

Minutes of the GSG Meeting, 8 May 2002

SUMMARY OF THE MINUTES

1. Call to order
2. Approval of Previous Minutes
 - Revised February Minutes
 - April Minutes
3. Guest Speakers:
 - Associate Provost Jed Marsh
 - Tim Aubry & Jim Moyer, Scholars in the Schools
4. Officer Reports
 - Treasurer's Report
5. Old Business
 - Committee Reports
 - Post Enrollment
 - Ad-hoc new construction committee report
 - Telephone and cable television service
 - Environmental concerns
 - OIT
 - Cost of additional disk space
6. New Business
 - Furniture drive
 - Lunch with new administrators
 - Housing situation
7. Scheduling of Next Meeting (June 12, 6pm, 309 Frist -- summer hours)
8. Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE GSG MEETING, 8 MAY 2002

Attendance

Officers Present: Chair Scott Miller, Parl. Sec'y Lior Silberman, Corr. Sec'y Eric Adelizzi, Press Sec'y Meredith Safran, Rec. Sec'y Anita Adhitya, Treasurer Donnell Butler, Social Chair Kerry Bystrom,

Representatives Present: AOS Anita Adhitya, CHE Eric Adelizzi, CLA Meredith Safran, EAS Brigitta Lee, ELE Bill Jordan, ENG Kerry Bystrom, MAE Brendan McAndrew, MAT Lior Silberman, MUS Emily Snow, ORFE Mike Ludkovsky, REL Elliot Ratzman, SOC Donnell Butler, WWS Tony Fiori

Delegates Present: Butler Huiyan Yang, GCHC Lior Silberman, Women's Centre Heather White, BGC Ade Artis

Councillors Present: CPUC Donnell Butler SOC; CPUC, Exec Matt Fouse POL, Past Chair; CPUC Lior Silberman

Others Present: Steven Miller MAT, Past Treasurer; Matt Fouse POL, Past Chair; Jim Moyer, Scholars in the Schools; Tim Aubry, Scholars in the Schools

Representatives Absent: ANT Riaz Tejani, COM Seth Abelson, COS Robert Osada, EEB Sarah Smith, ECO Tanjim Hossain, GER Brian Tucker, HIS Joseph November, HOS Ishita Pande, MOL Jessica Bessler, NES David Brenner, OPR Patrick Gerland, POL Jason Casellas, PPL Ethan Schartman, PSY Cara Talaska, FRE Juliet O'Brien,

Delegates Absent: Hibben-Magie Nate Gleason, Lawrence Eszter Hargittai, Millstone Matt Moore, Off-Campus Upma Sharma, ACSS Haizhou Yin

The following representative seats were vacant: ARC, ART, AST, CHM, GEO, PHI, SLA, SPA

The following delegate seats were vacant: CIGS

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

o

- o The meeting was called to order at 6:05pm by Scott Miller, Chair.

2.

3. **APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

o

- o Approval of the February minutes was postponed to the next meeting. Revisions of the minutes will be made in the intervening time.
- o Meredith Safran moved to ratify the April minutes, seconded by Kerry Bystrom. The minutes were approved with no opposition.

4.

5. **GUEST SPEAKERS**

3.1 Associate Provost Jed Marsh

- **3.1 Associate Provost Jed Marsh**
- Associate Provost Jed Marsh was introduced. Dr. Marsh, formerly of Northwestern University, has been at Princeton for approximately 1.5 months.
- Dr. Marsh reported that the Post-Enrollment Committee had met twice. Dr. Marsh reported that the committee was currently in the process of gathering background information in an effort to understand how post-enrollment works across campus. Meetings were scheduled through the summer and the committee hoped to get a report out in early Fall.
- Aderemi Artis commented that to report on the status of post-enrollment in early Fall would be slow progress, stating that the current status of post-enrollment was bad. In response, Dr. Marsh noted that many aspects of the university were intertwined, and that it would be unrealistic to expect change to happen quickly. He reassured the Assembly that the Provost was committed to making life as a post-enrolled student more bearable.
- Kerry Bystrom queried the approach that was being taken, asking if it was pragmatics (*e.g.* annoyances of post-enrollment) or the underlying issues that the committee was focussing on, to which Dr. Marsh replied that pragmatics were certainly being considered but that the whole picture had to be examined.
- Ms. Safran asked if there was any hope that recommendations for small changes could be ready by Fall, noting that President Tilghman had suggested at the February meeting of the GSG that the smaller problems could be solved more rapidly. Dr. Marsh replied that that would depend on the approach taken. For example, if a new status was created for post-enrolled students, it would be necessary to integrate this with the rest of the University's 'machinery': there would need to be a way of tracking students and data, and not enough was understood about this yet.
- Expanding on Ms. Safran's comments, Lior Silberman stated that President Tilghman had hoped that some things could change this semester, and that so far no changes had taken place. As an example of a small act that could be done quickly, Mr. Silberman suggested an information package for post-enrolled students could be produced.
- Eric Adelizzi voiced a concern as to whether Dean Wilson's retirement

