

- Outline and Summary
- Attendance
- Minutes
- Mr. Azcarate's presentation on the Ombuds Office
- Treasurer's Report and Funding Requests
- Funding Requests in 2001–02 and 2002–03 (accessible only from princeton.edu)
- SHARE Proposed Policies
- Letter to GESO on their Petition
- Report on the National Conference on Graduate Student Leadership
- 2004 Officer Elections Plan

Outline and Summary

1. Call to Order
2. Special Guest: Camilo Azcarate (overview of ombuds office)
3. Introductions and Approval of Minutes: Five new Representatives were introduced to Assembly.
4. Voting Matters
 1. Funding Requests: The Graduate Football Club was funded at \$50, the Queer Graduate Caucus "Queer Tea" was funded at \$75, and the Chinese Graduate Student Association "Taiwanese Film Festival 2003" was funded at \$75.
 2. SHARE Policies: Two proposed policies by title="Sexual Harrasment/Assault Advising, Resources & Education" >SHARE were endorsed by Assembly.
 3. Restoration of HOS Representative Seat: The HOS Representative seat was restored.
 4. Appointment of Delegates to the Ivy Summit
 5. GESO petition: A reply to title="Graduate Student Employee Organization, of Yale">GESO's request for endorsement of a petition was approved.
5. Reports
 1. Corresponding Secretary's Report (graduate student departmental committees)
 2. National Conference on Graduate Student Leadership
 3. Housing Committee Report (room draw)
 4. Elections Committee Report: The plan proposed by the Officer Elections Committee was approved by Assembly.
 5. Recording Secretary's Report (audit)

6. PriComm Open Meeting

6. Adjournment

Attendance

• **Representatives present** • Irina Marinov, AOS • Jack Tinsley, CHE • Brigitta A. Lee, EAS • Gregory D. O'Mullan, proxy for Christiane I. Meyer, EEB • George Reis, proxy for Fei Sun, ELE • Meredith Safran, proxy for Kerry Bystrom, ENG • Valerie Dionne, FIT • Karin Sigloch, GEO • Michael K. House, GER • Jane Murphy, HIS • Chris Wyckham, MAE • Lior Silberman, MAT • Andrew Moroz, ORF • Annika Peter, PHY • Jonathan Eastvold, POL • Ian Parrish, proxy for David R. Smith, PPL • Cole M. Crittenden, SLA • Debbie Becher, SOC • Leslie A. Medema, WWS •

• **Delegates present** • Huiyan Yang, Butler Apartments • Lior Silberman, Graduate College (GC) • Radhika Wijetunge, Lawrence Apartments • Leonard F. Pease III, Off-Campus • Heather White, Women's Center •

• **Councilors present** • Chair Leslie Medema, title="Council of the Princeton University Community">CPUC, CPUC Priorities Committee • Parliamentary Secretary Leonard F. Pease III, CPUC, CPUC Priorities Committee • Corresponding Secretary Nicole Esparza • Press Secretary Meredith Safran • Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida • Treasurer Eitan Bonderover • Lior Silberman, CPUC, CPUC Rights and Rules Committee • Ian Parrish, CPUC, CPUC Executive Committee • Brigitta Lee, CPUC, CPUC Executive Committee •

• **Others present** • Donna A. C. Sy, HOS representative after the seat was reintroduced • Camilo Azcarate, ombuds officer • Lisa M. Sherov, GC residence life coordinator • Beth McKeown, community programs coordinator • Newsha M. Dau (WWS) • Hany Girgis (MOL), GC house advisor • Philo Juang (ELE), Graduate Football Club, Chinese Graduate Student Association •

• **Representatives absent** • Aleksandar Donev, APC • Riaz Tejani, ANT • Sinéad Mac Namara, CEE • Jia Su, CHM • Jessica H. Clark, CLA • Jonathan Vogel, ECO • David Shrom, MOL • Kim Montgomery, PSY • Susan Gunasti, REL •

• **Delegates absent** • Fei Sun, Association of Chinese Students and Scholars (ACSS) • Aderemi Artis, Black Graduate Caucus (BGC) • Weining Man, Council of International Graduate Students (CIGS) •

• **Councilors absent** • Assistant Chair Eric Adelizzi • Social Chair Sinéad Mac Namara • Rob Sobak, CPUC • Joseph P. Valentino, CPUC • Fei Sun, CPUC Governance Committee • Meredith Galanter Hastings, CPUC Judicial Committee • Aderemi Artis, CPUC Resources Committee • David R. Smith, CPUC Rights and Rules Committee •

• **Representative seats vacant** • ARC • ART • AST • COM • COS • MUS • NES • POS • PHI • SPO •

• **Delegate seats vacant** • Hibben/Magie Apartments • Millstone Apartments •

Minutes

I. Call to Order

The Assembly of the Graduate Student Government held its regular monthly meeting on November 12, 2003, at Frist 309. Chair Leslie Medema called the meeting to order at about 6:03pm.

