

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

Meeting started at 6:00pm with 33 senators present.

Amended minutes from February urgent meeting passed.

Budget items

Ron Willa said that there are no big news in the budget other than that we are right now breaking even with RAP funds.

1. **Omega Phi Beta Sorority** requested \$1000 for the **Domestic Violence Banquet**; the Budget Committee's recommendation was \$300 (\$200 from General Cultural and Social Events and \$100 from GSO Sponsored Advertisements, for an advertisement in their booklet). Kostas Pentikousis asked if this is a new policy for GSO to fund sororities. Graduate students are sponsoring the Sorority as well and they accept graduate students as their members. Audra Van Wart made a motion to fund the event for \$300. The motion failed (16 in favor, 12 opposed, 5 abstain).
2. **Social Justice Alliance** requested \$1000 for the **Argentina Autonomous Project Puppet Show**. The Budget Committee recommended \$1000 to be taken from the General Cultural and Social Events line. Karl made a motion to fund the event for \$1000. The motion passed (25 in favor, 0 opposed, 7 abstain).
3. **Art Department** requested \$200 for the visiting artist **Jesal Kapadia**. The Budget Committee recommended \$200 to be taken from the Speaker Series line. The motion to fund the event for \$200 passed (20 in favor, 8 opposed, 5 abstain).

Committee reports

a. Rules and Constitution Committee. The changes in the Constitution and the Bylaws that were presented in the last senate meeting could not be voted because it is required for a vote by 75% of the entire senate in order to make these changes. The number of senators in the room at this point was 34, which was less than what is required.

Salih Kocer made a motion to limit discussion to 3 minutes per person per item (only for the discussion part) for the rest of the meeting.

b. Board of Appeals. Scott Graves (Chair of the Board of Appeals) presented the findings of the Committee (see attached). Bin Tang responded (see attached), which was followed by a rebuttal from Scott. Bin was excused from the room. Since the recommendation for removal come from the Board of Appeals it came to a floor as moved and seconded so the floor opened discussion on the issue of removal. Karl Junhke moved to amend the motion to reduce the penalty from removal to censure and discussion opened on censure. Jasmina moved to table the motion that Karl made. The issue was tabled (20 in favor, 10 opposed, 2 abstain). Salih Kocer made a motion to end discussion. Motion passed (20 in favor, 9 opposed). The Senate then voted on the removal of the President. Motion failed (7 in favor, 17 opposed, 6 abstain). Karl moved to bring the censure motion off the table, which passed unanimously. There was a debate on the issue and the motion to end discussion on the censure issue passed (21 in favor, 10 opposed). The Senate voted on

whether the GSO President should be censured. The motion for censure of the President passed (24 in favor, 3 opposed, 4 abstain).

c. Elections Committee. Angeliki reported on the status of the elections and requested from the senate to decide on the means that the elections will take place this year: through the SOLAR system or the traditional paper ballot. Karl Junhke made a motion for this year's election of officers to be done online. The motion passed unanimously.

d. Lounge Committee. Pegine Walrad quit from Chair and member of the Lounge Committee. Bin Tang nominated Shawn Pottorf as the new chair. Jasmina Sinanovic made a motion for Shawn to be approved as the new chair, which was approved unanimously by the Senate.

e. Social Concerns Committee. Masha reported on the status of the quality of life survey. She mentioned there was an issue with the survey that we need the advice of Dr. Huddy on how to proceed. Jasmina Sinanovic asked what was the problem. Masha said that someone posted the questions of the survey on the SBCSSA bulletin board before the survey started.

f. Graduate Council. Angeliki gave a report on the housing tour of the Graduate Council (see attached).

g. Committee representation. Bin Tang appointed Bryan Field as the chair of the Polity fact-finding task force. Karl Junhke made a motion for the senate to approve the above appointment. The motion passed unanimously. Bin Tang was added at the Social Concerns Committee and Angeliki was added at the Housing Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC). The issue of whether Carl Shapiro should be a voting member of the Lounge Committee was brought up. Carl is a graduate student but Karl Junhke argued that since he is an employee of the SPOT he should not be a voting member of the Lounge Committee. Salih Kocer made a motion to allow Carl Shapiro to be a voting member of the Lounge Committee. The motion passed (14 in favor, 2 opposed, 6 abstain).

