

# Summary of the Minutes

1. Call to order

2. Approval of previous minutes

3. Officer reports I

- Parliamentary Secretary's report

4. Guest: Bill Russel, Dean of the Graduate School

5. Officer reports II

- Treasurer's report
- Social Chair's report
- Chair's report

6. Old Business

- Parking and Transportation Committee report
- Post-Enrolment Committee report

7. New Business

- Budget for 2002-2003
- Itemised billing update
- Environmental Oversight Committee
- Post-Enrolment Committee status
- Assistants in Instruction for graduate courses
- Graduate Student Life Initiative

8. Scheduling of next meeting

9. Adjournment

## ATTENDANCE

Officers Present:

Chair Scott Miller;

Parl. Sec'y Lior Silberman;

Corr. Sec'y Eric Adelizzi;

Rec. Sec'y Anita Adhitya;

Treasurer Donnell Butler;

Social Chair Kerry Bystrom;

Press Sec'y Meredith Safran

Representatives Present:

ACM Cynthia Rudin;

AOS Anita Adhitya;

CEE SinÉad Mac Namara;

CHE Eric Adelizzi;

CLA Meredith Safran;

EAS Brigitta Lee;

ECO Tanjim Hossain;

EEB Gregory O'Mullan;

ELE Bill Jordan;

ENG Kerry Bystrom;

FIT Juliet O'Brien;

GEO Meredith Galanter Hastings;

GER Michael House;

MAE Brendan McAndrew;

MAT Lior Silberman;

MUS Emily Snow;

OPR Patrick Gerland;

ORFE Mike Ludkovski;

POL Andrew Erickson;

PSY Cara Talaska;

REL Philippa Townsend;

SOC Nicole Esparza

Delegates Present:

GCHC Lior Silberman;

Lawrence Radhika Wijetunge;

ACSS Fei Sun;

Women's Centre Heather White

Councillors Present:

CPUC, Exec Scott Miller (CHE);

CPUC, Exec Brigitta Lee (EAS);

CPUC Lior Silberman (MAT);

Gov Anita Adhitya (AOS);

Jud Heather White (REL);

PriComm Leonard Pease (CHE)

Others Present;

Dean Bill Russel;

Sujit Nair (MAE): CIGS;

Sudhakar Govindavajhala (COS): CIGS;

Lee Worden (PACM): "Another World is Possible"

Officers Absent:

Representatives Absent:

ANT Riaz Tejani;

ARC Zach Ridley;

CHM Rahul Deshpande;

MOL Dave Shrom;

PHY Tamar Friedmann;

PPPL Ethan Schartman;

WWS Tony Fiori

Delegates Absent:

Butler Huiyan Yang;

CIGS Rahul Deshpande;

BGC Ade Artis

The following representative seats were vacant:

ART, AST, COM, COS, HIS, HOS, NES, PHI, SLA, SPO

The following delegate seats were vacant:

Hibben-Maggie, Millstone, Off-Campus.

1.

**2. CALL TO ORDER**

3.

- Scott Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:04pm.

## **APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

- Mr. Miller noted that Meredith Safran had requested clarification of some of her comments

as recorded in the previous month's minutes. Mr. Silberman made a motion to approve the minutes, subject to Ms. Safran's approval of the clarifications. Sinead MacNamara seconded the motion. The motion passed with none opposed.

## **OFFICER REPORTS I**

### **3.1 Parliamentary Secretary's Report -- Lior Silberman**

- Mr. Silberman announced the addition of several new representatives to the Assembly, namely: Gregory O'Mullan EEB, Meredith Galanter Hastings GEO, Andrew Erickson POL, Phillipa Townsend REL, and Nicole Esparza SOC.
- Mr. Silberman also announced the results of the vote regarding the co-sponsorship of the orientation barbeque at the GC. The results were 18 in favour and 0 opposed. Mr. Silberman noted that the GSG had agreed to co-sponsor the BBQ by \$850.

## **GUEST: BILL RUSSEL, DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL**

- Mr. Miller introduced Dean Russel to the Assembly, noting that Dean Russel is new to the office and that he wished to discuss priorities for the Graduate School. Two handouts were distributed: 'Priorities Committee and Other Requests; Graduate School; 2003-2004', and, 'Time-to-degree Data'.
- Dean Russel raised the issue of items considered for the Priorities process, noting their consideration in the context of working on issues of both graduate student life and matters of financial aid. Dean Russel informed the Assembly that discussions that had begun under his predecessor, Dean John Wilson, were continuing; these discussions

included issues such as needs in housing, maintenance needs, and staffing and processes in the Dean's office. He informed the Assembly that these all needed adjustments and revisions to the budget and that time had to be spent thinking about 'what fits where' in the University budget. For example, there is an operating budget that covers staff and programmes in the GC; a fellowship budget; and budgets of other offices that construct their own.