II. Special Guest: Camilo Azcarate

Ms. Medema introduced Camilo Azcarate, the University ombuds officer. He thanked her for the invitation to come to an Assembly meeting, distributed several copies of his notes, and proceeded to describe the role of the ombuds officer. A copy of his notes will be deposited in the archives with these minutes.

Mr. Azcarate explained that an ombuds officer is a person who hears complaints about conflicts in complete confidence, tries to show options, and provides information about policies. If the person wants to go farther, he will offer to mediate the conflict. However,

about 60% of his work is just consultations. The ombuds officer is not an advocate for the University, and his main assets are confidentiality and impartiality. If he detects a pattern of similar cases, he will try a systematic intervention.

Mr. Azcarate then asked what ideas people associated with conflict. All replies having a negative connotation, he stated that avoiding conflict is the worst policy. If ignored, conflict tends to grow in the dark. Managing conflict is a balance between threat and opportunity: conflict can cause change, but change can't be introduced too quickly. Then he took the GSG as an example of a collegial body: if there is no conflict, no new knowledge is created; however, if approached negatively, conflict can be very destructive. He observed that sets of rules like Robert's Rules of Order were designed to allow conflict to develop in a positive manner. Most people (he continued), don't like to bring grievances forward; the ombuds officer is an opportunity to solve them informally and confidentially (be it grievances with students, teachers, roommates, researchers, staff, administrators).

The ombuds office provides three kinds of service: consultation, neutral services (mediation), and prevention (skill building). Mr. Azcarate is working on a peer mediation program. He often helps setting roommate contracts (whereby the roommates discuss their expectations, so that there are no surprises later).

Mr. Azcarate concluded his presentation, and invited questions.

Jane Murphy asked whether Mr. Azcarate provided training for groups trying to advocate for a position, to help them be more effective in explaining their position and avoiding misunderstandings. Mr. Azcarate explained that he can not advocate for specific positions (unless there is an unfair situation that needs to be corrected), but can help the groups in learning how to advocate better.

A member of Assembly asked Mr. Azcarate whether he had a "tip" on how to manage conflict situations. Mr. Azcarate replied that the best skill is to listen. In some situations, people don't have time to think, because emotions come out. So, learning to ask questions in such a way as to cause such emotional responses, calm people down and learning to listen, are important skills. He pointed out that this is not about accepting insults, but rather not reacting emotionally. Otherwise, discussion degenerates into a shouting-match.

Ms. Medema asked what is the proportion of time spent with different people in the University community. He stated that about 60% of the time is with employees; in his opinion this has to do with the fact that they have been around for a long time, while students don't know about the ombuds officer. Then, 30% of the time is spent with students, and the remaining 10% with faculty, or administrators (for example, trying to handle a performance evaluation), or outsiders.

Leonard Pease asked what Mr. Azcarate could do if the other party had not understood there was a conflict yet. Mr. Azcarate stated that he can't call people if they don't want to come; involuntary mediation doesn't work. There are employee peer mediators, and he is trying to start a program of student peer mediators.

Irina Marinov asked whether he was part of human resources. Mr. Azcarate stated that is not the case. Sometimes people don't think a human resources officer will serve their interests, because they may perceive the officer is a representative of the University. He emphasized, however, that people in human resources do help in many situations. In the other hand, they are not bound by the very high level of confidentiality that an ombuds is.

Lior Silberman asked whether other University parties (such as the house advisors, the residence life coordinator, the Graduate School) referred people to the ombuds officer, and whether that was common. Mr. Azcarate said they did so, both for graduate students and undergraduate students. It's not very common, however, because most of the time the problems are solved without his intervention being needed. The most delicate cases are conflicts between mentors and mentees, for one of the parties is too powerful and the other too powerless.

Mr. Azcarate concluded his visit by stating he would be proposing a plan to have advisors and students set a contract before starting to work in research, so that everyone is clear about expectations (such as regularity of meetings, attribution of results, etc.) from the start of the relationship. Such procedures are well-trying, and work. Maybe the GSG could advocate for it as well

Ms. Medema asked Assembly members to inform their constituents about the services provided by the ombuds office, and thanked Mr. Azcarate for coming tell us about his work.