Karl Junhke made a motion for the meeting to continue in two weeks from today. Motion passed (13 in favor, 2 opposed, 8 abstain) and the meeting will be held in two weeks at the same time. The place will be determined after the executives inquire as to whether the same room is available.

Geng Tian made a motion for the meeting to adjourn. Motion passed (15 in favor, 2 opposed, 3 abstain).

Meeting adjourned at 8:15pm

Submitted by Angeliki Field-Pollatou

GSO Secretary

03/26/03

Conclusions of the GSO Board of Appeals (with supplemental material)

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

Budget cap, from Bin Tang's response to the letters of grievance:

When graduate students from IGSA and SBCSSA complained to me the \$2000 cap imposed to their annual activity funding, as GSO president, considering the large population of Indian and Chinese students, this cap seriously impedes their future activities. As the largest two graduate associations, SBCSSA and IGSA put together many events attracting thousands of graduate students each year. I realized this is a very serious issue concerning graduate student campus life. And being organization representing the interests of all graduate students, GSO has the obligation to at least listen and help those graduate clubs.

In this issue, from the beginning to present, I didn't do anything unconstitutional and violate any duty as GSO president. However, Bryan argued that "the budget cap was written into the budget passed by the senate last year", this has nothing to do with whether this cap is fair or not.

From Bin's testimony reported in the minutes of the Board of Appeals meeting (2/5):

He further stated he was the only one who had different vote (in regard to the Lounge issue) from them and that the GSO couldn't say, "you are not the GSO President." If the Senate is wrong it cannot expect Mr. Tang to say it is right.

Again, from Bin's response (in regard to the Lounge voting issue):

Hereby, Masa's complaint of my "not respecting the majority vote of the GSO Executive Councils" is precarious. How can I say something went terrible wrong is right just because the majority (which is happened to be Angeliki, Bryan and Masa) say it's right... (t)here are personal interests involved.

Attempt to call emergency Senate meeting, after the RCC resolved the Lounge representation issue against him:

Email #8*****

Bin Tang
<bitang@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU>
<SENATE-L@lists.sunysb.edu>
01/23/2003 08:35 AM
Please respond to bitang
To: SENATE-L@lists.sunysb.edu
Subject: Call for urgent Senator meeting, please forward.
Dear Senators:

Please forward the important message to your department.

=====

Dear Stony Brook Graduate Community:

Considering the apparent divergences and conflicts happening within GSO executives, as GSO president, I strongly feel the purpose of GSO as to identify and protect the rights of graduate students has been compromised, therefore I would like to call for an urgent Senator meeting to discuss:

1. The manipulation of voting in GSO Lounge Committee and how to remedy the functionality and credibility of GSO as an apparent Student Government to serve the benefits of all graduate students.
2. Encourage public input and suggestions to decide the future fate of Graduate Student Lounge, which costs GSO (and subsequently, your own activity fee) more than \$30,000 every year.
3. Strengthen the regulations and operations of GSO make it under supervision of all the graduate students.
4. Your input to Graduate Student Quality of Life Survey, which will be the base point for us to serve the rights of students better.

Bin Tang
President
Graduate Student Organization
Stony Brook University

Email #9*****

Karl Juhnke yangfuli@YAHOO.COM

01/23/2003 08:06 AM PST
Please respond to Karl Juhnke
To: SENATE-L@lists.sunysb.edu
Subject: Re: Call for urgent Senator meeting

Bin,
The Constitution states
"Emergency meetings of the Senate must be convened upon the request of either 2 voting members of the Executive Council or 8 Senators."
To call an emergency meeting, you need another Executive Council member or 8 Senators. You can't call a meeting by yourself.
Thanks for listing your proposed agenda. It contains several items of importance. If we are going to have an emergency meeting, what date do you propose for it?
Peace,
-Karl Juhnke (AMS department)