would affect the progress of the committee. Dr. Marsh indicated that progress would probably not slow down, noting that there were other staff in the Graduate School who know how things work and who could help ease the transition.

- Dr. Marsh informed the Assembly that Dean Wilson was serving in his capacity as Dean of the Graduate School, in response to Mr. Miller's enquiry into the capacity in which Dean Wilson was serving on the committee.
- In response to Ms. Safran's enquiry into Dr. Marsh' experience at Northwestern and the preparation for his current work, Dr. Marsh stated that he had been responsible for the day to day operations in the University and was not closely involved in the academic aspects. His portfolio had included planning and admissions.
- Mr. Silberman asked if Dr. Marsh had been involved in graduate student housing at Northwestern University. Dr. Marsh informed the Assembly that the housing situation at his former institution was very different to Princeton's: University housing at Northwestern was limited. Also, there were many other differences in the graduate student experience at the two universities. For example, at Northwestern, not all students were on fellowships, health insurance was not provided, and there was no post-enrollment status.
- No further questions for our guest forthcoming, Mr. Miller thanked Dr. Marsh for attending the meeting.

◦ **3.2 Tim Aubry & Jim Moyer, Scholars in the Schools Programme**

- Tim Aubry and Jim Moyer, fourth year graduates in English and initiators of the Scholars in the Schools programme, were introduced to the Assembly.
- Mr. Moyer thanked the GSG for the work that they have been doing.
- Mr. Moyer began by outlining their philosophical vision in initiating the Scholars in the Schools programme. Messrs Moyer and Aubry had given consideration to their mission as educators; a desire to link academia with an educational gap, in both a voluntary and professional capacity; the overproduction of higher degrees and shortage of teaching; economic pressures faced by graduate students; and a desire to link the knowledge

of graduate students with a need for knowledge.

- Messrs Moyer and Aubry had developed two programmes in response to the above:
 - Scholars in the Schools -- a programme in which graduate students visit local schools and talk about their work. Mr. Moyer reported that they had received over 100 emails from graduate students interested in participating in the programme, and that the programme had become a reality.
 - Mentoring -- Mr. Moyer reported that the idea of a programme in which graduate students are mentors to school students had also received an overwhelming response. At present, 23 school students from Princeton, Ewing and Trenton are involved and receive help from Princeton graduate students with their writing and maths skills.
- Messrs Moyer and Aubry have also been working on a teacher certification programme. Mr. Moyer noted that there was a teacher shortage in New Jersey, and that graduate students might find it desirable to obtain teacher certification. New Jersey certification allows teachers to teach in 32 states in this country. Messrs Moyer and Aubry have developed a teacher certification programme that the Graduate School has approved and that the university has officially endorsed. It will become an option for all graduate students from next Fall.
- Mr. Aubry stated that their first goal was to publicise the Scholars in the School and teacher certification programmes, and invited suggestions.
- Mr. Aubry echoed Mr. Moyer's earlier statement that there had been an overwhelming response for mentors, adding that only 4 positions had been opened. Mr. Aubry suggested that a independent programme could be created, in which all graduate students are given the chance to interact with underprivileged children. He hoped that the university or alumni might be able to offer payment to participating graduate students, but indicated that it could still proceed as a voluntary programme.
- Mr. Aubry also raised the idea of a colloquia series, in which teachers, theorists and experts discuss what is happening in public schools. The proposed colloquia would have the following 2 goals in mind:

encouragement of interaction between those who usually do not interact (e.g. teachers and theorists), and creation of a multi-disciplinary environment. Mr. Aubry stated that they aimed to raise the level of consciousness of the public school system.

