

Minutes of the GSO Senate meeting on Wednesday February 12th, 2003

Meeting started at 5:45pm with 29 senators present.

Minutes from December passed with one amendment.

Budget items

1. An increase of \$200 for **St. Patrick's Day Party** expenses. The Budget Committee recommended the amount and the request passed with 25(yes)-0(no)-2(abstain).
2. **LGBT Conference**. The Budget Committee recommended \$1000 for the event and the request passed with 24(yes)-0(no)-2(abstain).
3. **Drag Show 2**. The Budget Committee recommended \$1000 for the event and the request passed with 23(yes)-3(no)-3(abstain) At this point the number of senators raised to 32.
4. **KGSA** requested \$800 for the **Korean New Year** and the Budget Committee recommended \$1000 for the event. Tanya Smith made a motion to give \$800 instead of \$1000 which was the recommendation of the Budget Committee. The motion failed (13 yes,13 no,6 abstain).
5. **Music Department** requested \$150 for '**Music and War: Piano pieces composed between the World Wars**'. The request passed unanimously.
6. Music Department requested \$200 for '**The Puzzle and the Menu: Music, Ritual and Space**'. The request passed unanimously.
7. **Indian Focus Group** requested \$1000 for renting satellite equipment in order to watch the **Cricket World Cup** at the Schomburg Commons. The Budget Committee had no recommendation on this item. The request (\$1000) passed with 22 yes, 3 no and 6 abstain.
8. **Buddhism Study and Practice Group** requested \$1000 for their monthly talk. The request passed unanimously.
9. **Taiko Drumming Club** requested \$1000 for the **Taiko Drumming Workshop**. The request passed with 24 in favor,3 opposed and 5 abstain.

Committee reports

a.Executive Committee's report. Bin gave the report on behalf of the Executive Committee (see attached). The survey for the Quality of life is been prepared by the executives with the help of Dr.Huddy from Political Sciences. The issue whether there should be a Task Force created for the survey or whether the survey should be manned by the 'Social Concerns Committee' came up. The Committee is chaired by the Vice-President and right now has no issue to meet upon. Tanya Smith made a motion for the survey to be under the Social Concerns Committee. Motion passed with 27yes-0no-4abstain.

b. Rules and Constitution Committee. Chris presented the amendments that are proposed for the Elections Committee Bylaws and the Budget Bylaws (see attached report). The Senate is given time until the next regularly senate meeting (March 12th) to read the changes. The report is attached

c. Elections Committee. Angeliki gave the report of the Elections Committee regarding the referendum on IRAQ (see attached). Carolyn McIlree made a motion to open the floor for discussion on the issue of the referendum that is in the agenda under the new business. The senators voted on whether they wanted to move the agenda item from new business to be discussed now and 5 senators voted yes, 17 voted no and 7 abstained.

d. Graduate Council and Student Life Committee. Angeliki presented the issues discussed in these committees. The report is attached.

e. Lounge Committee. Pegine Walrad gave a full report on the Lounge Committee meetings and progress so far.

f. Housing Committee. Masha Prodanovic presented the Housing Committee report (see attached)

g. Board of Appeals. The Committee presented the following report:

“The following reports the conclusions and recommendation of the Board of Appeals as a result of its hearing of February 5th, 2003.

Conclusions of the GSO Board of Appeals

The Board of Appeals, constituted in accordance with Article VII, Sec. B of the GSO Constitution, met Wednesday, February 5, 2003 at approximately 8:30 AM to conduct a hearing in regard to three letters of grievance received against GSO President Bin Tang. The grievances were received from Angeliki Field-Pollatou, Bryan J. Field, and Masa Prodanovic.

