on that respect too.

Mr. Adelizzi offered to strike History of Science from the amendment. He explained that the seat was vacant and these students are represented through HIS, while students from Applied and Computational Mathematics and Population Research are not part of departments and would not be represented in the GSG if not recognized by the By-Laws. He took an informal poll, and proceeded with the change.

The second amendment would determine that if 25% or more of the operational budget is not used in a year, then half of it would be invested in the University endowment, unless the Assembly directs otherwise. Mr. Miller just suggested that members of the Assembly read the text of the amendment before the next meeting.

The text, by the way, had been sent by email and read thusly:

AMENDMENT X. Movement of Surplus Funds to the Endowment.

Explanatory Statement. The GSG has been running budgetary surpluses for a number of years. Three years ago, the Assembly voted to establish a



GSG

endowment, an investment fund invested in the Princeton University endowment. Although Princeton usually requires an initial investment of

\$50,000 from student organizations to establish endowments, the rules were

waived in honor of the centennial of the Graduate School, and the GSG

endowment was established with \$2000. The purpose of the creation of this

endowment was twofold: (1) to invest surplus revenues in one of the world's best investments, the Princeton University endowment, rather than

allowing them to sit in our University account, which bears no interest,

and (2) to provide an increasing revenue stream for future years, given

the difficulty of raising GSG dues. The endowment grows at the rate of

growth of the University investments and pays 4.5% per annum in dividends.

The Executive Committee wishes to create a system whereby the Assembly is

encouraged to spend GSG funds in a given year, but, if these funds go

unspent, the funds should be invested where they will aid the long-term

financial stability of the organization. Therefore, it is proposed that

if the continuing surplus in any given year exceeds 25% of the annual

budget from the previous year, half of the outstanding surplus shall be

automatically transferred into the endowment unless the Assembly directs

otherwise. This will give the Assembly a strong motivation to spend its

budget on social events and co-sponsorship ("use it or lose it") while

ensuring that, if the Assembly fails to spend its dues money in a given

year, a significant portion of the surplus is directed to the long-term financial welfare of the GSG. The clause allowing the Assembly to block the transfer of funds will give the Assembly a second chance to designate the funds in question for a worthy end. Nothing in this amendment prevents the Assembly from putting additional funds in the endowment in a given year if they so choose.

Text of the amendment.

To By-Law Article IV shall be added a new paragraph:

4. The Endowment. The Assembly shall be empowered to establish and maintain endowments or investment funds for the benefit of the Graduate Student Government and the Graduate Student Body, within the framework of such regulations as Princeton University may establish.

a. Annual Income. The Annual Income from such an endowment shall constitute part of the annual budget.

b. Investment of Surpluses. If the continuing surplus of the GSG at the end of a given fiscal year amounts to more than one-quarter of the total GSG budget from that fiscal year, the Treasurer shall announce the fact to the Assembly within two months of the close of the fiscal year; two months following such an announcement, the Treasurer shall invest one-half of the amount of the continuing surplus from the close of the previous fiscal year in the GSG endowment or such part of the endowment as the Treasurer deems advisable, unless the Assembly directs otherwise in the intervening time.

c. Donations. Within the framework of regulations established by Princeton University, the GSG and its Officers may solicit and

accept donations for specific projects and for the endowment.

## >B. Judicial Committee Representative Election

Mr. Miller explained that our representative in the CPUC Judicial Committee was currently unavailable, and that the committee would be convened shortly. So volunteers were needed. There can be no common members to (the other Committees of) the CPUC and the Judicial Committee, to assure separation of powers.

Mr. Pease inquired what was to be discussed. Mr. Miller replied he didn't know, and it was confidential anyway.

Ms. Hastings volunteered and Mr. Pease volunteered as alternate. Mr. Adelizzi clarified that members of the Judicial Committee can not be members of other judicial bodies, and that the Executive Committee can be construed as such a body, for it has judicial powers [Constitution, VIII]. Mr. Pease, being a newly elected officer, was therefore ineligible. Ms. Wijetunge then volunteered.

Mr. Miller asked if there were objections. There being none, their nomination was deemed APPROVED.

## >C. DGS letters

Mr. Miller summarized the ongoing debate in gsg-active and gsg-assembly on letters to be sent to the DGSs. The Executive Committee had sent letters to the DGSs of departments with no GSG Representatives, and was suggesting that another letter should be sent to departments who already have Representatives, to inform the DGS about the GSG and to make sure the Representatives are really elected. He opened the floor to debate.