- Mr. Aubry informed the Assembly that another idea of theirs was a scholars in residence programme, similar to an artist in residence programme. For example, a graduate student would work half-time at the school and half-time on research. This might be a good arrangement for post-enrolled students. The advantages include: exposure of graduate students to other teaching and learning environments, and an increase in the basic 'literacy' of school students. It is hoped that would contribute to the creation of a more intellectual climate in this country and hence more of an audience for graduate students' work. Such a programme would allow graduate students to combine intellectual life and contribution to society.
- Mr. Miller opened the floor to questions and offered the assistance of the GSG. Mr. Moyer stated that they wanted to make the GSG aware of their programmes and ideas.
- A discussion of advertising means ensued. Mr. Silberman suggested that GSG representatives could inform their departments of the programme, and Mr. Moyer suggested that they could put together a package for representatives for this purpose. Bill Jordan suggested a web link, in response to which Mr. Moyer informed the Assembly that they were working on a web page. Steven J. Miller suggested Messrs Moyer and Aubry's presence at Registration Day.
- Huiyan Yang asked if the teacher certification programme would be open to international students, if international students would be accepted by high schools, and if international students could have teacher certification. Messrs Moyer and Aubry did not foresee problems with this.
- In response to Mr. Silberman's question regarding payment, Mr. Moyer informed him that it was by honorarium.
- Mr. Miller asked if there had been any interest in the teacher certification programme. As it was only a recent development (~1 month), this was difficult to answer. However, Mr. Moyer suggested that it would be a

worthwhile programme to offer even if interest was low, and thought that the university should do so. Mr. Aubry informed the Assembly that Dean Wilson had agreed to publish it in the Graduate Student Announcement. It was suggested that this publication attracts few readers.

- In response to Matt Fouse's question as to whether graduate students had to be involved in the teacher certification programme 'from day one', Mr. Aubry informed the Assembly of the requirements: 2 seminars, course requirements, shadowing of a student for a day and a teacher for a week, and 1 semester of practical work.
- Ms. Bystrom suggested that the GSG could sponsor the colloquium. in response to Mr. Aubry's questions regarding GSG funding, Mr. Miller informed him that there was not a lot of money but that the GSG could give some.
- Whilst on the topic of funding, Toni Fiori stated that the Woodrow Wilson student committee 'just found a large chunk of money'. The catch was that one had to match funds.
- Returning to the Scholars in the Schools programme, Mr. Aubry informed the Assembly that the way it works is that participating graduate students are listed in a catalogue and teachers contact students that they would like to have visit their school. Mr. Moyer added that students write a description of their proposed talk and attend a McGraw primer that will hopefully be offered at the beginning of Fall and Spring semesters. Prospective Scholars in the Schools participants can contact John Webb (jwebb@).
- On the mentoring front, Messrs Moyer and Aubry are just beginning to organise the programme.
- Mr. Miller thanked Messrs Moyer and Aubry.

6.

7. OFFICER REPORTS

◦ 4.1 Treasurer's Report -- Donnell Butler

- Mr. Butler stated that one funding request had been received, from the Queer Graduate Caucus. Heather White would speak for them as they were not present...