Board members in attendance: Scott E. Graves, Political Science (Chair); Chris Noto, Ecology and Evolution; Jasmina Sinanovic, Theatre Arts; Agnieszka (Aga) Skrodzka-Bates, Comparative Literature; Audra Van Wart, Neurobiology

Following presentation of grievances, a response from Mr. Tang, and a period for further questions from the Board, its members concluded that President Tang had committed the following:

1. Misconduct and abuse of power by ignoring and circumventing proper channels of policy adoption by the GSO when proper channels proved unsuccessful
2. Misrepresentation of GSO policies to conform to his own policy preferences both to graduate students and to external actors in the University administration
3. Actions contrary to the integrity of the graduate student community through the involvement of administration in internal discussions of the Lounge Committee over the formation of GSO policy

4. Actions contrary to the integrity of the graduate student community by making statements impugning the motives and integrity of other GSO executives and committee members when they disagree with him

5. Neglect of duty in regard to failure to serve as chair of executive council meetings, failure to set agendas for these meetings, and failure to observe the procedures for conduct of these meetings

The Board of Appeals in its report to the GSO Senate will provide supporting details and documentation.

In its capacity as an advisory body to the GSO Senate in regard to the removal of officers, the Board of Appeals recommends removal of Bin Tang as President of the GSO. Such removal requires a two-third vote of the Senate and ten days must elapse between the time at which the findings and recommendations of the Board are made public and such a vote. Thus, the Board recommends that the Senate remove Bin Tang as

President in the regular March meeting.”

Bin talked about the fact that the executives have different opinions about the SPOT and presented some research he did on the SPOT budget. Scott was asked to put the findings and the Appeal letters to the Bulletin in our website. A motion was made for the Appeals Committee to present the evidence in the next senate meeting and senators to vote in April. The motion failed (10yes-18no-2abstain). Jasmina Sinanovic made a motion for all the documents to be available at the GSO Bulletin Board by next Wednesday (February 19th) and the issue to be voted on the March Senate meeting. The motion passed (29in favor,1opposed,1 abstain).

h. *GSO/GSEU Liaison Committee*. The GSEU representatives invited graduate students at the next meeting and also stressed the importance of every department having a GSEU representative.

Jasmina made a motion for the meeting to adjourn. Motion passed (15 in favor, 6 opposed, 7 abstain).

Meeting adjourned at 8:00pm

Submitted by Angeliki Field-Pollatou

GSO Secretary

02/26/03

GSO Executive Committee Report (1/12/03)

Bin Tang-President

1. University Senate Meeting (2/3)

- (a) Provost talked about the 12% budget cut. I asked him what effect this will cause to our graduate students. He mentioned there will probably be 10% reduction of TA lines offered in this fall and the school is trying to remedy this reduction.

What can we do?

- (b) There is a tuition increase of \$1,400 proposed by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York for the next academic year. Still, to which extent this will affect the graduate students is unknown. Dr. Martin, Dean of Graduate School, said” that it is likely that any tuition increase would include an equal, or pro rata, increase for graduate student tuition rates...”

2. Stony Brook Graduate Student Quality of Life Survey needs your participation!
3. New Graduate Student Help Website – facilitate solving administrative problems that have not been resolved through normal means.

URL: www.stonybrook.edu/gradhelp

4. Ongoing Seminars on Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS)
5. Stony Brook Day in Albany (February 25, Tuesday)

Register on line: <http://www.sunysb.edu/albany> (Deadline: 2/14, Friday)

6. GSO resolution on proposed \$1,200 tuition increase for SUNY students.

Rules and Constitution Committee

Brief of Meeting Minutes from 1/23, 1/28 and 2/10

[The meeting minutes are available online on the Standing Committees Bulletin of the GSO website.]

In the January 23rd RCC Meeting, we addressed who should represent the GSO in meetings with administrators on the proposed move of the Lounge to the End of the Bridge, consistent with Article II, Section B, Point 3 of the Standing Committee Bylaws and Article IV, Section A, Point 1 of the Constitution.

The following resolution on this Constitutional issue was passed:

"Resolved that the Lounge Advisory Committee has the right to choose representatives to negotiate the future of the Lounge with Administrators. However, they should keep in mind that all their actions are subject to review by the Senate."

In the RCC Meeting of January 28th, the RCC offered clarifications on following points:

1. With regard to whether or not there is a conflict between Article IV, Section A, Point 1 of the Constitution and Article II, Section B, Point 3-f of the Standing Committee Bylaws, it was unanimously decided:

There is no conflict between Article IV, Section A, Point 1 of the Constitution, "The President shall act as a spokesperson for the GSO in the presentations of its positions and enunciation of its policies" and Article II, Section B, Point 3-f of the Standing Committee Bylaws, "The committee chair is responsible for...representing the Standing Committee during interactions with graduate students, administrators, and the public." The function of "representing" is different from the function of establishing policy.

