

GSG Assembly Meeting – May 14, 2003

Outline and Summary

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Previous Minutes

3. Officers' Reports

1. Parliamentary Secretary's Report: There are vacant seats which should be filled. Representatives were asked to send information on the election procedures in their departments. A formal Interpretation issued by the Executive Committee was discussed.
2. Treasurer's Report: "The Game" was funded by \$450.
3. Chair's Report
4. Social Chair's Report

4. Committee Reports

1. Transportation and Parking: The current proposals by administration to solve the parking problems were discussed.
2. Housing: The schedule of the Lawrence construction was discussed, as well as the proposed rents for the news apartments. A letter was discussed, and several improvements were recommended. It will be sent to Assembly for further feedback, and Assembly consented to it being sent to administration the coming Friday (May 16).

5. Other Business

1. GSG T-shirt Contest: Assembly chose a winner for the T-shirt design contest.
2. AI Handbook
3. APGA Facebook
4. Furniture Drive
5. Elections Committee Report

6. Scheduling of Next Meeting and Adjournment

Attendance

Officers present: Chair Bill Jordan; Assistant Chair Eric 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: Huiyan Yang, proxy for Anita Adhitya, AOS; Sinéad Mac Namara, CEE; Eric Adelizzi, CHE; Jia Su, CHM; Jessica H. Clark, CLA; Tanjim Hossain, ECO; Gregory D. O'Mullan, EEB; Fei Sun, ELE; Meredith Safran, proxy for Kerry Bystrom, ENG; Meredith G. Hastings, GEO; Brendan McAndrew, MAE; Lior Silberman, MAT; Michael Ludkovski, ORF; Kim Montgomery, proxy for Cara Talaska, PSY; Philippa Townsend, REL; Cole M. Crittenden, SLA; Nicole Esparza, SOC; Leslie A. Medema, WWS.

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

Councilors present: Lior Silberman (MAT), CPUC; Huiyan Yang (AOS), CPUC; Meredith G. Hastings (GEO), CPUC Judicial Committee; Leonard F. Pease III (CHE), CPUC Priorities Committee;

Others present: Sharon Bewick (CHM), for The Game Committee; Kate Bartkus (WWS).

Representatives absent: Cynthia Rudin, ACM; Riaz Tejani, ANT; Zach Riddley, ARC; Brigitta A. Lee, EAS; Juliet O'Brien, FIT; Michael K. House, GER; Karoline Cook, HIS; David Shrom, MOL; Emily Snow, MUS; Patrick Gerland, OPR; Tamar Friedmann, PHY; Andrew Erickson, POL; David R. Smith, PPL.

Delegates absent: Radhika Wijetunge, Lawrence Apartments.

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

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

Minutes

I. Call to order

GSG Chair Bill Jordan called the meeting to order at about 6:05pm. The meeting was held at Frist 309.

II. Approval of Previous Minutes

Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida noted that there were two spelling mistakes in the draft minutes. Meredith Safran and Sinéad Mac Namara moved to approve the minutes with this correction. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Officers' Reports

A. Parliamentary Secretary's Report

Parliamentary Secretary Leonard F. Pease III started his report by pointing out how important it is to fill the vacant seats, so that the GSG Assembly be effectively representative of all students. He suggested that Assembly members could try to look for potential Representatives-to-be in departments whose seats are vacant. Later in the meeting, Mr. Pease further observed that it was important that Representatives who will be away during the Summer appoint proxies, and Leslie Medema introduced Kate Bartkus, who will be her proxy, to Assembly.

As to the election procedures in each department, Mr. Pease reinstated his request (sent by email to Assembly, at about the time of the previous Assembly meeting) that all Representatives tell him the method of elections in their departments. In fact, only 3 Representatives had replied. He pointed that the Constitution requires annual elections,

and that no one serve for more than 15 months without a reelection [Constitution, IV-10].

Mr. Pease then brought to the attention of Assembly a judicial opinion recently issued by the Executive Committee [as mandated by Constitution, VIII]. Indeed, Fei Sun had asked for formal Interpretation of some points of the Constitution, By-Laws, and Standing Rules. In those cases, the Executive Committee is to issue an opinion. The opinion was 15 pages long, and had been sent in advance by email, so that Assembly could look into it. In fact (has had been explained in said email), Assembly has review powers, and Mr. Pease was now asking if Assembly wanted to exercise those powers. So that the reader can more easily follow the ensuing discussion, it might be useful to quote here the syllabus of said opinion. The syllabus is followed by the reasoning behind the opinions; said reasoning is not quoted here, as it will be posted elsewhere.