III. Introductions, and Approval of Minutes

Parliamentary Secretary Mr. Pease announced five new Representatives: Ms. Marinov (AOS), Christiane I. Meyer (EEB), Ms. Murphy (HIS), Andrew Moroz (ORF), and Debbie Becher (SOC). He reminded Assembly members that Representatives serve for terms of no more than 15 months [Constitution, IV.10], and that starting in January he would enforce that and ensure that elections take place. Meredith Safran stated that the Executive Committee could provide assistance in setting up an online election.

Ms. Medema wished to introduce Newsha M. Dau, who will be the WWS Representative starting next month.

Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida proceeded onto the minutes. He reported that several suggestions had been provided, amounting to over 20 linguistic or typographic mistakes, two suggestions for using complete names and titles of administrators, two suggestions (read by Mr. Boavida) by Eric Adelizzi on his chair's report. Mr. Silberman moved to approve the minutes with those corrections, which motion got a second, was put to a vote, and carried without opposition.

IV. Voting Matters

A. Funding Requests

Treasurer Eitan Bonderover had sent his report in advance of the meeting, as well as a report on funding requests over the past two fiscal years.

In the previous meeting [Minutes 10.8.2003, VIII.B], Assembly had decided to postpone to this meeting the discussion on whether to fund the "Butler Wine and Cheese" at a higher level (it was then funded at less than requested, with the provision to increase funding if possible), and whether to fund the Graduate Football Club.

Huiyan Yang spoke for the Butler Committee. The committee recognized that the GSG

budget was very tight. Moreover, they were planning to ask funding for other events, and so they decided to withdraw the request for further funding of the “Butler Wine and Cheese” event. She further reported that the event had been postponed to December 4th, thus giving more time to prepare the event and explore other funding.

Philo Juang spoke for the Graduate Football Club. The request, as explained in the last meeting, was for uniforms for the GFC. They would not have any names printed, so that they could be used by the club in the future. The total cost was about \$600. The GC House Committee had already pledged \$400. As the Graduate School had agreed to increase their participation from \$100 to \$150, the GFC was asking only \$50 from the GSG, instead of \$100. The names of the sponsors would be printed on the uniforms. Ms. Murphy asked how many people would be reached. Mr. Juang stated that there were about 22 graduate students involved with the club, but only 11 uniforms would be bought. Ms. Safran moved (and was seconded) to fund at \$50:

MOTION: to fund the Graduate Football Club at \$50. PASSED with none opposed.

The next request had been placed by the Chinese Graduate Student Association (CGSA). Mr. Juang spoke for them too. CGSA had been running the “Taiwanese Film Festival 2003”. The series started in September, and four movies had been shown so far. The movies were directed by Taiwanese directors. They were shown in McCosh 28, and the room was usually packed, with 75 to 100 people. CGSA was originally planning to ask for donations, but they needed funding for the last 2 movies in the series. They were asking \$40 to buy the DVDs and \$60 for refreshments.

Mr. Bonderover recommended fully funding the DVDs, or partially funding the refreshments. Mr. Silberman supported the recommendation, and asked what CGSA was planning to do with the DVDs; if they had no plans, he suggested selling them to the GC House Committee. Mr. Juang stated that CGSA was planning to donate them to the library. Andrew Moroz asked whether it was possible to rent the movies (instead of buying them). Mr. Juang stated that they are not available locally, and in fact must be imported from Asia. Ms. Murphy asked whether they had contacted the library, and suggested that more funding be given, for it would impact more students than the funding for the GFC or the Queer Tea (the following request). Mr. Moroz asked what were the criteria the GSG used to

choose between events, Mr. Bonderover stated that the GSG never had had to choose between different events to be funded. He reminded Assembly members that the typical guideline had been \$3/graduate student in attendance. However, as the surplus had been spent, we were now doing a quarterly budget, and had \$660 for each quarter [Minutes 10.8.2003, V.D and VIII.B]. We had already allotted \$350 this quarter. The previous funding decisions (in the previous meeting and this) corresponded to about \$1.5/graduate student in attendance (which was in accordance with having about half as much money for cosponsorships as had been spent last year). Ian Parrish moved (and was seconded) to fund CGSA at \$40. The motion carried with none opposed (but was reconsidered later in the meeting).