Juliet O'Brien suggested that the same letter be sent to all departments, in order not to emphasize a distinction. In fact, her DGS had suggested this. Ms. MacNamara asked for clarification: was the DGS suggesting that tact was needed? Ms. O'Brien agreed: her DGS suggested that some DGS might think that participation in the GSG might have a negative impact on academic work. She concluded that it was nice of him to make such contributions

on this delicate subject.

Mr. Miller stated that there had been a suggestion that Representatives should be the ones to send the letters. Mr. Silberman added that Andrew Erickson had opposed that. Mr. Casellas (proxy for Mr. Erickson) was not aware of the details.

Mr. Miller suggested that we might not want to leave the elections in the hands of the DGSs, and Ms. MacNamara added that some might simply appoint representatives. Mr. Artis suggested that, on the other hand, the potential benefits were greater, for more students would get involved. Mr. Miller agreed: that was precisely the idea.

Ms. Esparza asked if the letter would be sent by mail or email. Mr. Adelizzi stated that that had not been discussed explicitly, but he had presumed all the time that it would be sent by email.

At this point, Mr. Miller checked if the Assembly agreed that something was to be sent by someone. It was clearly the case.

Mr. Casellas suggested just sending letters to departments with no representatives. Mr. Miller clarified that that had already been done. He then wondered aloud if Representatives are representative. He added that it was important that more faculty be aware of the GSG and Departmental Representatives. And he also pointed that there are often problems when Representatives graduate. Mr. Silberman suggested that, in order to avoid that, paper letters be sent to the DGSs, because DGSs change often and a paper letter is more likely to be transferred than an email message.

Mr. Adelizzi then suggested that Representatives might use the letter already sent by the Executive Committee as a starting point. Along another line, Mr. Miller added that in some departments the DGS could be not the right contact, but rather department managers or graduate administrators, or an email to all students in the department. Brigitta Lee added that maybe each representative knows each department better.

Mr. Silberman then asked if we wanted to be sure that something would be done in all

departments, or if we trusted each representative, or rather if we would ask them to report back to the Executive Committee. Ms. MacNamara suggested some representatives might not feel comfortable to talk with their DGS, but only with students.

Mr. Silberman then suggested contacting the representatives and getting an answer from them in three weeks. Mr. Adelizzi added that, would a Representative not take action, the Executive Committee could send the letter that had been presented to the Assembly. Mr. Miller suggested that we should do that later, as the Spring break was coming. Mr. Adelizzi then changed his suggestion to sending a reminder in three weeks.

Mr. Jordan stated that Representatives should make sure elections are held. If needed, they should look for replacements. It should be made clear that Representatives should find successors. Mr. Miller cautioned that in cases that would amount to hand-picking. Mr. Adelizzi explained that it is common for Representatives to stop coming to Assembly meetings when they graduate. The Parliamentary Secretary used to remind the Departments or Representatives that elections were in order. Maybe we should get information from all departments on their election practices.

Mr. Artis stated he had tried to get information from students in his department, and no one answered. In fact, he had tried four times this year. He asked what to do if his Representative didn't come.

Mr. Silberman explained that part of the idea was to get faculty to know about the GSG. Ms. Lee suggested that we should revive the Campus Relations Committee to do that. Mr. Miller asked for a motion; it was made by Mr. Silberman and seconded by Ms. Hastings.

MOTION: to contact all Representatives on behalf of the Assembly, asking them to send a letter (based on the letter previously circulated) about the GSG to either the students or the appropriate (as judged by the Representative) administrators in their departments; the Representatives shall report back by the end of the year, otherwise the Executive Committee will send the letter. PASSED.

>D. Voting Power of Special Interest Groups

Mr. Miller suggested that Mr. Artis, having originally the next two points in the agenda, introduced them, in any order he preferred.

Mr. Artis, alluding to the preceding discussion of the amendment on academic programs representatives [see V.A above], stated that students in the programs are in a department too and that is quite analogous to the situation of interest groups. For example, he was the first black philosopher after Cornel West (who had been the first). Furthermore his departmental representative doesn't come to GSG meetings [the PHI Representative seat has been vacant since October 2000]. In light of this, he claimed the BGC deserved full voting powers (currently they can not vote on funding matters).