The GSG Executive Committee was called on to make several clarifications and rulings regarding the Constitution, the By-Laws, and a standing rule.

The Executive Committee unanimously finds:

(A) Delegates who are not specifically defined in the By-Laws as "voting Delegates" are non-voting Delegates and possess every power that a Representative from an Academic Unit has except the right to vote. This includes the right to move matters before the Assembly and debate.

(B) No individual may hold more than one voting seat in the Assembly at the same time, even if one of these seats is held by virtue of a proxy. Voting seats include Representative seats and voting Delegate seats.

(C) Special Interest Groups that possess lists of their own members are empowered to devise their own procedures for the election of Delegates to the Assembly.

(D) The offices of Representative Secretary and Web Page Administrator ceased to exist at the time of the ratification of the current Constitution. The Executive Committee declines to provide a summary of the duties and powers of the Web Page Administrator under the former Constitution.

(E) The number of votes won by each candidate in the election for Corresponding Secretary held at the April meeting should have been announced. The failure to announce the number of votes won by each candidate is not a fatal defect and the result of the election stands. The results (Nicole Esparza 17, Fei Sun 4) will be entered into the minutes and announced at the May Assembly meeting.

(F) The Standing Rule on Budgetary Requests adopted by the Assembly on October 9, 2002, specifying that all funding requests must be received by the Treasurer at least two weeks prior to the Assembly meeting at which they are to be considered, is not in conflict with the By-Laws of the GSG. This requirement has been legally waived by unanimous consent on several recent occasions; the Executive Committee is unaware of any violations of this rule.

(G) The Executive Committee is unable to find any instances in the Constitution or By-Laws in which the words "Delegate" or "voting Delegate" are improperly used.

(H) Votes taken over e-mail require a quorum of a majority of the total number of Active and Inactive seats in the Assembly. A vote in an Assembly meeting to authorize an e-mail vote to be taken at a future date

requires only a quorum of a majority of Active seats.

(I) The Assembly may approve ordinary business by a simple majority vote.

Further details follow Robert's Rules of Order.

(J) To the best of the Executive Committee's ability to determine, votes

in the Assembly have been properly counted and the distinction between

Active seats and total seats has been respected. Announcement of the

exact number of votes on each side of a question is ordinarily not required unless a specific request is made. The notes on how to be Parliamentary Secretary written by former Parliamentary Secretary James

Vere are merely advisory and have no legal force.

(K) The Executive Committee, in reaching its decisions, places the greatest weight on the plain meaning of the text of the Constitution and

By-Laws. Interpretation may be aided, though, by consideration of original intent, common or traditional practice, and the practices described in Robert's Rules. The Executive Committee trusts that the

doctrine of stare decisis (adherence to precedent) will prevail in coming

years and provide permanent resolution to judicial questions.

The full decision of the Executive Committee follows.

Mr. Sun explained that he was writing a Constitution for the ACSS, and had looked into the GSG Constitution to get some ideas. Upon reading it in detail, he had been confused about the real powers of the ACSS and CIGS Delegates. On reading the Executive Committee's answer, he had asked for the list of Assembly members (in the GSG website) to be made more clear when referring to Delegates, and acknowledged that it was clear now. He suggested that the final three points be removed, as they answered questions that he not asked formally. He also suggested that the Constitution should be more self-explanatory; for example, he was surprised that the opinion used

<http://www.constitution.org/rror/rror--00.htm>>Robert's Rules of Order as an

authority, and attempted to move that the Constitution be amended to include such a reference.

Mr. Pease observed that such correction was unnecessary, for the Constitution already had such a reference. And he read Article VI-4: "When necessary for order, meetings shall be conducted by the rules of Parliamentary procedure as described in Robert's Rules of Order, unless otherwise specified by By-Law." Aderemi Artis was afraid that this applied only to meetings, but Mr. Pease reassured him that that was not an issue.

As to waiving rules on the timeliness of funding requests [described in By-Laws IV-3, and Minutes 10.9.2002, final of section 5.1], Mr. Sun also thought that the possibility of waiving such rules by unanimous consent (as allowed by Robert's Rules) should be made more clear. To make a long discussion short, different people expressed their opinions regarding this issue. One point was whether the standing rule was or not against the By-Law; and it was clarified that it was not the case, in fact, the standing rule is only more demanding than the By-Law (which does not contradict the By-Law). Another doubt was whether unanimous consent (consisting of asking if anyone objects to waiving the rule, and holding a vote if there are objections) could be used; but it was pointed out that if no one objected to waive the rule in the first place, then certainly either a two-thirds (to waive the By-Law) or a simple majority (to waive only the rule) would always be achieved, and further formalities were not needed.