1. Misrepresentation of GSO policies to conform to his own policy preferences both to graduate students and to external actors in the University administration

Representation on the Lounge issue:
Email #1 *****
01/17/2003 04:03 PM

To: Lawrence Martin/Grad
cc: Angeliki Fieldpollatou/GST@SUNYSB, Christine Promin/GST@SUNYSB, George Meyer
bcc:
Subject: Re: The Spot

Dear Lawrence:
I would like to serve on this position since it is part of my responsibility as GSO president. I feel so even though Angelike and Christine were elected in some way to be our representatives. I strongly think this is one of the most important issues in the next half year for GSO and I would like to dedicate to work it out.
Thanks!

Lawrence Martin
01/17/2003 03:46 PM

To: Bin Tang/GST@SUNYSB, Christine Promin/GST@SUNYSB, Angeliki Fieldpollatou/GST@SUNYSB
cc: George Meyer
Subject: The Spot

I need to be able to tell George Meyer who should be invited to these meetings concerning the Spot. I had previously told him that this would be Bin Tang as that was what Bin had told me. I was told last week that Angeliki and Christine are now the representatives of GSO in this matter and that either one of them can act in Executive fashion on GSO's behalf. I shall be grateful for written confirmation so that we can get on with business. Thanks, LM.

Lawrence B. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School, Associate Provost for Analysis and Planning, and Director of International Programs
Professor of Anthropology and of Anatomical Sciences
The Graduate School
Suite 2401, Computer Science Building
Stony Brook University, NY 11794-4433, U.S.A.
Tel. (631) 632 7035, Fax. (631) 632 7243
E-mail: Lawrence.Martin@stonybrook.edu

2. 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

See email #1 above, also:

Email #4*****

Bin Tang

<bintang@cs.sunysb.edu>

01/21/2003 01:43 PM

To: <lmartin@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>

cc: <skenny@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>, Pegine Walrad <pwalrad@ic.sunysb.edu>, Angeliki Field Pollatou <angeliki@grad.physics.sunysb.edu>, "Bryan J. Field" <bfield@ic.sunysb.edu>, LaBarbera <Christopher.Philip.LaBarbera.02@alum.dartmouth.org>, Christine Promin <cpromin@hotmail.com>, Masa Prodanovic <mprodano@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>, <fpreston@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>, <gmeyer@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>, <kkelly@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>, <edfeldman@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>

Subject: Re: Graduate Representation to University Committees regarding the Lounge

> that notification comes to me from the GSO President or Executive Committee
> once GSO has determined who will represent their interests concerning the
> Spot in dealings with the administration. Thanks, LM.

Hi, Dean Martin:

As an elected GSO president, my obligation is to follow the GSO Constitution to serve my post and fulfill the responsibility assigned by Constitution and the general body of graduate students. The first responsibility as GSO president specified by Constitution is to "act as a spokesperson for the GSO in the presentation of its positions and enunciation of its policies".

So my stance is that if GSO president can't present to solve the issue of SPOT, which is our graduate student lounge, it will be unconstitutional and seriously compromising my work of serving the rights of graduate students.

Regards,

Bin Tang

Graduate Student Organization

Stony Brook University

3. 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

See email #8 above, also:

Email #10 *****

Bin Tang

<bitang@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU>

01/23/2003 05:02 PM

Please respond to bitang

To: SENATE-L@lists.sunysb.edu

Subject: The agenda of the Ugent Senator meeting. Senators, speak up!

>Thanks for listing your proposed agenda. It contains several items of
>importance. If we are going to have an emergency meeting, what date do
>you propose for it?

Thanks, Karl. It's a long list. I have put them in that email, again, the prioritied items are followings:

1. Strengthen the unity and restore the credibility of GSO and its standing committee.
- ..
3. Make public the budgetary details of SPOT, and make daily operation of GSO and its standing committee and other related venues under close scrutiny of GSO senators.
- ..