- With that, Dean Russel drew attention to the 'Priorities Committee and Other Requests' handout and stated his intention to go through the requests and outline where they stand and into what type of issue they fit. Dean Russel noted that the points on the handout were in no particular order of importance. The first three items were relevant to the Graduate College.
- *Continental breakfast for Graduate College residents during break periods (not requested for summer months)* Dean Russel informed the Assembly that this request had come up last year and had been discussed with people from administration. A survey of GC residents had been taken. Dining Services is willing and able to provide breakfast, but there is the question of whether or not there is sufficient demand. Lisa Sherov stated that the survey showed that there was strong support for breakfast over the breaks but not during summer. The support for summer breakfasts was insufficiently strong to justify all residents paying for the breakfast. Dining Services can incorporate the cost of breakfast over the breaks into the meal contract; the cost is estimated to be \$31.
- *Subsidise the parking fee at the Graduate College residents (not pursued)* Dean Russel stated that GC residents pay a parking fee, but residents of the graduate student apartments do not. The response from administration was that this was consistent with treatment of apartments versus colleges in other parts of the University. Dean Russel stated that this matter would not be pursued further as a decision to focus on other facets where greater chance of success in filling the request was likely.
- *Extend the Graduate College Secretary position from 10 months to 12 months* Dean Russel noted that more people are currently living in the GC than when the 12-month position was abolished. It is intended that the position will be extended to 12 months; if there is a deficit, the Graduate School will pick it up in their

operating budget.

- *New position in support of Student Life, parallel to the Graduate College's Residence Life coordinator, which would coordinate programs with the Butler and Lawrence Committees* Dean Russel stated that this position will be similar to that of Ms. Sherov's, but for the apartments and is proposed at the recommendation of Dean Montero, Associate Dean for Graduate Student Affairs. It is intended to start with the opening of the new Lawrence apartments. The position will come with a full-time salary, benefits, and a two-bedroom apartment. Dean Montero has a list of the undertakings of the position. Dean Russel considered the position important. He indicated that he might like some input on how those present felt about the idea of an RLC-like post for Lawrence and Butler. This request will be taken to the Priorities Committee (PriComm).
- *Cost of consultants to work with OIT and Graduate School staff to implement three computer initiatives: electronic applications, PeopleSoft records to departments, and readmission* First, Dean Russel noted that electronic applications were now used. Second, there also exist about half a dozen electronic systems that are in use in administration, for example in registration. He noted that it was difficult to transfer information from one system to another. It would be desirable to create an in-house application; this would save money and solve data transferal problems. This would provide a way to get information to departments. Third, Dean Russel stated that an electronic readmission process that could be initiated by the student would also be desirable. All three requests require a project to be approved and a person assigned to the activity. It was hoped that the initiatives would be in place in time for applications in Fall 2004.
- *Stipend increases for humanities and social science students* Dean Russel informed the Assembly that the current algorithm is that funding for stipends grows by 3% per year. This is given to departments as a discretionary fund to distribute as they choose. It is proposed that funding will be given for across the board increases in stipends, and less in the form of discretionary funds. It was noted that even if there is no inflation in a given year, expenses associated with University life, including rents, tend to increase. To accomplish this, a request of extra money on top of the 3%, for a period of five years, will be made. This money will facilitate weaning of departments to the across the board increase system, and allow a steady state to be reached. \$125 000 over 5 years will



be requested from PriComm. It was acknowledged that the stipends of those in the humanities and social sciences could often be significantly lower than science or engineering stipends.

- *Hooding ceremony, orientation, and commencement* activities This request falls under the budget of the Provost/Vice President.
- *Add electronic submission of recommendation letters to website applications* This request falls under the budget of the Vice President.
- *Add checklist feature to PeopleSoft applications (data entry operators)* This will enable students to determine their application status. The above three requests are ones that money has been overspent on and are made in order to recuperate the deficit.
- *Graduate student concerns regarding major maintenance:*
  - Expansion of the New Graduate College kitchen
  - Renovation of the Social Lounge
  - Upgrade of the wiring in the Old and New Graduate College
  - Replacement and/or repair of broken chairs in Procter Hall
  - Install air conditioning of common areas for the Old Graduate College
  - Renovation of the Coffee House/Breakfast Room and replacement of furniture
  - Cleaning and routine maintenance of the stained glass windows
  - Renovation of van Dyke library
  -
- Dean Russel noted that two of the above requests would be to PriComm: the Student Life position and the stipend increase. Other sources of funding are as given above. Dean Russel stated that he wanted to give a sense that there was not a single source of funds; rather, funding came from all over campus.
- Mr. Miller noted that Dean Russel had specifically asked for comments on the stipend increases. Dean Russel asked if an annual increase in stipends would be useful. It seemed to be consensus that an increase would indeed prove useful.
- Ms. Bystrom began by stating that she understood there was a difference between an Assistantship in Research and a Fellowship. She thanked Dean Russel for raising the issue of stipend increases in the humanities and social sciences. Ms. Bystrom, a humanities student, noted that her roommate, a science student, received \$8000-9000