At a point, Heather White moved to close debate, and was seconded by Ms. Mac Namara. The motion passed, with Mr. Artis opposed and Messrs. Adelizzi and Sun abstaining. The debate being closed, Mr. Pease asked if there was any motion for Assembly action (about the judicial opinion). There was none.

There was a suggestion that the Constitution should be amended, so that standing committees be regulated [but see Constitution, VI-6].

In order to make it easier for people to find Robert's Rules, Ms. Safran moved that a link be added in the Constitution page, and there was a second.

MOTION: to add a link to Robert's Rules of Order from the relevant section of the GSG Constitution. PASSED unanimously.

Mr. Sun asked whether the last three points (I, J, K) could be removed. Mr. Pease read the summary of said points from the syllabus. Mr. Silberman observed that at least the last point should be kept (for it is a conclusion) but suggested that points I and J be stricken. Eric Adelizzi asked a point of order, observing that (Assembly having not decided to review the case) changing the text was not within Assembly's authority. He suggested that the Executive Committee could revise the text. Mr. Boavida expressed his confusion: wasn't the text factual? There could be no harm in keeping the facts in the text. Ms. Safran asked whether Mr. Sun objected to the conclusions, or to them being presented as answers to formal requests. Mr. Sun agreed with the second possibility, and asked whether the three points would be stricken. Mr. Jordan thought that such change might be possible.

B. Treasurer's Report

Eitan Bonderover had submitted his report in advance. It read thusly:

I. Advance Funding Requests (1)

The Game Committee - The Game

1_Organization_Name: The Game Committee
2a_Contact_Person_Name: Dargan Frierson
[contact email removed by the Recording Secretary]
3_Event_to_be_funded: The Game
4_Date_of_event: September 13, 2003 (rain date Sept. 14)
5_Expected_GS_Attendance: 100
6_Requested_Amount: \$700
7a_PU_Account:
7b_Approved_GradSchool: Not_Yet
9_Event_description: Projected budget: \$1500
\$800 -- 8 clues at \$100/clue
\$450 -- food for post-game party
\$150 -- drinks and snacks along the way
\$100 -- prizes for the winning team

Requested support:

\$700 -- the rest of the funding will be provided by the House Committee, and possibly the Graduate School.

In the past, all of the funding has been provided by the House Committee.

However, last year the total budget was \$1117.50, which was \$317.50 over the

original budget provided by the House Committee. This meant that prizes for the

winning team and dinner for the organizing committee were not offered as they

usually are, at a cost of an additional \$200. Since we would additionally like

to increase the participation from previous years, we expect our total budget

to be \$1500. Assuming the \$800 that was granted by the House Committee last

year, we request \$700 from the GSG. We are also requesting funding from the

Graduate School, which we don't expect to get.

Graduate student participation: 100 graduate students

15 teams of 6 people/team = 90 players

6 people on design team

4 clue testers

Every year the Game is filled to capacity; in fact there are more requests than

can be handled. We would like to expand to 15 teams of 6 from 12 and 13 teams

from the previous two years.

If funding is granted, the GSG will be acknowledged as an event sponsor on all

the advertising announcing the event, as well as during the event itself.

Recommendation: Neutral. I believe the GSG should support this event. However,

the level of support that has been asked of the GSG is significantly larger than usual (according to our rule of thumb, \$300 would be our level of support). This is a large event and some of last year's clues were indeed very intricate and expensive. Other sources of funding are available such as the Graduate School and Frist (if the final party is held there).

III. Current Balance

Financial Balance, 05/07/03:	6,146.91
Liabilities:	1,063.50
Cash Balance:	7,210.41

Liabilities represent funding requests that the GSG has granted, but the receiving organization has yet to submit receipts for reimbursements.

The cash balance consists of \$1,953.59 of 2002-2003 (current fiscal year) budgeted expenditures that have yet to be spent; \$4,791.82 in prior year surplus; and, \$465.00 of graduate student fee income over the budgeted (expected) amount.

IV. Reconciled Financial Position

The GSG financial statements were last reconciled to the University bank statement date ending January 31, 2003. A budget to actual income report for the GSG was last completed for transactions as of April 7, 2003. All of these reconciliations may be reviewed by any GSG assembly member. Interested parties

should contact the GSG treasurer to make an appointment.