Bin Tang

President

Graduate Student Organization

Stony Brook University

Again, from Bin's response (in regard to the Lounge voting issue):

Hereby, Masa's complaint of my "not respecting the majority vote of the GSO Executive Councils" is precarious. How can I say something went terrible wrong is right just because the majority (which is happened to be Angeliki, Bryan and Masa) say its right... (t)here are personal interests involved.

From the minutes of the Board of Appeals hearing (2/5):

Q2: You claim that the decisions about the Spot are motivated by the personal interests.

Mr. Tang: The LC is in charge of the Spot, bar with theatre inside, they would prefer the space with the theatre inside.

4. 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

Not disputed.

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.

President's Statement on GSO Senator Meeting

3-12-2003

Bin Tang

During the past few months, GSO Senate has witnessed lots of divergences and dispute between its President and other people. As GSO president, I understand how sad and frustrated the GSO senators are with these unfortunate things going on.

First, I must admit that I caused some of the problems. Being inexperienced in this office while posing a headlong attitude, I had hurt some people who are innocent. In December senator meeting, I yelled at Speaker because I thought IGSA (Indian Graduate Student Organization) and SBCSSA (Stony Brook Chinese Scholars and Students Association) didn't get a chance to speak even though it was listed in the agenda. My impoliteness also happened in some other committee meetings. I feel it was very inappropriate to do that. I am sorry for what had happened.

Secondly, part of the problems is indeed due to the misunderstanding. My communication skill is not proficiently enough and it had caused problems some times.

However, I do have the goodwill in trying to do the best I could in my responsibility as a GSO president.

Furthermore, I would like to address some of my concerns as I encountered during my practicing of duty.

Topic 1 -- The Controversy surrounding the SPOT

The dispute arose as who should represent GSO to discuss with the school about the relocation of SPOT. First I would share my view about SPOT.

These days, I have come to realize that the issue of SPOT arises from cultural differences. Some people think that since I am an Asian student and Asian students usually don't go to SPOT, I have a desire to close it. That is not true. I am a strong believer that the graduate students deserve a better space, which can be deemed as a home by them. If it proves to be popular, GSO can even have more subsidy for it. The issue is how to improve the programming of SPOT to attract more students to participate, and how to improve the management so that graduate students clubs are willing to hold their activities there. I have to admit, though, this is not an easy task. But, this at least has to be taken into consideration when we design our future SPOT. We have to try to accommodate the diversity that has existed among our graduate students.

My vision about SPOT is that it should be more than just a party space. It should be educational, entertaining and full of fun. It should serve as a place for promoting learning and understanding from different cultures and ethnic. It should not be the space GSO has to subsidize more than \$30,000 per year while failing to be the momentum to enrich the campus life of general body of graduate students.

It should be a space that one day on the red couches of SPOT the students from Ethiopia and China and the students from United States will be able to sit down together at a table of brotherhood. It should be a space that one day even the countries of North Korea and Iraq, sweltering with the hostility towards US, will bury the hatchet and be able to send their students to study here and give more meaning and color to this oasis of freedom and justice.

Then, let's go back to the controversy itself. When it came to the time to decide who should represent GSO to negotiate the issue of SPOT with the school administration, the Lounge Advisory Committee (LAC) and I had both wanted to be in this position. My understanding is that according to the Constitution, the President shall act as a spokesperson for the GSO in the presentation of its positions and enunciation of its policies. My further understanding is that the current GSO Constitution does not give the LAC (Lounge Advisory Committee) the right or to empower them to elect or to appoint a representative(s) to represent the GSO for discussion with the University, when it is viewed in the absence of a recommendation from the President. The recommendation is of course subject to a final confirmation by the Senate.

There are three places in the Constitution regarding the appointment of GSO representatives:

A: Article V Section D: "GSO External Representative shall be nominated by the President, and confirmed by the Senate ..."

B: Article VII Section D: on the University Committee: "Any GSO member can be appointed by the President, subject to the confirmation by the Senate ..."