The next request was made by the Queer Graduate Caucus (QGC), for a "Queer Tea". Heather White explained that about 50 people were expected, and that fine teas and coffees would be served. They were asking \$100. Mr. Bonderover's recommendation was to fund at \$75. Mr. Parrish moved to fund at \$75, and there was a second. Ms. Yang pointed out that such funding would leave only about \$250 for January, and that might not be enough. Someone asked whether there were big events at that time, to what Mr. Bonderover stated typically there were the Butler New Year event and the title="Association of Chinese Students and Scholars">ACSS Spring Festival (it was observed later that those events were held in the next quarter, as opposed to the requests being made in the current quarter). Mr. Boavida suggested that we should not hold funding for future requests: we should encourage new events, and we shouldn't encourage groups to think that traditional events have their share reserved. Karin Sigloch suggested that it would be easier to handle all requests for a quarter at the same time, and that if we decided so, we should warn groups in advance for the next quarter. Jack Tinsley, looking at the funding pattern in previous years, observed that the first quarter was typically heavier, and so if we spend \$100 more in the first quarter there will be no problem.

MOTION: to fund the QGC "Queer Tea" at \$75. PASSED with none opposed.

Mr. Bonderover closed his intervention. He stated that the Executive Committee would be contacting the Association of Princeton Graduate Alumni (APGA) to ask for cosponsorship for student events. If they were willing to help, we could keep the same funding levels as before. He reported that he would be leaving Princeton, and so he would resign as

treasurer. The resignation would take effect at the end of the meeting. He stated that it had been a lot of fun to serve as an officer. Mr. Pease recognized Mr. Bonderover's resignation, and thanked him for his service.

At this point, Ms. Becher stated that she felt people were uncomfortable with giving different amounts to the CGSA movie series and the QGC Queer Tea, when the attendance was the same. So, she moved (and was seconded) to increase the funding for CGSA by \$60 (thus, getting it to \$100). Mr. Pease explained that, according to Robert's Rules, that should be handled by a motion to reconsider: so, there would first be a vote on reconsidering that funding, and (if that vote succeeded), the funding would be decided again. Jonathan Eastvold recommended that, if new funding was decided, then it should be according to the \$1.5/graduate student guideline, and so the total should be \$75 instead of \$100. Ms. Becher took that suggestion as a friendly amendment, and there were no objections. Cole Crittenden recommended against giving much more than \$200 in one meeting. Ms. Medema took a vote on reconsidering the original motion. Reconsideration was approved, with 2 opposed. Mr. Moroz observed that giving \$75 to the movie series would be consistent with the funding given to the QGC. Ms. Safran observed that the GSG had voted in the past for funding a series of events [Minutes 10.9.2002, 5.1]. One issue that arose then was whether the graduate students served were the same in the several events or not. Mr. Juang stated that the estimated attendance of 50 graduate students was for each of the two movies, and was certain that there was a large overlap between attendees to both movies. Before putting the matter to a vote, Ms. Medema clarified that the motion was to fund by \$75. If it did not carry, the previous funding of \$40 stood.

MOTION: to fund the CGSA "Taiwanese Film Festival 2003" at \$75. PASSED with 4 opposed.

B. SHARE Policies

The next topic in the agenda was discussion on title="Sexual Harrassment/Assualt Advising, Resources, & and Education" >SHARE's proposed policies on stalking and harrasment based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The discussion had been postponed in the last meeting [Minutes 10.8.2003, VIII.C], for the GSG was waiting to receive a third proposed

policy. Nicole Esparza reported that the third policy had not been received yet. She pointed out that we had been asked to endorse the policies, so it was not in order to discuss changes to the text. Mr. Parrish pointed out that there were rumors that the policies had been already submitted to the CPUC. He observed that we have representatives in the CPUC, as well as in the CPUC Committee on Rights and Rules, and asked for suggestions. Mr. Silberman moved that we resolve that we consider the issues addressed by this policies deserve serious consideration, although there are concerns about the exact phrasing. As a delegate to the Rights and Rules Committee, he asked for guidance from Assembly on specific concerns. Ms. Safran suggested a course of action similar to what was done with the GESO petition [IV.E below]: detail our concerns in a letter. Mr. Boavida suggested that would be a tedious process, and in this case it would be more effective to instruct our delegates on our concerns.