Submitted 05.10.03,
Eitan Bonderover
Princeton University
Department of Electrical Engineering

Sharon Bewick was representing The Game Committee. She explained the budget. Her first point was that interesting clues are expensive. She had brought an example (some sort of thing with wood, strings, and glue). At first sight, she suggested, it looked quite inexpensive, but if one considers that multiple copies (one for each team) have to be made, the costs go up. In fact, if there were only 10 teams, at a cost of \$10/copy, each clue would cost \$100. The committee tries its best to keep the costs low and recruit volunteers. As to the end-of-game party, last year the cost had been \$450; this year the committee would try to keep it at \$300 (for food and drinks). Finally, \$120 were budgeted for food and drinks along the way, and \$100 for prizes.

She acknowledged that the request was well over the usual guideline of \$3 per graduate student participant, but pointed out that this was an all-day event, at the beginning of the year, and an opportunity for incoming students to get to know people.

Ms. Safran asked if Dean Montero had been approached. Ms. Bewick didn't know; in fact, she was only representing The Game Committee, but was not directly involved in the organization. Ms. Safran suggested that, this begin a September event, maybe the funding could be decided later, when the committee could have procured other funding. Ms. Bewick observed that a lot of time is needed to design the clues, and so the available funding must be known well in advance.

Ms. Mac Namara observed that the budget for food had been changed, and asked if the total budget had changed too. Ms. Bewick thought that was the case. Ms. Mac Namara further observed that, considering the number of participants involved, the title="Association of Princeton Graduate Alumni">APGA and the Vice-President for Student Life would possibly fund. Mr. Silberman added that, considering The Game is an orientation event, the Graduate School would probably fund it too. At this point Mr. Adelizzi observed that in the previous year the GC House Committee had funded the event, but it had run over budget.

Gregory O'Mullan moved to fund the event by \$450, and there was a second. Tanjim Hossain asked if Assembly could revise this number if no other funding was obtained. Mr. Silberman thought that if other funding became available, they should tell Assembly anyway. Considering the guideline of \$3/student, Ms. Safran proposed a friendly amendment, to commit only \$300, and review the decision in the Summer if needed.

Mr. Artis suggested it would be wiser to check first how much money we have left in the budget, and asked the total money available. Mr. Bonderover stated about \$6,100 was available. Mr. Silberman asked how much was left in the co-sponsorship budget. Mr. Bonderover stated that, although the co-sponsorship budget was exhausted, there was a surplus which should be used. He further stated that the total expected income from fees was \$9,000, and the (total) co-sponsorship budget was about \$3,400. The surplus was about \$5,400. Answering a question by a member of Assembly, Mr. Bonderover stated these calculations were already taking the recent endowment investment [Minutes 3.12.2003, III.B] into account. Mr. Artis then asked what was the typical level of funding requested during the Summer. Mr. Silberman stated that the House Committee would soon apply for \$750 for Summer events, and that the Graduate School typically asked \$850 for the Orientation barbecue. Weining Man added that the ACSS would apply for funding for the Moon festivities in September, which typically involved about 300 people.

Ms. Mac Namara observed that a motion had been made. Philippa Townsend asked if we could discuss the amount, as the value proposed seemed arbitrary. Ms. Safran pointed that we should try to use the same criteria for every one, and it was only prudent not to commit ourselves to excessive funding. Jessica Clark suggested that we should better wait for other Summer requests, and make a decision next month.

At this point, Mr. Artis proposed a friendly amendment to Mr. O'Mullan's motion, to fund by \$600. Mr. O'Mullan chose the mean term, and returned to his original proposition of \$450.

MOTION: to fund "The Game" by \$450. PASSED with four abstentions.

Ms. Bewick got a smile from some faces by attempting to vote against. Ms. Mac Namara asked, as a point of order, if they could always come back and ask for more funding. Mr. Pease said it was so.

C. Chair's Report

Mr. Jordan observed that President Tilghman could not attend this Assembly meeting, but was willing to come in October, and probably the Provost and the Dean would come too. He observed that we should use the Summer to decide what issues we want to bring to their attention. The Summer meetings will be in the second Wednesday of which month, in the same room Frist 309. Mr. Pease observed that members who could not attend should appoint a proxy. Mr. Jordan added that the Executive Committee would meet with President Tilghman in June.

Mr. Jordan stated that the preparatory meetings of the CPUC Priorities Committee are held in September, which meant that by July we should have clear ideas about what we want to ask, and should have contacted appropriate administrators to present our proposals.

Mr. Jordan concluded his report by observing that he had appointed Mr. Adelizzi Assistant Chair. This position had no real powers [Constitution V-2.f], but the Executive Committee had agreed that Mr. Adelizzi, being an experienced GSG member and having helped write the Constitution, could provide useful advice. He would attend Executive Committee meetings, and had agreed not to preside over Assembly meetings.

Ms. Mac Namara reported on the recent GSG/APGA picnic, held at the GC, on May 3. It was very well-attended, so much so that food ran out quite rapidly. She observed that APGA's support was very good, and they would be willing to try other events. She invited suggestions for Fall events.