more each year even though they were in the same position of being graduate students. Ms. Bystrom also noted that expenses increased each year. She acknowledged that stipend levels increase each year for the incoming class but pointed out that, by the time students are in their fourth or fifth year, their stipends are lower than those of first years and the cost of living has increased. Ms. Bystrom stated that some increase in stipend would be useful even if not all students could be given the same amount.

- Dean Russel noted that fellowships were \$12 000 - 13 000 per year plus summer money, and noted that the summer money was less than that received by ARs.
- Meredith Safran stated that she thought it necessary that increases in the cost of living and stipend levels correlate. Ms. Safran informed the Assembly that, in Classics, the Director of Graduate Studies distributed the discretionary fund to older students. Dean Russel noted that fellowship levels were not correlated with rent and that an attempt could only be made to do this retroactively or not at all. Mr. Silberman stated that rent increased at 5%/year. Dean Russel said he did not know who decided that funding for stipends would increase at 3%/year; he noted that the spending rule on the endowment fund was 4-5%. Mr. Silberman asked if this was also why the Assistantship in Instruction rates increased from year to year. Dean Russel said that this was set by faculty?
- Tanjim Hossain noted that, in the Economics department, the top ten students were offered \$24 000 stipends and the other students receive much less. He said the extra comes out of the money provided to the department for stipend increases, that is, the aforementioned '3%'. He noted that fifth year students get much lower stipends than first years. Mr. Silberman noted that this was a recruitment approach.
- Mr. Miller asked if Dean Russel wished to solicit comments from people in apartments regarding the RLC-like post for Lawrence and Butler. Dean Russel asked how many of those present lived in apartments; it seemed that most did.
- Radhika Wijetunge stated that she was on the Lawrence committee and that the Social Chair of the committee would organise such things as kids' activities and barbeques.

She stated that it would be nice to have someone akin to a Residence Life Co-ordinator to help organise these events. Ms. Wijetunge also noted that the types of activities organised currently depended on who the Social Chair was; for example, Social Chairs with children had a tendency to organise more activities for kids than those without children.

- Cynthia Rudin said that she understood that students could be Social Chairs and what being a Social Chair entailed; Ms. Rudin had previously served as Social Chair on the GC House Committee. She questioned whether a Student Life position was really needed. Mr. Erickson asked what extra value the position would bring. Ms. Rudin further asked if the new position would be worth the money spent on it. Dean Russel stated that Dean Montero was convinced of the need of such a person in Lawrence and Butler. In response to the question of what such a person would do, Dean Russel stated that it would be similar to what Ms. Sherov orchestrates at the GC. Additionally, there would be more family oriented activities to cater for families. For example, daycare support at Butler has been organised in the past. It was suggested that such a person could also facilitate maintenance requests. Dean Russel informed the Assembly that the Community Programme Co-ordinator would be responsible for apartment life; community building; facilities advancement; support for committees; would have a small budget; and would act as a liaison with the GSG and other centres on campus, such as the International Centre and the Women's Centre. Dean Russel suggested talking to Dean Montero for further information.
- Mr. Miller, who lives in Butler apartments, responded to Ms. Rudin's comments by noting that there was presently far less community in Butler than in the GC. He said that whilst the Butler Committee did a great job, it could not do as much as the GC. Mr. Miller also noted that the person responsible for Student Life could also help organise babysitting, collective childcare and so on. The latter, Mr. Miller noted, was something the Butler Committee had been trying to deal with for several years.
- Ms. Rudin asked why the money could not be given directly to particular concerns. such as a shuttle or childcare. instead of having a 'middle-man'.
- Heather White wished to echo support for the new position, saying that it would address

the feeling of marginalisation of graduate students. She stated that we should not see the concerns of graduate students as competing with each other for funding. Ms. White wished to express her thanks, and thought that the Student Life position would address important concerns.