C: Standing Committee Bylaws Article II Section B 3(f): "Committee Chair is responsible for representing the Standing Committee during interactions with graduate students, administrators, and the public."

In case A and B, the person is to be nominated or appointed by the President. In case C, the chairperson can be the representative. However, it is sad to note that there is no paragraph in the Constitution to choose a representative to represent the GSO in dealing with the University on a specific issue when such an issue has arisen.

So, when LAC voted for its representative, I had disagreement. What I should have done is to bring this disagreement to GSO Senate for review. However, I failed to do that while still arguing about the issue based on my understanding of the Constitution. I have to be responsible for this failure.

That's also why Rules and Constitutions Committee (RCC) later convened several times and passed a resolution stating that LAC has the right to vote for its representative.

I didn't show my full respect the decision by RCC. However, the above arguments apparently come from different understanding of the Constitution by different people before RCC finally interfered. It was not justifiable to say that the power had been misused. Furthermore, I had not overruled the RCC's findings by presenting myself to the Admin.

Another concern for me is that the operation of GSO and its standing committee must have credibility. However, LAC's voting on 1/9 turned out to be unconstitutional since one non-voting member voted. (Note: I am also a LAC member and I was voted out as representative because they think I have different view about SPOT and furthermore, I am not a very senior LAC member and lack of knowledge about it). However, what I real felt uneasy is the fact that on 1/9 meeting, the SPOT manager was the acting chair and he brought that non-voting member to vote. These are serious and obvious conflict of interest and a violation of the constitution. Hereby I bring it to the attention of GSO senators. We appreciate the work by SPOT employees and their participation has helped greatly in the operation of SPOT. However, it is very inappropriate for them to step in, especially in the participation of making any decision about SPOT.

Topic 2 ---Webmaster recruitment

During the process of the webmaster recruitment, we followed the exact procedure and interviewed more than 10 candidates, each of them was evaluated by GSO executives, based on their presentation, communication and skills.

Knowing somebody does not necessarily mean that people will show their preference to him/her. On the contrary, that's exactly my honesty telling everybody I know her, instead of doing things in the black box. I know her because she is one of my students and she did exceptionally well in the class. In fact, her presentation and well-designed application materials impressed everybody, didn't she? By saying she is good is just the fair evaluation from one of the interviewers and one who happens to know she is really good. Actually, after the first two candidates either was fired or turn our offer down, the third choice finally got the job. It turns out that she has been very responsive and responsible from the beginning, as all of GSO executives admit, which is also a proof of the correctness of the president's judgment.

Everybody has the right to assert his/her preference. A final decision on hiring rests with the Executive Committee. A right to present his view could hardly be considered as a grave misconduct or an impeachable offense.

The purpose of GSO is to identify and protect the rights of graduate students. As GSO executives, we need to try to help our graduate students as best as we can. We could also set up different priority based on the need under different circumstances. That's why I prefer to hire Master students than PhD students, since MS students usually don't have support. That's why when our first webmaster was fired, I prefer to hire people who don't have support. However, my suggestion was rejected.

If this can be served as a ground for impeachment, as GSO president, I don't know if I can say or do anything more to perform my job.

Topic 3 Cap-removal:

When graduate students from IGSA and SBCSSA complained to Bryan (our treasurer) and me about the \$2000 cap imposed to their annual activity funding, as GSO president, considering the large population of Indian and Chinese students, this cap has seriously impeded their future activities. As the two largest graduate associations, SBCSSA and IGSA put together many events attracting thousands of graduate students each year. I have realized that this is a very serious issue concerning the graduate student campus life. And being an organization serving the interests of all graduate students, GSO has the obligation to at least listen and helps those graduate clubs.

In this issue, from the beginning to the present, I didn't do anything unconstitutional and violate any duty as a GSO president. The IGSA and SBCSSA are seeking to remove this cap by normal procedure and they didn't do anything radical or violent. They simply want their voices to be heard and their right being protected. It is very reasonable that they contact Bryan and me on this issue. And it is our job to listen to their idea and voices.