Ms. Man pointed that CIGS had organized very successful International Game Nights in the GC Coffee House. Another would be held this May. Although no funding was needed now, maybe in future events it would be helpful. She asked if a global email could be sent. Ms. Mac Namara suggested that she send her the proposed global, and thought that APGA might be interested in funding such events.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Transportation and Parking

Ms. Mac Namara wished to tell Assembly the most recent proposal by administration to solve the parking problem. She asked everybody to bear in mind that it was not her proposal, and that she was merely a messenger. Although she wondered if GSG's input would be really considered, she wanted to know Assembly's opinion.

In the first place, at least for now, the shuttle will continue. In fact, the service will be improved soon. But there is a trade-off: student parking must be reduced. The University thinks that, there being a shuttle service, students living on-campus (this meaning, at the GC, Lawrence, Hibben-Magie, or Butler) don't need to drive to main campus every day: only those who really need it should have assured parking. This would include students living off-campus, as well as cases of medical needs and day care. All other students would not be allowed to park in main campus.

However, as sometimes exceptions might be needed, on-campus students would be given some as-yet-undecided number (10 has been suggested) of "get-out-of-jail" tickets per semester. Such a ticket would be valid for one day. Every academic department has green cards for use by administrators, faculty or staff on departmental business. Students who need to drive because of their work with their advisors, shall be given such green cards. Of course, the departments would have to be informed about that policy, and have more such cards.

Mr. Bonderover asked about off-hours parking. Ms. Mac Namara stated that parking would always be free after 5pm. Mr. Silberman asked if it would be possible to buy a permit to park on-campus. Ms. Mac Namara stated that administration had previously considered level fees upon all who want to park, but the prices at other universities suggested that the fee required (to effectively reduce parking with such such a strategy) might be very high (on the order of \$500/year). To her knowledge such possibility was no longer under consideration, because faculty have expressed their reluctance to any such fee. Mr. Silberman agreed, but pointed out that it would not be as bad if it was not a requirement, but

a possibility in addition to the other systems proposed.

Mr. Silberman also asked if the GC parking fee [about which the reader can find a lot of information in the [href="http://www.princeton.edu/~gchouse">GCHC site](http://www.princeton.edu/~gchouse)] would be abolished. Ms. Mac Namara stated that during these discussions she has always insisted that if any restrictions (to what exists now) are imposed, the GC parking fee has to be abolished. Apparently everyone agrees that the fee is unfair, but all say it's not their job. Mr. Silberman observed that it is the Provost's job.

Ms. Mac Namara observed that the initial plan was more or less like this one, but in addition 140 parking spots currently used by graduate students would be taken. The GSG Transportation and Parking Committee argued strongly that no spots can be taken, as we already have less than are needed for graduate students living off-campus. At least, we had managed to keep all parking spots. Meredith Hastings thought this plan was better, and was indeed an acceptable compromise.

Mr. Pease stated his opposition to any parking fee, for it's always easy to impose new fees and seemingly impossible to abolish them. He was further opposed to any plan to limit the rights of graduate students to park on campus. Ms. Safran pointed out that we are not the only ones with parking difficulties: the incoming freshman were summarily told they can't park on campus.

Mr. Artis observed that the administration seems to have the priorities backward: instead of recognizing that the shuttle is effectively working, they only look into decreasing parking. Ms. Mac Namara wholeheartedly agreed, and pointed out that a few days before she had spent about 8 hours in Laurel Harvey's office discussing this, and had left thoroughly frustrated at the futility of dealing with an administration whose priorities are so at odds with our own. The problem is: Laurel Harvey's job is to reduce parking, and we don't want to lose the shuttle.

Huiyan Yang asked whether green cards would be issued to students working in Forrester Campus. Ms. Mac Namara stated that anyone working in Forrester Campus will always be allowed to park in the main campus for free.

Ms. Clark thought that parking was just enough for off-campus students. Ms. Mac Namara clarified that it's actually less than that. Ms. Clark then continued her thought: when sending an email to tell students about these policies, it should be made clear that off-campus students do need to park, and the available spots were barely enough for them. Ms. Mac Namara clarified that this is actually the administration position: off-campus students deserve to park; the shuttle was created for the on-campus students (thus eliminating their need to park). Because these (on-campus, shuttle-served) students have continued to drive, this new policy was an attempt to force them to stop driving. In Ms. Mac Namara's opinion, the view that the shuttle is only to serve the students who were otherwise driving is too narrow, but as Mr. Artis had observed before, the administration doesn't seem to care much about quality of life.