There was some debate on the phrasing: the specific concern at hand was whether the definition of stalking proposed would be too broad. Some people were afraid that the definition could be stretched to mean “looking at someone twice”. Others observed that the definition also added words to the effect of “[repeated events] such that a reasonable person would feel threatened”, and the definition was the legal definition. After some discussion, Ms. White observed that SHARE only had asked for endorsement or not. She suspected that the policy would be approved by the University anyway, and part of the intention was to sparkle discussion on these issues. She thought there was no need to spend much time debating the concrete text. Ms. Safran asked whether Ms. White thought worthwhile to send feedback to SHARE. Ms. White thought so, and suggested either sending the minutes or the correspondence in `gsg - assembly`. Mr. Silberman observed that we are under no obligation to endorse the policies. Ms. Safran suggested dividing the question in two: first, whether we endorse each of the policies, second, whether we discuss any further feedback. Mr. Tinsley stated that the only concern was that interpretation was to strict. There being no objections to division of the question. After some more debate, Ms. Murphy and Mr. Tinsley moved to close debate and that motion carried.

MOTION: to endorse SHARE’s proposed policy on stalking. PASSED with 3 opposed.

MOTION: to endorse SHARE’s proposed policy on harrasement based on sexual orientation and gender identity. PASSED with 2 opposed.

As to taking any further official action (the second part of Ms. Safran's proposed division, on contacting SHARE detailing our concerns), the motion did not carry (1 in favor, 5 opposed).

C. Restoration of HOS Representative Seat

Discussion moved on to the restoration of the title="History of Science">HOS seat [[\]. As such change requires a By-Law amendment \[Constitution, IV.2\], there had had to be a one month waiting period \[Constitution, VI.10\]. The By-Law to be changed was By-Law I.3. Ms. Medema asked for an estimate of students in the program. Donna Sy \(who was representing the program, and was elected the Representative, if the seat was reestablished\) stated that there were about 25 students.](../10/#VIIIId)

MOTION: to restore the HOS seat. PASSED with none opposed.

D. Appointment of Delegates to the Ivy Summit

Ms. Medema asked Brigitta Lee to introduce the next topic. Ms. Lee had been recently in the National Conference on Graduate Student Leadership [see [V.B](#) below]. The delegates from Ivy League institutions thought it would be interesting to have a summit on graduate student representation in the Ivy League schools. The event had been held before. The University of Pennsylvania offered to host the summit in February 2004. They would cover the food costs, but travel expenses would have to be supported by participants. Each school will send four student delegates (including student government and non-traditional student groups) and one administrator (involved in programming for graduate students). They needed the names of our four delegates by the coming Saturday (November 15). The Graduate School (at Princeton) promised to support up to half of lodging and expenses.

The Executive Committee had sent an email to Assembly, asking for nominations. Several nominations had been received and accepted by the nominees: Heather Tarleton (for the Black Graduate Caucus, BGC), Aleksandar Donev (for the Queer Graduate Caucus, QGC), Ms. Safran (for the GSG), and Ms. Esparza (also for the GSG). Ms. Medema invited candidates from Assembly. Ms. Dau volunteered, stating that although she didn't know a lot

about the GSG, she wished to learn more. Ms. Medema stated that Ms. Tarleton couldn't come to the Assembly meeting, because she was representing the BGC in another meeting. However, she had left a written statement, in case Assembly wished to listen to it.

Mr. Moroz asked what would be the cost. Mr. Silberman pointed out that no decision was being made on supporting the cost, if only because the GSG can't afford it. Ms. Lee stated that the possibility had been considered of accepting observers; that would be a solution for the fact that there are five candidates for a delegation of four. Or we could send the five names, for in case someone couldn't be present, we would already have an alternate. She moved (and was seconded) to send the five names.

MOTION: to send Ms. Dau (for the GSG), Mr. Donev (for the QGC), Ms. Esparza (for the GSG), Ms. Safran (for the GSG), and Ms. Tarleton (for the BGC) as the Princeton delegation to the Ivy Summit. PASSED with none opposed.

E. GESO petition

Ms. Medema asked Radhika Wijetunge to introduce the letter to title="Graduate Student and Employee Organization, of Yale">GESO [Minutes 10.8.2003, VII.A]. The letter had been sent to gsg-assembly in advance. As instructed by Assembly, the international students' concerns committee had prepared a letter detailing the GSG's reservations about their petition. However, the committee had two questions: whether it should be the committee or Assembly to sign, and whether they should mention the restrictions posed by our Constitution.