- Mr. Silberman asked if the \$40 000 budget included budgeting for programming. Dean Russel was not sure. Mr. Silberman asked if graduate students felt there was a desire for programming in the apartments. He also noted that the GC House Committee was bigger than the apartment committees and collects dues.
- Brigitta Lee stated that there were many spouses who are both part of and not part of the University community. She suggested that these people feel marginalised and that the new position could help make them feel they are part of the community.
- Mr. Adelizzi noted that Ms. Sherov also deals with administrative issues, such as liaising with Housing, etc. Mr. Adelizzi noted that many things do not get done if follow-up phone calls and so on are not made.
- Mr. Miller drew the discussion to a close and directed attention to the second handout.
- Dean Russel informed the Assembly that the second handout contained time-to-degree data. The handout was intended to be self-explanatory. He noted that there were a lot of different ways to compile time-to-degree data. Dean Russel stated that the median had been reported, and that it was aggregated in a way that would be statistically significant. He explained that 'Ivy+' table was a comparison of Princeton time-to-degree data with that of the Ivy League schools plus other well-regarded institutions. Dean Russel also noted that the data had been lumped into categories of Humanities, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, and Engineering.
- Cara Talaska questioned what Psychology was classified as. Dean Russel noted that there was a problem with the categorising of Psychology and Computer Science.
- Dean Russel stated that the Princeton data went back to the 1970s. He also noted that there

was a difference between the Ivy+ and Princeton cohorts data in that the Ivy+ data was for the time to reception of degree.

- Messrs. Miller and Silberman thanked Dean Russel for the data, noting that the GSG had been asking for this data for years.
- Mr. Butler echoed the sentiment that it was great that the administration was presenting the data to the GSG. He stated that he would compare the data to the statistics on the web. Dean Russel stated that the data was the same as on the web. Mr. Butler asked if there was a way to get more detailed data and proceeded to raise several issues. He said that the data on the web was given by department. He noted that, for the graphs on the web document, there was a discrepancy between the line and chart. Mr. Butler questioned whether the mean or median was being used. He also asked if data only included PhDs.
- Dean Russel suggested that individual departments be asked. Mr. Miller asked if students could be told this data and it was not a secret. Dean Russel confirmed that the data was not a secret.
- Mr. Miller drew the discussion to a close and thanked Dean Russel for his attendance at the meeting. The Assembly thanked the Dean with a round of applause.
- Following the departure of Dean Russel, Ms. Rudin wished to explain her reasons for questioning the Student Life position. She recalled that Ulrich "Ulli" Struve, former Residence Life Coordinator, was a stickler for rules. Ms. Rudin suggested that, if Butler and Lawrence were to have a person in an RLC-like position, it would be important to have graduate students on the hiring committee. Mr. Silberman recalled that the GC House Committee was given the opportunity to meet with candidates for the RLC post before a decision was made.
- In response to a comment by Mike Ludkovski, Mr. Adelizzi suggested that perhaps the reason for so many GC-related requests was because Dean Russel had been cc'd on the Major Maintenance requests for the Graduate College.

## OFFICER REPORTS II

### 5.1 Treasurer's Report -- Donnell Butler

- Mr. Butler informed the Assembly that there had been one funding request, and that another would be delayed. Following the funding request, Mr. Butler intended to present the proposed budget.
- Mr. Butler informed the Assembly that a funding request had been made by Another World is Possible for their "Progress and its Discontents" speaker series. The request was for \$900 per semester. Lee Worden, representing Another World is Possible, informed the Assembly that the speaker series was being run in cooperation with other campus groups, both graduate and undergraduate. Mr. Worden stated that the series would run throughout the year. Mr. Worden informed the Assembly that topics include concepts of progress; speakers included David Ehrenfeld and Susan Griffin. Mr. Worden proceeded to circulate a list of speakers. Mr. Worden suggested that the talks would cover substantial issues and address them in ways that they would otherwise not be covered.
- Mr. Ludkovski asked how many talks there would be per semester, to which Mr. Worden replied four to five.
- Mr. Erickson asked what the amount of the USG co-sponsorship was compared to the request for co-sponsorship from the GSG. Mr. Worden did not know. Mr. Erickson asked if these were the only two sources of funding. Mr. Worden replied that there were also other sources, for example PEI (Princeton Environmental Institute). Mr. Silberman suggested the Office of the Vice President as a source of funding, suggesting that Mr. Worden contact Vice President for Campus Life Janet Dickerson.
- Mr. Silberman asked how many distinct graduate students were predicted to attend the

event. He raised the question of whether this should be considered as nine different events or one long event. Mr. Worden suggested that there would be a fair amount of non-overlap between talks.