Mr. Bonderover asked whether, in the case that in the end there were unused parking spots, there was a risk that students would lose those spots. Ms. Mac Namara confessed she shared that concern.

Mr. Adelizzi stated that Laurel Harvey had volunteered to put this proposal in writing. He pointed out that it was important that the committee who is to grant exceptions have graduate student representation: the last thing we want is to have some bureaucrat decide what are the exceptions. Ms. Mac Namara agreed, indeed Laurel Harvey agreed that such committee had to be able to overrule any general provisions. Mr. Silberman observed that if there were free spots, parking permits could be sold. He also observed that written promises are not necessarily respected by administrators, as the GC parking fee well proves.

Ms. Mac Namara sought to draw the discussion to a close. Did anyone have very strong objections to the proposal on principle? No such objections were heard. Mr. Silberman suggested that Representatives could seek to find the opinions of their constituents. Mr. Jordan further suggested that the text of the proposal could be sent to Assembly. Ms. Mac Namara would try to get a written proposal from Laurel Harvey quickly. Ms. Medema asked if students should send opinions to Laurel Harvey or rather to Ms. Mac Namara. Ms. Mac Namara suggested that Representatives collect opinions, and send conclusions to Ms. Mac Namara.

Ms. Medema asked what would happen if the parking lot continued full. Mr. Jordan clarified

that the administration is currently only attempting to decrease parking by on-campus residents, and profess to consider it reasonable if all off-campus residents park. Ms. Mac Namara pointed that in fact there was a fear that on-campus drivers would park elsewhere if they are not allowed to park in University lots.

B. Housing

Mr. Adelizzi first reported on the belated Lawrence construction. He had written Mark Kirby (University planner, in charge of the Lawrence construction) to inquire about the new schedule, and was told the current plan was to have the first building completed in December 2003, and the rest of the complex in September 2004. Once again, this schedule depended on having a mild Winter. Mr. Adelizzi observed that students who live in the new apartments next year, will not only live in the worst University dormitory (i.e., Lockhart), but also on the most expensive University apartments (i.e., new Lawrence).

As to the high rents, Mr. Adelizzi pointed out that several questions had been submitted for the CPUC meeting in May 5. Those questions were answered by the Provost and the Dean. The Trustees had decided that the rent should cover not only maintenance costs, but also one fourth of the debt contracted to pay the construction. Both the Provost and the Dean agreed that the rents were too high for students with low end incomes, but they think it's enough that it be affordable only to some. (The others can live in Butler apartments.) Mr. Silberman added they claim the costs were 10% lower than the local market.

However, Mr. Adelizzi continued, the total cost-of-living is higher than an AI stipend (the highest typical stipend paid by the University). About 20% higher, Ms. Mac Namara added. To Mr. Adelizzi, these suggested several concerns. Firstly, it's not clear what the University sees as the purpose of graduate housing: is it housing graduate students, or competing with the local market (by keeping prices 10% lower)? Secondly, the University doesn't apply its policies consistently: there's a strong policy of keeping undergraduate rents the same across all housing, to prevent segregation by wealth, so that all students have the same opportunities as to housing, and get mixed with students from different backgrounds.

At this point, Mr. Pease observed that the Executive Committee had prepared a letter to

President Tilghman, disagreeing with the rents, and asked for consent to send it. Ms. Safran proposed that it might be easier to send the text by email, and to hold an email vote. Mr. Pease thought that the time to act was now, as we had been told about this rents a month ago, and soon any action would be ignored. And so he proceeded to read the letter.

As will be seen soon, the letter was to be modified after the meeting. However, as it stood at this time, it recalled the interest the GSG had demonstrated for the project, right from the beginning. It also recalled (and documented) previous promises made by the administration, to the effect that the rents would be affordable for students, and asked for these promises to be kept. It recognized that the new apartments were better and so it was reasonable that the rents be slightly higher; and also that it was positive that the housing stock was increased, and that at least a few students could afford it. But, it continued, the fact is that most students have much lower incomes and so can not afford the local market. This very fact was demonstrated by an attached table, which compared the stipends of four typical students with the cost-of-living (as computed by the Graduate School). A second table showed that reducing the rents would make the new housing affordable. It then drew to a close, by admitting that for those in administration, it's sometimes difficult to know if one's actions do really make a difference in the lives of those on whose behalf one works. It assured that solving this issue would make a real and significant difference. It encouraged administration to either lower the rents or (why not?) raise all stipends by the same amount, and hoped that together with administration, we could find a creative and constructive solution.