The power to establish policy is granted to the GSO Senate in Article V, Section A, Point 1 of the Constitution, "The Senate shall establish policies and procedures of the GSO." In the instance which raised the Constitutional question, the Lounge Advisory Committee was acting as an agent of the Senate in the formulation of policy.

2. With regard to the wording of the resolution of the RCC Meeting of 1/23, which was,

"Resolved that the Lounge Advisory Committee has the right to choose representatives to negotiate the future of the Lounge with Administrators. However, they should keep in mind that all their actions are subject to review by the Senate."

The following clarification was unanimously offered:

1. The Senate represents the entire GSO.

And,

2. Senate-confirmed committee members are agents of the Senate.

And,

3. Representatives of the committees are agents of their respective committees.

Therefore, representatives of the committees represent the entire GSO. This holds for both internal and university committees.

4. With regard to whether the RCC resolution of 1/23 on the role of the Lounge Advisory Committee in negotiations with administrators excludes the President's responsibilities as GSO President, the following clarification was unanimously decided upon:

The President is ex-officio a spokesperson for GSO policy (Constitution, Article IV, Section A, Point 1). However, the President does not establish policy. In the case of the negotiations about the future of the Graduate Lounge, the recommendations of the

Lounge Advisory Committee constitute the provisional GSO policy.

In the RCC meeting of February 10th, we addressed three issues: proposed Amendments presented by the Elections Committee, proposed changes to the Budget Committee Bylaws, and the Constitutional provisions regarding the Graduate Student Advocate.

(1) First, we reviewed two proposed Amendments from the Elections Committee. The Constitution is available online on the GSO website.

The first proposal was submitted to review to the RCC. The RCC offers the following proposal:

As an Amendment to the Constitution, Article V, Section E, the following language is proposed to be adopted as Point 6, moving the

current Point 6 to Point 7:

"6. A Senator shall be removed if s/he is absent from three (3) consecutive regular Senate meetings. The Secretary is responsible for monitoring the attendance of the Senators and reporting to the Senate. The Senate may waive this removal by majority vote."

The second proposal by the Elections Committee submitted to the RCC would change both Article I of the Bylaws for the Election of GSO Officers and Article II of the Constitution. The proposed changes are as follows:

For the Bylaws for the Elections of GSO Officers, the Article I - Eligibility is proposed to be replaced by the following:

"Candidates for GSO office must have attended at least one Senate meeting, and at least two other meetings of the Senate, or two (internal or external) committee meetings within the past academic year. The Secretary of the Senate is responsible for monitoring attendance at Senate meetings, and the Chair of each committee is responsible for monitoring attendance at his/her meeting."

-and-

The following is proposed to replace the second sentence of Article III of the Constitution on Membership:

"Any member of the GSO may serve on any GSO committee. Any member of the GSO is eligible to be an officer provided they fulfill the requirements specified in the Bylaws for the Election of GSO Officers."

All proposed Amendments to the Constitution regarding Eligibility and Elections will be restated to the Senate body in the February Senate meeting. The Amendments are open to suggestions and revisions by the Senate body, and these proposed Amendments will be

voted upon in the March Senate Meeting.

(2) The RCC also discussed restructuring and revisions of the Budget Committee Bylaws. It was decided that further revisions will be made to be discussed at upcoming RCC meetings.

(3) The RCC also unanimously decided that there is no constitutional stipulation that prevents the Graduate Student Advocate from running for GSO Office.

Elections Committee Report

The following text was voted on the December Senate meeting to go through Special Elections in the first week of classes. The Elections Committee decided the referendum to be

put to a vote from January 27th at 9:00am to February 3rd at 9:00am to accommodate as many people as possible to vote. Only graduate students were eligible to vote.

Advertisement

The Elections were advertised through emails to the Senate list (was sent 3 times were senators were urged to forward it to the students of their Department), through email to the Graduate Program Directors and Secretaries (they were asked again to forward the elections announcement) and through posters in most of the buildings on campus.