- Ms. White informed the Assembly that the organisation had started this past year and had had 2 gatherings so far. As yet, they did not have an operating budget or regular source of funding. The Queer Graduate Caucus were requesting funding for a social gathering at the end of the year. 25 attendees were expected. Publicity would be via a mailing list.
- Mr. Silberman had calculated that the requested funding was equal to \$13 per student. After discussion, it was established that typical funding amounts are of the order of \$3-\$4 per student and that \$13 per student was somewhat high. It was later noted by Mr. Silberman that GSG fees are \$5 per student.
- Mr. Butler stated that it was generally expected that organisation would be able to secure funding from other sources, for example Vice President for Campus Life Janet Dickerson.
- Ms. White noted that the GSG had given funding to the Undergraduate Pride Alliance in past years. Mr. Silberman suggested that the GSG should fund the event, but not on the scale requested for this number of people. He suggested that \$75, being \$3 per person, would be a more reasonable amount.
- Mr. S. J. Miller and Ms. Safran suggested that the amount of money required would depend on the type of affair and atmosphere, to which Ms. White responded it would likely be a standing-up mingling affair held in the Women's Centre. Mr. Silberman asked if University catering would be used, and suggestions of alternatives ensued.
- Ms. White stated that it was not just want the money that was desirable, but also endorsement by the GSG.
- After some discussion as to whether or not to defer the decision, it was agreed that it would be reasonable to make a decision for funding of \$3-\$4 per person now. Ms. Bystrom made a motion for the GSG to give \$75 in funding to the Queer Graduate Caucus for their event, seconded by Ms. Safran. The motion passed with none opposed. Mr. Silberman gave a reminder that receipts are due 3 months after the event if funding is to be received.

8.

9. **OLD BUSINESS**

5.1 Committee Reports

5.1.1 Post-Enrollment

-
-
- Mr. Jordan noted that it seemed not everyone on the university Post-enrollment Committee had read the GSG's post-enrollment report. He also suggested that the GSG should continue to prioritise recommendations as in the report.
- Mr. Artis stated that it was time to apply pressure. Mr. Jordan responded by informing the Assembly that the atmosphere was one dedicated to making change. He suggested that the Provost first wanted to understand the post-enrollment situation.
- To this, Ms. Safran added that the committee was not likely to be ill-intentioned, rather they did not necessarily understand how bad the situation was as they did not live the life of graduate students. Mr. Fouse also added that he himself had learnt something new in the last two meetings. Mr. Miller noted that since the university was making policy decisions, they would consider it important to validate their information. And Mr. Adelizzi stated that, had they wished to, the university could have delayed the process further. Instead, for example, President Tilghman had emailed the GSG the day after the post-enrollment presentation at the February meeting. Also, Mr. Adelizzi noted, many administrators did not understand post-enrollment.
- Mr. Butler noted that many people did not know about the issue, and questioned how the information could be made more public. Mr. Silberman suggested the CPUC and Mr. Adelizzi stated that the report was not on the web, but that the prioritised recommendations were.
- Ms. Safran pointed out that faculty *et al* did not know how graduate students lived, for example they were not aware of the housing draw. She suggested that faculty were allies, but were lacking in information about the life graduate students. Ms. Safran suggested that departmental representatives could help disseminate information.
- Mr. Butler pointed out that, unfortunately, not all departments have a

representative and that people should be made aware of this. Mr. Ratzman asked if the same seats were vacant each year and was informed by Mr. Fouse that there was some turnover. Mr. Ratzman continued by asking if there were some departments that never received information and suggested that the Directors of Graduate Study of these departments be targeted; information could be sent out over summer. It was suggested by Mr. S. J. Miller that communication with faculty could be achieved at the regular faculty meetings that some departments hold. Mr. Silberman suggested that the Dean of the Faculty could also be contacted, though not necessarily now.

- *5.1.2 Ad-hoc new construction committee report*
- Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that construction of the new Lawrence apartments was moving ahead.
- Mr. Miller also informed the Assembly that, that afternoon, GSG officers and members of the Lawrence committee had met with Dean Montero, OIT and other administrators regarding telephone and cable TV service for the new Lawrence apartments. A choice was required between university and outside service. Verizon and RCN were the non-university telephone and cable TV options respectively.
- Mr. Miller briefly mentioned several issues relevant to the decision. These included: the various options available with each service, OIT's plans for the future, wiring, and feedback from Lawrence and Butler residents.
- Mr. Miller outlined the differences between the services. Regarding telephone service, he informed the Assembly that, for the university service, more service was offered at a lower price, there was no tax, long-distance service cost more per minute but there was no monthly fee, and telephone numbers could be listed in the campus directory. Also, the university can provide maintenance service at no extra cost. Mr. Silberman added that the university service also had the advantage of having no security deposit *etc.* and one could simply plug in the telephone and it would work.