- Mr. Adelizzi noted that the annual GSG budget was approximately \$8000.
- Ms. Bystrom asked if information about the event could be read out to the Assembly. Mr. Worden said a list consisting of information about who, when and projected attendance was available. Mr. Erickson asked about the intended topics. Mr. Butler offered instead the biographies of the speakers, this being information that he had, and asked Mr. Worden which speakers had been confirmed. Mr. Worden stated that two were confirmed, two had requested a speaker fee and were not yet confirmed, and one was uncertain.
- Mr. Butler asked how the estimated number of attendees had been arrived at. Mr. Worden stated that the number was based on last year's attendance.
- Ms. Bystrom made a motion to the effect that the GSG could fund this event. Mr. Adelizzi objected but Mr. Silberman ruled that this was a motion for the GSG to interpret the [later-read clause of the] constitution, hence in order.
- Patrick Gerland asked how speaker fees differed amongst speakers, suggesting that it was not obvious how the \$3/student co-sponsorship applied here. Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that GSG co-sponsorship was generally limited to \$3/student. This guideline was based on the total budget of the GSG.
- Mr. Adelizzi wished to make three points regarding politically-oriented activities sponsored by political organisations. He had three concerns. First, Mr. Adelizzi informed the Assembly that the GSG had a clear purpose and that the funding of political speeches was not one of the purposes of the GSG. He stated that there were other institutions on campus that will fund such events. Second, Mr. Adelizzi noted that the GSG budget was limited; he suggested that spending should be targeted at activities specifically relevant to graduate students. Third, Mr. Adelizzi informed the

Assembly that, in his former term as Corresponding Secretary, the GSG had received letters of complaint. The GSG used to take controversial political stances and get involved in political causes. Doing so resulted in many letters of complaint from graduate students, directed not only to the GSG, but also to the Graduate School. Angry students wrote to the Graduate School, asking the Graduate School not to consider the GSG as representing them and demanding a refund of their dues. The GSG stopped endorsing political causes, and these letters stopped. While they were sent, the letters undermined the credibility of the GSG in its dealings with the administration and in its claims to represent all graduate students. Mr. Adelizzi stated that the last time the GSG had given funding to a political speech, for Ralph Nader to visit campus, the GSG had been assured that the speech would be non-political, but it was turned into a fund-raising event. Many people were angered, and the result was the only vote of censure from the Assembly that Mr. Adelizzi recalled during his service in the GSG.

- Mr. Erickson stated that it was his first Assembly meeting and was unfamiliar with funding request procedure. He enquired what other competing priorities there were for the available money. Mr. Butler informed the Assembly that operating expenses, co-sponsorships, and GSG-related activities each consumed approximately one-third of the GSG budget. For example, this year \$4383 had been spent on co-sponsorship of events. Mr. Butler noted that the GSG currently had a surplus of \$3700 and had been asked to spend this by Dean Montero. Thus, money itself was not presently a problem. However, how this money was to be allocated to groups had to be decided.
- Ms. Talaska asked what events were typically co-sponsored. Mr. Butler listed the Butler Earth Day barbeque, GC ice-cream social, Program in Applied and Computational Mathematics conference, sexual harassment forum, SPEAK and International Centre events as examples of co-sponsored activities.
- Ms. White suggested that it was not the job of the GSG to make a stand on political issues or to decide what is political or not. She suggested that she did not want other programmes threatened. Ms. White also noted that constituents were politically active members.



- Fei Sun, in response to a question regarding what else the GSG might put co-sponsorship money towards, listed a number of events that the Association of Chinese Students and Scholars plans on running this year.
- Gregory O'Mullan suggested that Mr. Worden make a response to the issue of whether the talks were political. Mr. O'Mullan also noted that there were a number of speakers and a large amount of money was required; he asked what impact less money than requested would have on the event. Mr. Worden considered the issues covered by the talks to be philosophical issues and suggested that the talks would encourage free and open discussion of these issues. He contrasted the proposed event with that of the political speech by Nader. Mr. Worden again noted the philosophical nature of the proposed event and said that, if it would involve overt political activism, he would not have come to the GSG to request co-sponsorship.
- Ms. Safran recalled Mr. O'Mullan's second question and asked about the implications of not receiving as much co-sponsorship as requested, asking how the event would be downgraded and items prioritised. Mr. Butler noted that the budget for the event was \$14000 and suggested that the amount of \$1800 requested from the GSG was a small amount of the total budget for the event.
- Mr. Butler suggested looking at just the first semester for now. He asked if something would have to go if the GSG did not co-sponsor the event by \$900. He asked what part of the proposed programme would definitely happen and what might not? Mr. Worden stated that two of the talks were confirmed and attendance was estimated to be 300.
- Mr. Adelizzi suggested that the GSG could co-sponsor free and open discussion of matters affecting the graduate student community, but that political and national issues did not affect this community.
- Ms. Safran made a motion to treat the matter as two motions: the first dealing with whether the event should receive support from the GSG, and the second dealing with how much to fund the event should the Assembly approve such co-sponsorship. After consulting the Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Miller stated that such a motion was

allowed. Anita Adhitya seconded the motion.