Referendum text

"Whereas, a war on Iraq would risk the lives of American troops and reservists, including students of Stony Brook University, and kill thousands of Iraqi civilians; and

Whereas, a war on Iraq would cost the United States government about ten times what it spends annually on higher education; and

Whereas, there is no public and credible evidence that Iraq presents an immediate threat to the United States;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Graduate Student Organization of Stony Brook University opposes a preemptive war on Iraq."

Results

From the total of 435 graduate students that voted 310 people answered that the GSO should adopt the resolution and 125 that GSO should not adopt the resolution. The Elections Committee (Angeliki, Salih Kocer and Jin Xie) met on Monday February 3rd and confirmed the results of the election.

Technical problems/concerns

1. At 9:00am on February 27th an error message showed up to whoever tried to vote. We contacted the Solar System people and the problem was fixed at 9:55am the same day. No other technical problem of that sort came to our attention.

2. People who tried to vote twice from the same server were not able to do so. If someone tried to vote twice from a different server they were let to vote BUT but their second vote was discarded 'when the voted are tallied the second vote of the person who voted twice will be discarded' according to Philip Doesschate, Director of the Division of Information Technology of our University. Mr. Doesschate is the person who helped us with the online voting and concerns and the Elections Committee would like to thank him for his efforts.

3. The vote of each individual is not going to be kept on record. According to Mr. Doesschate 'it would be inappropriate for us to retain the detailed votes of individuals. We will not retain any of the data from this vote'.

Submitted by Angeliki Field-Pollatou for Senate Meeting of February 12, 2003

GSO Secretary, Elections Committee Chair

Housing Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC) Update -February 12, 2003

As of December 2002 projections, the new apartment complex will have 4 buildings with 672 single spaces in 4,5 and 6 bedroom apartments (one building with 168 spaces more than in November plans). Three buildings should be finished by Fall 2004 and the remaining one by Spring 2005. Adding one more building to existent plans reduces the projected rent from \$775 to \$728 for a single space. A quick reminder: based on a housing poll [contact me if interested in details] and discussion at November Senate meeting, GSO Housing Committee met on Nov 15th and recommended that 100 spaces be reserved for grad students in the new housing complex. The insufficient housing is a big problem in Stony Brook area. Nonetheless, 100 spaces was recommended with a great reservation since we are fully aware that the majority of grad students cannot afford to pay \$775 (cost projection as of Nov 15th) for a single room and there are no other options available.

HPAC formed a subgroup (D. Bachman and Al DeVries from Campus Residences, Karen Mendelsohn from HSC, Masa Prodanovic) to work on space allocations for undergrads/grads in the anticipated complex. The following is a summary of the meeting held on December 13th of the mentioned group.

These recommendations will be brought to HPAC meetings this semester:

1. The group recommends using demand data at the 2 week wait list snapshot of the Fall semester and the space is allocated according to the percentage of grads/undergrads on the wait list. (The numbers should be reexamined each year). Using this year's data it was calculated that 13.5% (135) of those on a waiting list for housing were graduate students and 86.5% (866) were undergraduates. That would result in 91 of the 672 spaces allocated to Graduate Students and 581 spaces allocated to Undergraduates.
2. It is recommended that the new spaces be billed on a monthly basis, consistent with Chapin and Schomburg.
3. The group recommends that once an allocation of space is determined, specific placement of HSC Grads and Undergrads be clustered to the same area/ group of spaces. We would not deny a non HSC student from living in one of these spaces if there were vacant beds but they would have to renew to a non-HSC space for the following agreement period. Further, it is recommended that the Grad and HSC Undergrad allocations be seen as fluid allocations, especially since many of the current HSC undergrad programs are shifting to Graduate level programs.
4. It is recommended that the Undergraduate Apts and the new facilities be treated as one complex including consideration of Grads being eligible to occupy spaces in UGA. The benefits of this would be that both complexes would be considered as one cost center. In addition it would make double rooms available in UGA for Grads (current double space cost

there is \$633) that want double rooms and additional single rooms available for undergrads who express greater demand in single rooms.

Masa Prodanovic

GSO HPAC Representative

GSO Housing Committee Chair

GSO Vice President

Email: mprodano@notes.cc.sunysb.edu