- For cable TV, Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that the university provided only basic service, RCN was bad in Princeton, the university expects to expand upgrade its outdated hardware in the future, RCN's potential upgrades are subject to politics and negotiations over their municipal cable monopoly, and that Facilities would not maintain antennae. Mr. Adelizzi added that RCN has a large initial fee, but also provided more initial service than the university. The university offered about half the service of RCN and about half the price. Mr. Silberman suggested that digital cable may be desirable in a few years and that that should influence the decision. Mr. Miller stated that RCN does not currently provide digital service. Mr. Adelizzi noted that the decision here would not be irreversible.
- On a different note related to housing, Mr. Artis stated that the new Lawrence construction would have a significant impact on the environment, affecting wildlife and approximately 1000 trees. He expressed his desire for the environment to be acknowledged and for everyone to be aware of the consequences. Mr. Artis noted that alternative sites were possible but had been discarded.
- Mr. Adelizzi informed the Assembly that, at a meeting with John Hlafter and other administrators, the GSG had been informed that 800 trees would be lost and 400 would be replanted in the area across the canal. He noted his concern that the proposed Millstone Bypass may go through the area intended for replanting, and that Mr. Hlafter had said that it would be next to that area. Mr. Adelizzi also stated that Dr. David Wilcove (EEB, WWS and former Lawrence resident) had been asked to do an environmental assessment of the Lawrence site.
- Mr. Artis stated that one could not consider trees using 'balance sheet' as the environment is an integrated, self-contained system. Mr. Artis made the point that no man-made environment could possibly make up for a natural environment that had been there for years.
- Mr. Adelizzi noted that the Lawrence site had previously been

farmland, his point being that that the forest there is not particularly old but had been constructed on previously cleared land, just as the new remediation site would be. Mr. Artis argued that one could not use age as an argument, and that the status of the land and richness of the environment *today* had to be considered.

- Mr. Silberman suggested that the decision to build at the Lawrence site was influenced by the ability to obtain permits to build there. Mr. Artis noted that it was also possible to build on the other side of the canal, but that graduate students did not want this because of isolation and transport issues. Mr. Silberman mentioned an alternative site on Harrison Street.
- Mr. Artis wished to make it known that he was dissenting from the decision made to build on the Lawrence site.
- Mr. Jordan stated that it was important to understand that, where the environment is concerned, the sum of parts does not equal the whole. That is, many smaller fragments of natural environment are not equal to the equivalent amount of natural environment as a whole. Mr. Jordan said that it was important that future decisions take into account the environment. Mr. Adelizzi suggested that in the case where the rehabilitation site was contiguous to the original site, perhaps the environmental impact would be less.
- Anita Adhitya stated that she had attended a talk given by Dr. Wilcove, who had been asked to do the environmental impact assessment, and had doubts about his views. For example, Dr. Wilcove advocated moving animal populations from one region to another at the convenience of human land-use. Although Dr. Wilcove seemed to think that this relocation did not matter to the animals, Ms. Adhitya highly doubted this.

▪ 5.1.3 OIT

- Mr. Miler informed the Assembly that Steven Sather, OIT, had informed him of a change to the pricing scheme for additional disk space. Mr. Miller stated that the current prices are 25c/Mb/month for the first 100Mb and 1.4c/Mb/month thereafter. The actual cost is 1.4c/Mb/month, which includes costs of physical equipment,

maintenance and backups. Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that, from 1 July, the cost of additional disk space will be 1.4c/Mb/month.

10.

11. **NEW BUSINESS**

◦ *6.1 Furniture Drive*

- Ms. Bystrom announced that the GSG had forgotten to set up a committee for the furniture drive!
- Ms. Bystrom informed the Assembly that as the undergraduates were moving out, their unwanted furniture would be collected and sold to graduate students. The proceeds go to charity. Last year, approximately \$2500 was raised for charity.
- Notes for running the event were available from last year. Ms. Bystrom informed the Assembly that it would involve: meeting with Karen Woodbridge and organising the event before 4 June. She invited volunteers to come forward. Volunteers can email gsg@
- Mr. Jordan suggested contacting Building Services.
- The issue of collecting furniture from trash was raised. Ms. Bystrom informed the Assembly that the university had a policy regarding this matter.