But I have to admit as GSO president, I need to be more careful and more prudent about stating this issue since I happened to be a member of SBCSSA. I didn't misuse my power to advocate my personal preference. However, in the eyes of other people, they would have different thoughts about it.

Topic 4: Ping-Pong Table

In the October budget committee meeting, students from Table Tennis club proposed to buy two tables. I thought this was a very good idea and I was strongly in favor of it.

My original thinking is that if we can put Ping-Pong tables at SPOT, it will greatly improve the participations from many graduate students. This idea can be supported by what had happened recently at Computer Science Department. A simple call from the CSGSC (Computer Science Graduate Student Council) for a Ping-Pong championship tournament had attracted more than 40 students (including two faculty members) to participate in one day.

I must say that this proposal didn't get a lot of attention from other people, since people would tend to think that I am a Chinese Student and of course I am in favor of buying Ping-Pong tables.

That is partially true. And by listening to graduate students' request can't justify I misused my power, although I have to be more prudent when this kind of issue come upon.

However, I must say that it is more than that My inexperience had caused some misunderstanding from LAC/Budget Committee because I failed to communicate properly with LAC about it before I presented it to the Senate. But at the same time, the indifference

and the not-willing-to-help attitude by some colleagues towards those students' applications had really troubled me. I was certainly disappointed with the unresponsiveness towards such an issue. The issue had been known for quite some times but it had been passively stalled without any visible action. It was technically wrong in view of the miscommunication in a sincere but regrettable attempt to refer to the Senate for further consideration. It was also a fact that it would be up to someone to point it out in the Senate so that the Senate would have a chance to overrule such an attempt.

Being one of the international students, I understand clearly how hard it is for them to address their concern and to get their voiced heard. They have to deal with the study, research and at the same time, things like cultural difference, homesickness, underrepresented which American students usually don't face. Unfortunately, I think GSO had not done enough to improve this situation.

Topic 5 --- CS senator signatures:

For the senator confirmation in my department (CS department), from the very beginning, I've been helping Angeliki to verify the signatures collected by two new senators (Mr. Phan, Mr. Ma). I had sent emails to the departmental secretaries and had also gone to their offices to try to give Angeliki the proper information, see email below.

Bin Tang 10/09/2002 10:43 AM

To:

eosmans@notes.cc.sunysb.edu, Angeliki Field Pollatou <angeliki@grad.physics.sunysb.edu

::

Subject: Thanks for your reply!

Hi, Edwina;

Sorry for bothering you again and again for this. But I am pretty sure this is the last one :-)

Can you just send Angeliki an email, stating that those three People (Mr. Phan, Mr. Chi Ma and Kostas) are the only three people who want to be the senators in our department? An email with a simple "YES" will work.

Thanks and have a nice day!

Bin Tang

10/08/2002 12:26 PM

To:

kathy@cs.sunysb.edu

cc:

angeliki@grad.physics.sunysb.edu, phan@cs.sunysb.edu, mchi@cs.sunysb.edu, brian@cs.sunysb.edu

Subject:

Please help us by sending PhD name list of CS department.

Dear Kathy:

I send you an email last week about the list of the current PhD list in our department.

Angeliki, the GSO secretary need them before today (no less than tomorrow noon) so that she can verify Vinththuy and Chi of our department can be senators in tomorrow's senator meeting. Otherwise, they can't be senators representing our department and CS department will lose its right for RAP funding (250\$ per student) and departmental allocation fee (250\$).

Please help us by sending Angeliki the current PhD name list. Thanks a lot!

Bin

As GSO president, I inquired my secretary about the progress of senator signatures. But I didn't ask her to take signatures if they were not enough. Actually, as her colleague, I helped her by emailing and even walked to CS department offices twice to finally get things done.

Topic 6 --- Volley-ball account number:

First I must stress that, during my talk with our treasurer, I never said words like "...policies did not matter in this case because I approved the decision"!!! I am an officer of the GSO and being a reasonable and responsible man and not a dictator. I know for sure it is the Treasurer's job to deal with the account number and I don't even know how to get into this kind of budget bureaucracy. How can I simply say that my approval can solve the issue ?!