Mr. Silberman tried to argue that the BGC usually approaches the GSG with funding requests, and that that conflict is the reason why interest groups should not vote on funding matters. To this Mr. Artis replied that departments also ask for funding. Mr. Silberman stated that that's rare. Mr. Artis exemplified that such a request had been handled earlier during the meeting. Mr. Silberman explained the request had been made by the Graduate Engineering Council, and Ms. MacNamara added that they are a special interest group, not a department. Mr. Artis replied that the GSG can always deny funding requests. Mr. Silberman insisted that there is a conflict of interests, because groups will be competing for funding.

At this point, Anthony Fiori asked for more details on the role of voting and non-voting members of the Assembly. Mr. Silberman explained that Departmental Representatives have full voting powers, as do Representatives from Academic Programs. Interest groups send Delegates to the Assembly. Of these Delegates, only the BGC and the Women's Center have voting powers, but not on funding matters. [Constitution, IV.2, IV.3; By-Laws, I.4]

Mr. Artis clarified that he couldn't speak for other interest groups, and didn't know if they would agree with him. Mr. Fiori asked if he thought such a change would make a big difference. Mr. Artis stated it would be symbolic, and that the BGC felt marginalized.

Mr. Sun added that the GSG is composed of departments and colleges, but that's not all, there are other groups like the ACSS. It was unfair that some vote and others don't. He inquired about the new policy, and stated that he didn't agree that groups vote on funding

requests. He ended suggesting that we should encourage more participation.

Mr. Silberman stated that the BGC and the Women's Center having voting power is indeed a strong symbol. The ACSS represents more students than the BGC and doesn't have a vote. Mr. Artis replied that that was not enough. Mr. Silberman added that there is a review clause: voting delegates must send a list of their members to the Parliamentary Secretary. Mr. Adelizzi clarified that that was not in the text of the Constitution, but only in the legislative intent. Mr. Silberman asked rhetorically what would happen if he created an Israeli Student Organization and they got a vote.

At this point, Mr. Smith asked if such a change would require a by-law amendment. Mr. Adelizzi answered that moving groups from voting to non-voting or vice-versa would so require. Mr. Smith then moved to close debate. Mr. Adelizzi added that removing the restriction that voting delegates can not vote on funding requests would require a referendum [Constitution, XI]. Mr. Fiori suggested that a motion to end debate needs a 2/3 vote. Mr. Smith's attempted motion to close debate continued unseconded.

Ms. Lee suggested that to address this problem, some rotating positions could be created. Mr. Adelizzi stated that that would also need a referendum. Mr. Butler clarified that turning Voting Delegates into Representatives would amount to a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Butler suggested that Mr. Artis discuss this issue with other groups and propose an amendment at gsg - assembly. Mr. Miller suggested gsg - active was a better venue. Mr. Fiori added that this was a quite valid question, not only for interest groups, but for the whole of the GSG.

Mr. Adelizzi told the Assembly that, when the GSG Constitution was being written, the original proposal didn't give any voting powers to Delegates. The Assembly then amended the proposal, so that the BGC and the Women's Center had a vote. The ACSS and CIGS Delegates at the time thought it would be undemocratic for them to have a vote, and so those groups voluntarily surrendered their voting rights. Mr. Adelizzi cautioned the Assembly that the method of election of delegates had to be considered, giving as example the Women's Center, whose delegate is a paid employee of the University.

Ms. MacNamara seconded Mr. Smith in his motion to close debate. The motion passed, with Mr. Artis and someone else (whom the secretary couldn't identify) abstaining.

## >E. Elections & Encouraging Candidates

Mr. Artis then introduced the other agenda topic. He started by observing that there had been no opposition in the officer elections. He added that it was strange and not really democratic. Mr. Miller clarified that there had been multiple nominations, all nominees were asked to run, but only one per office accepted. He added that one can nominate oneself.

Mr. Sun stated that he had been nominated, and had been notified only one day before the deadline to accept, which is very short notice. He stated he didn't think the problem was there being uncontested elections, but that there should be a way to get people to know the GSG. Mr. Artis added that many students didn't participate.

Ms. MacNamara agreed it would have been more interesting with more candidates, but disagreed with the suggestion that there had been some sort of orchestration to get only one candidate for each position.

Mr. Artis said he was not implying that. Rather, if nominees had been warned they would have had more time to think. Ms. MacNamara stated that she had accepted the nomination only a little before the deadline because no one had accepted yet. Ms. Hastings asked if in the future the notification could be faster.