◦ *6.2 Lunch with Administrators*

- Ms. Safran informed the Assembly that the GSG Officers were interested in taking new administrators to lunch, and asked if the Assembly would approve the cost of this lunch from the GSG account. After discussion, consensus seemed to be that it would be alright to approve the cost of the administrators' lunch but not the lunches of the GSG Officers. As there were not very many Assembly members remaining in the room at this stage, it was agreed that the decision of whether or not to fund this should take place at a another time. Mr. Miller volunteered to pay for the Administrators' lunch out his own pocket in the meantime; it was agreed that he could request reimbursement at a subsequent meeting.

◦ *6.3 Housing Situation*

- Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that, this year, rising second years were denied housing in the Graduate College. Mr. Miller also noted that the Poe field construction was an undergraduate dormitory that would create spare undergraduate spaces so that the university could renovate undergraduate dormitories. Mr. Silberman stated that the undergraduates already had 1 'swing dorm' that could be used as such and that the university wanted 2. One such dormitory is Lockhart.
- Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that the GSG would like the graduate student housing situation discussed by the CPUC.
- Mr. Jordan asked if both the Long-term and Short-term Housing Committees had been disbanded. Mr. Adelizzi, who serves on the Long Term Committee, stated that the Committee had not yet been disbanded, but that General Manager of Plant and Services Mike McKay, who was chair of the committee, had circulated a draft final report. Mr. Adelizzi said that he had been informed by Mr. McKay that the committee could not make policy decisions or recommendations, but could only work to provide an estimate for demand.
- Mr. Silberman stated that doomsday was nigh! Actual admissions for the next academic year were rumoured to be approximately 570-580.
- Mr. Silberman also stated that it would be desirable for Mike McKay, John Hlafter and Kathleen Mulligan to attend the CPUC meeting.
- Mr. Jordan pointed out that post-enrolled students were not counted in the university's statistics, to which Mr. Silberman added that most universities count all graduate students.
- Mr. Adelizzi invited comments regarding the CPUC and other housing meetings. (The idea of graduate students in trailers was proposed by Mr. Ratzman).
- Ms. Safran and Mr. Miller noted that there was significant anger from graduate students regarding the housing situation. This was substantiated by Mr. Jordan's information that he had received complaints at GC social hour. Mr. Silberman noted that the GSG was trying to do something about the situation.
- Brigitta Lee asked how many students knew about the problem, to which Ms. Bystrom replied that many second and higher year students did but

that, in general, others didn't.

- Mr. Ratzman proposed a disorientation guide :), containing explicit [truthful] information about the housing situation.
- Ms. Safran recalled Dr. Marsh' earlier comment that Princeton graduate students were fortunate in what they had. Mr. Butler stated that he used to agree, but did no longer. He proposed the concept of relative deprivation: at Northwestern, graduate students may be less fortunate but one knows that life as a graduate student will be hard; at Princeton, graduate students are disrespected, lied to and treated as second class citizens, whilst surrounded by others who are well-treated and affluent.
- Mr. Adelizzi noted that, in many cases, this may be a result of people's inattentiveness to the Graduate School; graduate student were not considered by many people. It may be that everyone else is unaware of the problems of graduate students and not that graduate students are deliberately mistreated. Administrators tended not to understand that problems graduate students face on a day-to-day basis. Mr. Adelizzi proposed the examples of post-enrollment, Graduate College furniture, and Dormnet. For example, in the case of the latter: once the issue of no Dormnet for graduate students was brought to the CPUC and Provost Ostriker had heard that no plans were in place to wire the apartments for DormNet, the Provost had ordered it done. Mr. Adelizzi expressed his hope that, by bringing the housing issue to the CPUC, awareness of the issue would increase.
- Mr. Silberman raised the issue of assignment of housing to married and unmarried students. Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that there was a possibility that changes in the way the draw done would be made. Mr. Adelizzi added that Patricia McArdle, Housing, wanted graduate student input in redesigning the draw process.

12.

13. **SCHEDULING OF NEXT MEETING**

◦

- The next meeting of the GSG is scheduled for 6pm, Wednesday June 12, 2002, in Frist 309.

14.

15. **ADJOURNMENT**

- Your scribe apologises for neglecting to record the time of adjournment and estimates it to be circa 8:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Anita Adhitya Recording Secretary