- Ms. O'Brien re-raised the issue of what counts as political and what doesn't. She asked what would happen if the event was (possibly later) also co-sponsored by a political organisation. Mr. Adelizzi recalled that the Nader speech was also funded by the Green Party and was a 'fundraiser'. He said that, afterward, the organisers were censured by the Assembly as the event had been represented as a non-political event.
- Ms. White suggested that political and partisan were being confused here. In particular she was noted the GSG has funded political events run by the Women's Centre. Mr. Silberman said there was a difference between pursuing political causes and allowing a political event to take place. He mentioned "Take Back the Night" as an example.
- Ms. Safran again raised the idea of voting on two motions. She suggested voting on the following.. First, does the Assembly think this event falls within the constitutional definition of a fund-able event, that is, can the GSG constitutionally fund this event; and second, if so, how much should the event be co-sponsored by.
- Mr. Sun noted an incident two years ago when ACSS was asked to fund an event that turned out to be a political speech. Many of their constituents were offended.
- Leonard Pease recommended exercising some restraint. He noted that the GSG was just getting Deans and other members of the administration to listen. Mr. Pease recommended restraint in determining what the constitution says.
- Ms. Bystrom said that she respected what the GSG can and can't get involved in. She questioned whether the GSG can support intellectual activities. Ms. Bystrom said that she did not want to be too quick to discard anything that politics was involved in.
- Mr. Miller consulted the constitution, which states that, *The purpose of this organization is to represent and advocate the interests of graduate students at Princeton University (hereafter "The University"), excluding industrial action, to provide a forum for free and open discussion of matters affecting this community, and to provide financial and organizational support for*

*social events within this community.*

- Mr. Erickson asked if the GSG had sponsored other lectures in the past. Mr. Adelizzi noted the Nader speech and SPEAC. SPEAC had requested funding for a political speech and a poetry reading. The GSG had funded the poetry reading but declined to fund the speech. Mr. Miller recalled that the GSG had partially co-sponsored the first Program in Applied and Computational Mathematics conference.
- Ms. Talaska asked if the event involved only talks or if a social component, for example food, drinks and so on, was also planned. Mr. Worden replied that this would be undertaken if possible. He noted that some speakers had stated an interest in doing more than just speaking.
- Philippa Townsend questioned the definition of a social event. She noted that there were various ways in which graduate students could have social interaction.
- Mr. Miller closed the debate and a vote was held on whether this event would fit into the category of a social event that the GSG could fund. Prior to this, Mr. Silberman stated that, under his reading of the GSG Constitution, funding for this event was not permissible. The motion passed with two opposed.
- Ms. MacNamara asked Mr. Butler for a Treasurer's recommendation on the amount that this event should be funded. Mr. Butler stated that the GSG currently had a surplus and that money was available, but that the question of whether the amount is reasonable based on graduate student attendance should be considered.
- Ms. Bystrom made a motion to co-sponsor the event by \$300 for the first semester. In response to a request from Mr. Ludkovski for clarification, Ms. Bystrom stated that she moved to fund the event for \$300 for this semester and that, if a request was brought to the GSG again for funding of the second semester, that the GSG would have the option of funding the event for less, the same, or more. Ms. MacNamara suggested that \$300 was reasonable for the estimated attendance of 75 people. Mr. Silberman suggested that \$300 was a lot.

- A vote was held on Ms. Bystrom's motion. The motion passed with four opposed.
- Mr. Butler suggested that it had taken too long to take care of the funding request. He recommended that organisations requesting money do so several weeks before the event and several weeks before the Assembly meeting at which they present their request. Mr. Butler suggested that, in this case, information could be sent to the Assembly if necessary. Mr. Butler made a motion to change the funding guidelines; Mr. Butler moved that funding requests must be submitted two weeks prior to the Assembly meeting at which the request is to be presented. Andrew Erickson seconded the motion. Mr. Silberman amended the motion to allow the Assembly to waive the timing guidelines. The amendment was accepted by Mr. Butler. The motion passed with no opposition.
- It was suggested that the new guidelines on timing be announced on the GSG website. Mr. Worden thanked the GSG for the funding and apologised for taking up so much time. He asked if the information could also be disseminated in other ways, as the web was not accessible to all. He pointed out that some people may have a disability that impedes their ability to use the web.
- It was suggested that discussions of funding requests could be held over gsg-list if necessary. Mr. Miller commented that the organisation requesting the funding might not be on the gsg-list list. Mr. Silberman noted that the organisation could approach the GSG and ask to be added to the list.