Mr. O'Mullan expressed skepticism that the amount suggested (for rent reduction or stipend increase) was enough to solve the problem. Mr. Artis suggested that the issues pointed out earlier by Mr. Adelizzi should be included, and expressed some fears that references to "unsafe neighborhoods" were really unnecessary, and could even suggest some racist connotations in some minds. Ms. Medema also expressed skepticism that a few percent decrease in the rents would be enough. Mr. Pease took all these suggestions as friendly amendments, and would change the letter accordingly.

Ms. Clark asked what did the value of 40% (of the income) for the rents apply to; was it to the studio? Ms. Mac Namara explained that all costs were monthly. The rents are always more than 40% of the gross income. The cases of 1 student living in a studio (2 would probably not be allowed the next year, but could be computed too), 2 students in a one-

bedroom apartment, and 2 students in a two-bedroom apartment had been considered. Ms. Safran pointed out that Ms. Mac Namara had also made comparisons with units already existent. Ms. Mac Namara continued: for the four students considered, the cost of a studio was respectively 68%, 61%, 48.9% and 46.3% of the income. As the state recommended 30% of the gross income as the maximum affordable rent, these values constituted an excess of 60% over the recommended maximum.

Ms. Bewick expressed one concern: when prospective students had asked her about housing, she had told them that although there was an housing crisis now, it would be solved when they arrive, precisely because of the new Lawrence apartments. She realized now that it was completely false, and suggested that soon prospective students would simply not come because there's no affordable housing. Mr. Jordan agreed, and stated that this had already been pointed out to both the Dean and the President. Ms. Safran thought that they don't understand how acute the crisis is, and Ms. Mac Namara observed that they don't realize either that when we propose alternatives and point out problems, we don't actually expect any benefit from it, for the problems won't be solved during our stay at Princeton.

Mr. Adelizzi stated that the administration will accurately defend itself by asserting that it provides housing to a greater proportion of students than peer institutions such as Stanford, but he doubted the value of such comparisons.

Brendan McAndrew suggested that, considering how scarce on-campus housing is getting, we could ask Housing to give more assistance to students looking for off-campus housing. Ms. Safran agreed, and stated that the Executive Committee had actually thought of asking the University to put advertisements in local newspapers, suggesting that landlords contact Housing with their offers. Indeed, housing maintains a list of off-campus housing, which is available in the web. And graduate students are good tenants, have a stable income, and spend a lot of time studying in the library.

Ms. Yang asked if Hibben-Magie was being considered as an alternative. Indeed, the administration seems to be pushing in that direction. If that happens, it will set a bad precedent: the new apartments were built specifically for graduate students, and in the end graduate students would not live there. It was observed that it's not even a solution, for Hibben-Magie is already full for next year.

Coming back to the recent CPUC meeting, Ms. Safran observed that the Provost behaves as if we are choosing not to live in the new apartments, and ignores any reasons, plausible as they are. In contrast, Ms. Mac Namara observed, she asked for a round of applause to the announcement that part of the undergraduate Butler dormitories would be demolished after the new colleges are built. Ms. Mac Namara couldn't resist telling the President that graduate students would be happy to live there.

Mr. O'Mullan pointed out that the comparison of rents with stipends proved that these rents are too large a problem, and suggested that we ask not for partial solutions, but for a real decrease in the rents or increase in the stipends. If we aim for small changes, we will most probably get nothing. Ms. Safran also expressed her concern that the same large increases happen again if Butler apartments are renovated; then there will be no more affordable housing.

Mr. Pease offered to send the new letter, with the changes proposed, to Assembly by email, for additional feedback, and moved that Assembly consent that the letter be sent Friday if there are no important mistakes. Ms. Safran thought Friday was an arbitrary deadline, and it would be better to work a bit more on the letter. Mr. Silberman pointed out that if we don't set a deadline, the letter will most likely never be sent. Mr. Adelizzi seconded the motion.

MOTION: for the Executive Committee to send the modified letter (and the accompanying tables) to Assembly for feedback, and for Assembly to consent that it be sent next Friday by close of business if no errors are detected. PASSED with one opposed and one abstaining.

V. Other Business

A. GSG T-shirt Contest

Nicole Esparza had collected all T-shirt designs submitted for the contest. There were 7 submissions, although one was received after the deadline. She first asked if there were objections to considering that late submission. Mr. McAndrew didn't see any problem

accepting it. Assembly agreed. The designs were circulated. There being only one possible winner, it was proposed that voting members of Assembly selected their preferred design, and a voice vote be held. This proposal was accepted. Three proposals got 0 votes, three proposals got 1 vote, and one got 4 votes. Many abstained. In any event, there was a clear winner.