Mr. Pease moved (and was seconded) the approval of the letter as proposed, and signed by the GSG. Several members of Assembly asked questions about the text. Ms. Marinov asked whether it was really a "terrible situation to be in as an international student" (this segment was removed from the final text). Mr. Moroz asked why we stated we supported the concerns but did not endorse the petition. Ms. Safran and Mr. Boavida explained the background: while the GSG was also concerned about the visa delays for international students, it did not support some of the measures to proposed in the petition the situation. So, it had been decided to write a letter explaining what exactly we support.

Mr. Tinsley had a proposal for several changes, and distributed it. He had stated he had omitted some references to subjective feelings. He moved to amend the letter according to his proposal. After consulting Ms. Wijetunge, Mr. Pease took this suggestion as a friendly amendment, and there were no objections. There was a further motion to preserve (when quoting the text of the original petition) the reference to an welcoming environment for international students. This motion passed with three opposed. There were no further amendments to the letter, so the whole letter was put to a vote.

MOTION: to approve the sending of the letter (as amended), signed by the GSG. PASSED with none opposed.

Ms. Medema thanked Ms. Wijetunge and Lei Xu for the work on the letter.

V. Reports

A. Corresponding Secretary's Report

Corresponding Secretary Ms. Esparza reminded Assembly members that the Executive Committee had asked for information on the departmental committees [Minutes 10.8.2003, VII.B]. She stated that not all Representatives had replied, and asked again for them to send the details. The following Representatives had replied: APC, AOS, CHE, EAS, ELE, FIT, GER, HIS, MUS, PHY, POL, SLA, SOC.

B. National Conference on Graduate Student Leadership

Ms. Lee and Elliot Ratzman had recently represented Princeton in the National Conference on Graduate Student Leadership, held in the Washington University in St. Louis, October 10–12 [see also [IV.D](#) above]. A copy of her report will be deposited in the archives with these minutes. After the meeting, they discussed with the Graduate School the ideas that seemed the most promising. The list is appended to her report.

C. Housing Committee Report

The graduate housing policy group has been working on the December 2002 GSG proposal for the draw. Mr. Silberman reported on progress [see href="..09/#Vb">Minutes 9.10.2003, V.B]. Next year, the application will be online, both for incoming and returning students. A new draw book will be written, and he would try to bring copies to next meeting, for revision by Assembly members. It had also been suggested that, as the GSG had been the proponent of the new procedures, that a paragraph be included to that effect.

D. Elections Committee Report

Mr. Pease reported that the Elections Committee [href="..08/#VId">Minutes 8.13.2003, VI.D] had met and prepared a href="election2004">plan for the 2004 Officer Elections. He described the plan succinctly (it had been sent to gsg - assembly in advance) and was seeking Assembly's approval.

MOTION: to approve the 2004 Officer Elections Plan. PASSED with none opposed.

E. Recording Secretary's Report

Recording Secretary Mr. Boavida then reported on one of his duties, the GSG audit [By-Laws, III.2.e]. Mr. Boavida reported that after taking office in March 2002, Donnell Butler (the previous treasurer) reconciled the books for several years back. So, he (Mr. Boavida) had seen no need to repeat that audit. He had relied on Mr. Butler's conclusions up to that point, and checked everything since then. On October 2002 [Minutes 10.9.2002, 7.1], a budget for the new fiscal year had been approved, and on March 2003, Mr. Bonderover had taken office. Mr. Boavida had audited everything up to and including June 2003 (from then on, any audit was pending on the University completing some transactions in our account). In conclusion, the fiscal year 2001-02 had been completely audited (and was totally satisfactory), and the fiscal year 2002-03 had been audited up to June (and was also totally satisfactory). Mr. Boavida praised the high standard set by Messrs. Butler and Bonderover.

F. PriComm Open Meeting

Ms. Medema stated that there would be a title="Priorities Committee">PriComm open

meeting, the following Tuesday (November 18), at McCosh 62, at 8pm. This is the chance for students to express their concerns to administrators. There will be a question and answer period. The Executive Committee asked Representatives to tell their constituents about the meeting, and to emphasize that (in order to be listened to) questions should be asked politely. Mr. Tinsley asked whether it was possible to remind representatives about the requests made by the GSG [Minutes 7.9.2003, IV.B]. Mr. Pease clarified that the meetings are confidential, so we don't know which requests (brought to administrators by the GSG) were actually made by administrators.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business, Ms. Medema adjourned the meeting at about 8:07pm.

Submitted 11.24.2003,

João Pedro Boavida Recording Secretary

Approved 12.10.2003

Report to Assembly