## **5.2 Social Chair's Report -- Kerry Bystrom**

- Ms. Bystrom announced that the First Chance Dance went well. She thanked the GSG officers, Ms. MacNamara, Yesim Tozan, Patrick Gerland and Ms. Lee for their assistance with the dance.
- Ms. Lee asked what the attendance at the dance was. Ms. MacNamara recalled that the room was full. Mr. Miller estimated 300 at any time and Ms. O'Brien recalled that the most people were there at 1am.

- Ms. Bystrom had spoken to Dean Montero, who had talked to first years, and reported that they enjoyed the event.

### **5.3 Chair's Report -- Scott Miller**

- Mr. Miller reported that the GSG Executive Committee had met twice since the last Assembly meeting. The topics of discussion had been post-enrolment and the First Chance Dance.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **6.1 Parking and Transportation Committee Report**

- Ms. MacNamara, Chair of the Parking and Transportation Committee, informed the Assembly that the GSG shuttle survey had received 600 responses. She proceeded to present the results of the survey. Ms. MacNamara announced that the results showed a clear mandate for a morning rush period of 8-10:30am. Most graduate students left campus after 7pm. Survey results had also shown the need to address transportation to Forrestal campus. The main concerns regarding the day-time shuttle were punctuality, frequency, and reliability of the night-time shuttle. Ms. MacNamara suggested that Pam Hersh, Director for Community and State Affairs, was 'on our side' and wanted the shuttle to happen. She said that a lot of work had gone into this in the past and that now the University had agreed to fund a shuttle. Ms. MacNamara informed the Assembly that the survey results had been presented to the University, Greater Mercer Transportation Management Authority and A1Limousines. She said that the response to Forrestal campus stop requests seemed positive. Ms. MacNamara noted that there was concern about the later end of the schedule and that Pam Hersh had asked for a costing of running the shuttle to 10pm. Ms. MacNamara informed the Assembly that a route and schedule would be chosen and that administrators would then get back to the GSG. Ms. MacNamara noted that Pam

Hersh was hoping that the shuttle could begin running on 1 November.

## **6.2 Post-Enrolment Committee Report**

- Mr. Miller recalled the previous Assembly meeting, in which the Provost had presented the proposed changes to post-enrolment. Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that the GSG Executive Committee had written a letter to administration -- Provost Amy Gutmann, Associate Provost Jed Marsh and Dean Bill Russel -- in response to the information. The letter stated what the GSG understood the changes to be and noted that the changes were not what were hoped for. It was noted that some of the 'changes' already existed for post-enrolled students, such as extension of healthcare by one year and library access. It was also noted that the new Degree Candidacy Continues status was a new name but not much had changed for post-enrolled students.
- Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that a reply had been received a few hours before the Assembly meeting. Mr. Miller stated that he had not yet had time to thoroughly review the reply.
- Mr. Miller proceeded to outline the changes to post-enrolment, in response to a request from Mr. Jordan: ID cards for one year, parking (at least for those with DCC status), reduction in the cost of a facilities pass, eligibility of post-enrolled students for University housing without the 18% surcharge, and creation of an email mailing list.
- Mr. Erickson asked if one could renew DCC status, to which Mr. Miller replied that one could not.
- It was again noted, this time by Mr. Silberman, that, for the most part, the changes were only in name.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

## 7.1 Budget for 2002-2003

- Mr. Butler presented the budget for 2002-2003! There had been no budget for 2001-2002 as the previous Treasurer had not prepared one.
- Mr. Butler summarised the budget as follows... The Estimated Graduate Student Fee Income is \$9000; this was estimated based information from the Registrar as of Tuesday and corresponds to 1800 graduate students. The Estimated Endowment Dividend Income is \$90. Proposed Expenditure consisted of an estimated \$3480 in Co-sponsorships, \$3550 in GSG Initiated Events, and \$2060 in GSG Operating Expenses. The Estimated Spending Surplus for the 2002-2003 fiscal year is \$3400.
- A motion was made to approve the budget as submitted. Ms. Bystrom seconded the motion. Mr. Miller opened the floor to debate.
- Mr. Ludkovski asked about the phone and internet for the GSG office. Mr. Miller explained that this was a new item. These expenses had been dropped by the GSG in the past. Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that they had been given money from an anonymous donor to help cover these costs initially.
- Mr. Butler said that there would be a little extra money as the GSG would not initially be paying for the phone and internet. However, the GSG would have to assume the total cost in March. As there would be no donation to contribute to GSG expenses next year, Mr. Butler explained that he had budgeted for the cost of phone and internet access for the entire year. Mr. Butler informed the Assembly that the costs of the phone and internet were \$22/month and \$7.50/month respectively.
- Mr. Pease requested clarification of the budgeted NAGPS expense. Mr. Miller informed the Assembly that the NAGPS was the National Association of Graduate and Professional Schools. Mr. Butler said that this was an advocacy association. The benefits are that, if the GSG have an organisational membership, graduate students who wish to join do not have to buy a individual membership; graduate students would have access to individual benefits. These benefits include discounts on insurance, including