However, I do think this whole problem (the misunderstanding between the treasurer and me) is partially due to my spoken English. What I did is that I had simply asked the treasurer to check out the procedure. But the treasurer had simply felt pressured by my not so good English and my communication skill.

Topic 7 --- About setting an agenda for a meeting:

It is better to have an agenda when there are many major issues to be discussed and to be resolved.

Since the executive meeting is a very small group meeting, it is also an internal meeting, anything can be brought out even it is not on the agenda, and without prior notice. Several proposals from different people could also be brought out instantly to form an agenda. Besides that, we do exchange email often with each other about what our agenda is.

Out of all other standing committee meetings, not even one of them prepared copy for its members. However, this does not affect the functioning of GSO.

If you are dissatisfied that there is no agenda in the executive meeting, I should be alerted. This issue is related to an inner working of a small group. If the President was not alerted and the request for an agenda was not made, we would have to assume that everything was ok. If a request is made, and you are still dissatisfied, a resolution for censure for failure to provide an agenda should be sent to the Senate floor for a vote. Such a technical issue could not be a ground for an impeachment, especially when the complainant has failed to alert the Senate with a prior notice that there was a deficiency in the executive meeting.

However, I do think that it would be more efficient and productive if I can prepare a written agenda. I thank Angeliki for raising this topic in her grievance letter. And actually, that is what I've been doing from the day I got her grievance letter.

Topic 8 --- Fulfillment of my job

The accusation that "Mr. Tang does not represent GSO in outside Committees. He has not participated the two committees that he has volunteered to represent GSO" is totally wrong.

In fact, the accusation that "Mr. Tang does not represent GSO in outside Committees. In fact, of the two committees that he has volunteered to represent GSO, he has not participated" is really contradictory and in fact, both wrong.

For the external committee, I've been representing GSO on Dean of Students Advisory committee, University Senate meeting, and Campus Life Award committee. Besides, I am serving in Honorary Degree Committee and Diversity Committee, which need graduate student's participation. As with GSO's internal committees, I am a member of GSO/GSEU liaison Committee, Lounge Committee and Housing Committee.

So, I don't understand why somebody said I do not represent GSO in outside Committees. If somebody still doubt, I have my schedule planner here.

However, I did missed once in University Senator meeting last semester due to my conflict of schedule.

As far as the time and energy I have put into as a GSO president, it is more than a full-time job for me. I am working tirelessly for the graduate students. Not to mention even before I am a GSO president, I was president of Computer Science Graduate Student Council and had worked hard to address CS students' concern. I initiated the petition from Chapin residents for the mailbox issue last summer and had reached some compromises with the University Apartment.

Now, as GSO president, realizing the great responsibility on my shoulder, I have worked even harder. I initiated the Graduate Student Quality of Life Survey, trying to find out what really concern the students most. With the help from Christine Promin and Bryan Field, I had prompted the school to construct the Graduate Student Help Website to facilitate the communication between the school administration and graduate students. We have constructed Graduate Student Help Website. I even went with some graduate students individually to the International Offices and the Police Station to address their concern and to protect their rights.

We, the GSO executives, have held numerous meetings with the school administrators about big issues like housing and stipend and are still trying to push forward these issues and get their attention.

Recently, I've been attending RCC committee and Social Concerns Committee to help with many issues.

The newest committee, which I had initiated and I have been attending, is the Grad/Undergrad Liaison Committee. My approach is that since we are all Stony Brook Students and are facing many common problems, there is no reason that we can't do things together to have a strong voice when we try to improve the campus life. I even went to the office of Statesman and Press to dig out the materials and had talked with them about their view for this kind of communication. And I was flattered by hearing that I was the first GSO president who had even gone to their office for some communication.

The newest thing I did was that I had singly organized a SEVIS workshop with graduate school for the international students about their serious concern for studying and living in this country. The popularity of this workshop can be testified by the more than 50 students' participation.