Ms. Esparza observed that she had contacted "Active Imprints", with whom the University usually contracts the printing of T-shirts, and had gotten prices of about \$2.50 per T-shirt.

B. AI Handbook

Mr. Jordan reminded Assembly that Dean Redman had asked if the GSG would want to appoint representatives to help revise the AI handbook. In fact, the McGraw Center for Teaching and Learning thought that, although the core was good, it would be useful to update it to include new resources, like Blackboard, and new services, like the McGraw center itself. The Executive Committee has asked for details about the time commitment, and how many students would be needed. After investigating with McGraw, Dean Redman stated that this revision could probably be done in two weeks, in no more than 8 to 10 hours. Two or three students were enough.

Mr. Silberman asked what was the scope of the handbook: if it covered different disciplines and kinds of classes, 2 or 3 students would probably not be enough. Mr. Boavida pointed that, as only an update was needed, adding new resources, that wouldn't probably be an issue.

Mr. Jordan added that the idea was to do this during the Summer, so that it be ready before the start of classes. He tried to find volunteers among Assembly members, and Ms. Esparza offered. There being no more volunteers, he suggested that Representatives could look for volunteers in their departments. He would send Dean Redman's email with the timing details to Assembly.

C. APGA Facebook

Mr. Jordan then proceeded to tell Assembly some information Dean Montero had sent, about the APGA facebook project. The APGA's idea was to publish a first-year graduate student facebook, to be distributed to incoming students, and possibly including DGSs and other administrators, officers of the GSG and residential committees, Graduate School staff, and other useful people. If it is done annually, in five years all students would have been covered. There were no concrete details yet. Mr. Jordan asked for suggestions.

Mr. Silberman suggested that there could also be an online edition. Ms. Safran pointed out that in any event students should be given a choice not to be included. In either edition, Mr. Silberman added. He also added that the GC faceboard, when it existed, was quite useful.

D. Furniture Drive

Mr. Jordan then discussed the furniture drive. When undergraduate students move out, they usually leave furniture behind. The GSG usually helps collect this furniture, and sells it at low cost, donating the proceeds. This year, the drive will be on June 3 and 4. Volunteers are needed to accept payments. Mr. Bonderover added that the typical compensation is one piece of furniture for free, and Mr. Silberman suggested that there would likely be free snacks and drinks. Ms. Man asked for how long the volunteers were needed. Mr. Bonderover stated that there are several locations, and people usually can show for 1 to 2 hours.

Mr. Jordan asked for volunteers. Mr. Bonderover, Ms. Clark, Ms. Man, and Mr. Pease volunteered.

E. Elections Committee Report

Mr. Silberman asked to report for the Elections Committee. He recalled that in the recent elections, it had been impossible to determine the size of the voting population, and Assembly had to find an ad-hoc solution [Minutes 3.12.2003, IV.A]. It was not practical, he suggested, to do the same every year if the same problem arises. The Graduate Student Body (GSB) is defined [Constitution, III] as including all enrolled students, all students in absentia, all students on leave who were enrolled the previous year, and all post-enrolled

students who elect to pay dues. The difficulty consists in determining who are the students on leave who were enrolled the previous year. It can be done, but it's not trivial. To remedy this problem, he suggested that the voter population [described by By-Law III-5] be changed to exclude these students.

Ms. Safran thought that in that case, students in absentia should be excluded too. Mr. Silberman agreed that was another possibility, which had in fact been proposed by the Graduate School. Mr. Boavida pointed that students in absentia pay dues, and as such should have a vote. Mr. Silberman observed that in fact the Graduate School didn't charge dues to those students; that was an issue which we could try to pursue.

Mr. McAndrew asked if it was not equally difficult to determine who are the post-enrolled members of the GSB. Mr. Silberman explained that it was very easy, for they pay dues directly to the GSG.

There was some discussion on the enrollment status of students in absentia. It was pointed that we should be careful in considering this, and take the analogies with post-enrolled students into account. As the discussion was being quite inconclusive, there was a motion to close debate. It was seconded, and passed with Mr. Silberman opposed. Ms. Safran moved that Mr. Silberman write a concrete amendment proposal that can be discussed. Mr. Pease seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Pease used the occasion to announce, as was required by the By-Laws, that in the recent election for Corresponding Secretary, Ms. Esparza got 17 votes, and Mr. Sun 4.

VI. Scheduling of Next Meeting and Adjournment

Mr. Jordan reminded all that the next meeting was scheduled for June 11, at 6:00pm, in Frist 309. There was a motion to adjourn, and the meeting was adjourned at about 8:05pm.

Submitted 5.27.2003,

João Pedro Boavida Recording Secretary

Amended and approved 7.9.2003.