healthcare. Mr. Miller suggested that access to group healthcare for \$5 in GSG Student Fees was not a bad deal. Mr. Butler noted that a catch was that one had to be a 'student'. The implications for DCC and post-enrolled students were not certain. Mr. Butler stated that other benefits of NAGPS membership include publications and shopping, and that some of the work that the NAGPS does includes advocacy regarding international student issues and visas for part-time students.

- Ms. Safran noted that the budgeted Printing and Mailing (Newsletter) expense was an estimate. She informed the Assembly that she had emailed Printing Services to request a costing and had received a reply this morning. The cost of 2000 black and white 11x17 newsletters would be \$580 (29c/copy). Ms. Safran noted that this was higher than the budgeted estimate of \$300. Mr. Ludkovski asked how many newsletters would be distributed per year, to which Ms. Safran suggested two per year. Mr. Butler recommended leaving the budget as is. He suggested that, once the cheapest method of producing the newsletters was established, copies could be made for the Assembly.
- A vote on the motion to approve the budget was held. The motion passed with none opposed.

## 7.2 Itemised Billing Update

- Mr. Jordan recalled that student account statements were not itemised. He informed the Assembly that he had asked Payroll to list every deduction on student paychecks. Mr. Jordan stated that the response from the Director of Payroll was that to add more line items on the system used would exceed the limit that the computer program allows. Therefore, itemisation of every deduction on student paychecks is currently not possible. It was also not possible to itemise deductions on a monthly statement or on the web because the system is not set up to do so.
- Mr. Jordan informed the Assembly that Maureen Ciambrello, whom he had spoken to regarding the itemisation of deductions, had suggested that students with questions about their student bill contact her. Ms. Ciambrello's contact details are as follows: *Maureen Ciambrello Phone: 609-258-5039 Fax: 609-258-2873 Address: 3 New South Building Department: Loans and Receivables Email: maeweaver@*



- Later in the meeting, but recorded here for organisational convenience, Mr. Ludkovski asked if the paycheck issue was closed or if it was still being pursued. Mr. Jordan replied that the update he had just given was as far as he had progressed to date. Since resolution of the problem would require rewriting of the system, a decision over whether to push for this would have to be made.

### **7.3 Environmental Oversight Committee**

- Mr. Jordan informed the Assembly that the Environmental Oversight Committee, on which he serves, is meeting monthly and discusses all environmentally related issues in the University, including recycling and new buildings. He stated that the committee consists of representatives from Facilities, OIT, PEA, Purchasing, and students.
- Mr. Jordan informed the Assembly that the two main projects now were: paper recycling and purchasing of recycled paper with higher post-consumer content, and recycling bins.
- Mr. Jordan noted that meetings are currently not open to the public, but invited ideas. Mr. Jordan can be contacted at [wjordan@](mailto:wjordan@)

### **7.4 Post-Enrolment Committee Status**

- Mr. Jordan also reported that the University Post-Enrolment Committee had been disbanded.

### **7.5 Assistants in Instruction for Graduate Courses**

- Ms. MacNamara inquired about AIs for graduate classes. She stated that some graduate classes could be large. For example, Electrical Engineering graduate classes could consist of 50-60 students. Ms. MacNamara noted that problem sets were often assigned in classes but that AIs were not given to graduate students.
- Mr. Jordan noted the existence of graders. Ms. MacNamara raised the issue of the source of

funding for this. Money for graders came from departments, whereas money for AIs came from the school. Ms. MacNamara also noted [something about 20 GS and 4 UG, for example].

- The question arose as to whether the Woodrow Wilson School was part of the Graduate School.
- Ms. MacNamara said that while there was a University-wide policy of assigning AIs for a particular number of undergraduates, none existed for graduate students.

### **7.6 Graduate Student Life Initiative**

- As it was growing late, Mr. Miller stated that approval of the Graduate Student Life Initiative would be conducted by email vote.

### **SCHEDULING OF NEXT MEETING**

- The next meeting has been scheduled for 6pm, 13 November, Frist 309.
- Ms. O'Brien asked how open the GSLI was. Mr. Miller said that, once approved, the GSLI would be linked to the GSG website. Ms Safran noted the GSLI would then be publicly available. Mr. Silberman noted that changes can be submitted prior to the report being made publicly available.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

- The meeting was adjourned at 8:24pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita Adhitya