Summary:

I am not perfect and had made mistakes some time. I am not a sage and I have my own proud and prejudice, which are not correct and sometimes give others the impression of rudeness and inconsiderate. For anyone who is affected by the above, please accept my sincere apology. Being a GSO president is really a learning experience for me. And it's been quite a rewarding experience, too, through which I found some of my weakness which I didn't realize before, which I assume I will never have a chance to find out hadn't I run for this office.

But, it is an undeniable fact that I have the goodwill in trying to help and to do something for all the graduate students and also to voice their concerns. After having finished in writing the above statements, I realize that I had made some mistakes. But I believe that I had neither done anything unconstitutional nor had abused the power to deserve the removal out of office.

I know that I am not the best GSO president in the Stony Brook history. However, I have tried my best not to be the worst either. Finally, I would like to thank my Vice President, Speaker and Treasurer for those letters, pointing out all my mistakes. More importantly, I appeal that we could end this dispute and be a strong GSO executive team again from now on. Let's unite and work together for the rest of our journey.

Thanks!

Bin Tang

President

Graduate Student Organization 2002-2003

Stony Brook University

bitang@notes.cc.sunysb.edu

Senate meeting on March 12th, 2003

Secretary's report - Submitted by Angeliki Field-Pollatou

Elections Committee: According to the Elections Bylaws, the Senate has the power to authorize elections via electronic means, The procedure for this should be approved by a two-thirds vote at a regular senate meeting before the elections. The only option we have for online elections is using the SOLAR system like we did for the Iraq referendum. Due to the amount of work that is need to organize the elections the decision regarding the issue has to be voted today in order the elections to be organized in a proper manner. If online elections are approved, the elections will take place between April 21 and April 25. If traditional (paper ballot) voting takes place it will be on the 23rd and 24th of April.

In order for a candidate to be eligible to vote they need to bring signatures from 25 graduate students that have to be verified by the Secretary. The date that the nominations are due will be announced shortly.

The following are not minutes of the meetings but important points that were discussed that I believe are of interest to the graduate students.

Housing tour of the Graduate Council (02/24/03)

Due to time constraints we were not able to visit the apartment that we recommended. We visited 2 apartments in Schomburg and 4 in Chapin including the Community Center and the laundry facilities. Although most of the apartments that we saw were in good condition (since they were pre-selected by the On Campus Housing office) the serious problems regarding the buildings were obvious. We saw apartments that had water dripping from the ceiling, moisture coming from outside changing the color of the walls, mold under the refrigerators, heating problems. The impression from the Committee members was that there are some serious problem with the apartments but the on campus housing representatives told us that most of the problems come from neglect from the people who live in the apartments. Additionally we were given a report addressing the important issues that many students complained about in the emails that were sent to the GSO and the Graduate Council. Please contact me if you want a copy of that report.

Student Life Committee/Spot relocation (03/11/03)

The participants in the discussion were: George Meyer, Bin Tang, Jerry Stein, Kevin Kelly, Michelle Millar, Lawrence Martin, Ron on behalf of Louis Rispoli and GSO representatives (Angeliki and Christine Promin). The GSO representatives clarified that the space that was suggested in the last meeting was less than 1,500 ft² and that a minimum of 2,000 ft² is what is required. The GSO proposed a plan that would expand the area that we would be given on both sides in order to reach 2,000 ft². The representative from the Facilities Planning asked for some time in order to make a budget for this plan. Also it was requested to have a budget for both collapsible doors and real walls to be built between the new Lounge and the dance floor. Almost all the participants were in favor of the collapsible doors since it will give us more flexibility to expand to the dance floor if needed, but the cost will determine whether that will be a better option. GSO will have its own separate entrance to the venue. Until we find out the cost of the renovations we will not know what and if GSO has to contribute financially. Jerry Stein was asked whether the GSO would be subject to the one time per semester restriction placed on clubs who wish to use the dance floor area at the Union. He responded that he will have to check into it. Dr. Martin supported that GSO should not be subject to this rule since GSO is an organization, not a club.