Mr. Miller explained it had been a mistake. Mr. Adelizzi reminded all that there had been a snow blizzard in the deadline day. Mr. Jordan suggested warning nominees as soon as they were nominated. Mr. Miller was afraid that could discourage further nominations and competition.

Mr. Silberman, chair of the Officer Elections Committee, closed by saying the Elections Committee would report on this. In fact this was a symptom. What must be corrected is that people were not running (there are no benefits). Changing the elections procedure won't help; people must care.



Mr. Butler, outgoing Treasurer, then eloquently expressed his opinion, and the secretary can't hope to faithfully represent his words. He started by suggesting it's very easy to accuse the Elections Committee or the Press Secretary. But shouldn't the Assembly do more? Some members don't even show for the meetings! The outgoing Executive Committee was really very good; the Assembly didn't do anything. No one ran for Corresponding Secretary: someone should find there a chance to participate. The vote on the Executive Committee (setting the agenda, participating in discussion) is very important. What about the Departments? Why don't members tell students in their Departments about the GSG? It was sad how this election had been decided: by the Assembly because of the absence of a quorum! What about next year? Did any of those present have any idea about the implications of this? He asked once, he asked twice, he asked thrice; no one answered! He recommended that people go home and study the by-laws. (Will my gentle reader allow me to recommend following the suggestion? No references this time.) They can really change things!

Mr. Artis stated that that wouldn't work in his department, for personal motives.

Mr. Adelizzi asked if the Assembly were suggesting that the Executive Committee should look for people? He himself had nominated at least a dozen candidates. Mr. Silberman added that in fact he had nominated all but one. Mr. Adelizzi continued that it was very difficult to get people to agree to run.

Ms. Hastings suggested that student participation in elections be also addressed in the letter to the DGSs.

Ms. Lee added that we should discuss specific issues, and get the Committees to work on those issues.

Ms. Esparza stated she had asked people to run, but no one wanted; no one volunteers to help. Only the Valentine's Party was an exception. Ms. MacNamara added that, aside from people recruited by Ms. Esparza, only officers had helped to run the party.

Mr. Sun offered for Corresponding Secretary, but added that he didn't have much time this

month.

Then Alan Tormay asked what was the alleged problem with the quorum, saying that the Assembly should have been informed of such implications. Mr. Butler also protested that he hadn't been warned that such a motion would be made. Mr. Adelizzi explained the implications at some length, that there were no major ramifications; however, if quorum was not met for two consecutive years, the Assembly would be asked to vote on the question of whether to continue direct elections of officers or revert to the previous parliamentary system under which the Assembly elected officers.

Mr. Butler continued his previous point: it's bad when the Assembly votes too fast, although it was positive that today there had been discussion. Members should not come only for pizza; they should come prepared!

Mr. Miller asked if the Assembly wanted to continue discussing this topic. Ms. O'Brien suggested continuing the discussion by email. Mr. Miller suggested `gsg-active` or `gsg-assembly`. Mr. Silberman clarified that all students can subscribe to `gsg-active`.

## >F. Announcement of CPUC Elections

Mr. Miller introduced a new item in the agenda: the election of title="Council of the Princeton University Community">CPUC Representatives. He explained that the GSG chooses seven representatives, two serve ex-officio and five are elected. The GSG also nominates members to the Committees: two to the Priorities Committee, one to the Governance Committee, one to the Resources Committee, one to the Judicial Committee, two to the Rights and Rules Committee. He asked members to run or find candidates, for it is important. More information can be found in the websites of the Graduate U-Council and the `href="http://www.princeton.edu/~vp/cpuc">CPUC`.

Mr. Adelizzi concurred that it is really important, Mr. Silberman added that it is where we can have the most influence. Mr. Adelizzi stated that the aforementioned Cornel West had been a member of the CPUC.

## >VI. Scheduling of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on April 9 at 6pm, in 234 Frist (note different location).

## >VII. Adjournment

Mr. Miller closed his term as GSG Chair by thanking the contributions from all. He expressed gratitude for the opportunity to serve the Graduate Student Body. He acknowledged the work of the Executive Committee, which made his job easier; he added it had been productive. Applause followed. He wished good luck to the new officers, and offered his help. And with these words he adjourned the meeting, at about 8:35pm.

Submitted 3.30.2003,

João Pedro Boavida Recording Secretary

Approved 4.9.2003.