**GSA General Assembly Meeting**

February 17th, 2016

Meeting start time: 6:45 PM

1. Approval of Minutes
   1. Minutes stand as written.
2. Approval of Agenda
   1. Agenda stands as written.
   2. Andrew (Genetics) asked about receiving a copy of resolution S16-001, and Liz said we are tabling it until next meeting, but will discuss the issue more generally tonight.
3. Department Meeting Reports
   1. Philosophy – Alex Zhang
      1. 33 students. 15 students at meeting. No major new ideas. Philosophers have three main areas of concern
         1. CTF- philosophy department has very little money for sending students to conferences and for professional development—only $250/ student. Students requested more transparency about CTF because lots of students rely on CTF for funding.
         2. Professional development- Philosophy has a terrible job market and students are thinking there should be more advice coming from faculty or graduate school: what they should be doing to build up CV at various stages of program?; some confusion on advising responsibilities of dissertation committee?; general sense that faculty members don’t know about the job market. Lots of students fall through the cracks because they either get top level interviews or nothing at all. Lots of smaller liberal arts school and state schools think Yale PhDs are a flight risk and won’t consider them as viable applicants for vacant professor positions. There is also a general concern that teaching experience is limited at Yale. Lots of people get adjunct positions at SCSU or UConn.
         3. 6th year funding- Suggestion that faculty provide more information in a more timely manner about which courses they are intending to teach, what their leave/sabbatical schedules are, etc. At least one 7th year student did not have a TF position, which means he was not paid while working on his dissertation.
      2. Liz asked what the dissertation committee looks like in humanities
         1. Alex said one to two advisors and at least one or two people at Yale. Varies by department whether you have the actual committee earlier or later.
      3. Patrick said that $250 per student is actually very good for Yale departments. Most don’t offer anything. We’re hoping to increase the amount of funding we get for CTF so we can give out more money to more students. Patrick is currently updating the application and grading, then launching into campaign to get more funding. Collecting information from professors now about what kind of funding is available in departments. Will bring information to Dean Cooley later this year in a Steering meeting.
   2. Economics – Fabian Schrey, Mohit Agrawal, Fabian Eckert, Louise Laage
      1. Fabian Schrey reported that there about 120 students with about 50+ attending the meeting, which was less than expected, but bad timing on meeting. People were quite happy but three major areas of concern:
         1. Study space- in econ, there is really only study space from 3rd year onwards and even then it is not secured unless you are in your job market year. Really want bass to be refurbished into a huge graduate study space as opposed to books. First and second year cohorts are growing in size, so the problem will get worse. Concerned that HGS is going to close since many students have used classrooms and other spaces for studying.
         2. Professional development- Job market outcomes are dependent on person in charge of placement in the department. As long as there is a good person in charge, placement is good, but there is no real mechanism to keep this going. Very concentrated on academic jobs, so it’s very hard to voice if you are not interested in an academic job. Teaching and learning Center does not do a particularly good job for economics.
         3. First year of the PhD is very hard because professors change from year to year. Try to have some continuity so students know what to expect and can get advice from students in higher years? More hours of coverage for mental health and counseling are also needed because of the intensity of and anxiety related to first year.
      2. Other suggestions: New bike racks, law school type shuttle from Sachem street.
   3. Neuroscience/Neurobiology – Elizabeth Salm, Emilio Salazar-Cardozo, Sol Bernardez Sarria
      1. Emilio reported 70-80 people in program (neuroscience/ neurobiology). Reps wanted to get numbers they can tally over the years so they can track trends, so they sent survey to department and used some of the money to incentivize people to take the survey (prizes)- got 41 responses. Initial results suggest that students are mostly happy. Work life balance is good and they understand the expectations of their advisors. One thing students didn’t like was that the community in the department is bad. Most people are on med campus, but number of people on Science Hill. The opportunity to get together has existed less this year than it has in previous years. Tried to figure out ways to make this better- happy hours for example.
      2. Complaints about the classes that could be used towards credit—not much relevance to research. Most classes are targeted for undergrads or medical school students and are very general, covering a broad range of topics from molecular neuroscience to clinical practice.
      3. What are students doing with PhD? Pretty much across the years, the number of people who want to be academics stays about the same.
      4. Ideas
         1. This has worked well in Neuro, and might work well for other departments—On a monthly basis have student faculty lunches where students are invited to meet with two faculty in a lunch setting and a topic is chosen (how do you handle the work life balance, how do you go through the qualifying process?, etc. ). Great opportunity to get answers, but also to interact with faculty.
         2. Recruitment weekend- registrar decided to push for diversity conversation at the recruitment weekend. It was a student only gathering (10-15 students) from diverse backgrounds and the recruits were able to attend (optional, but it ended up being everyone). It ended up being a really good conversation. Also a good time to tell them more general things they should realize/ think about/ etc. before coming into graduate school—no pay for first two weeks, so save up for security deposit, rent, food, etc.
4. Discussion on Graduate Student Housing
   1. Is housing something we should work on? Overwhelming majority of people are interested in working on housing.
   2. Anastasia (Slavic Languages and Literature) highlighted a problem she personally experienced— she applied for housing in April when accepting to come here, and got an email in November asking whether she’d like to see any housing.
   3. Joe (Public Health)- what’s the status of the Yale version of Craigslist that people tried to make a thing? Wendy (MD/PhD)- lots of landlords listed on there now, but there are organizational issues: the name of the landlord can be anything and so it is very difficult to search. There are also display issues like zooming in on the map (doesn’t filter things out that are not on the map). Anything you want improved? Send Wendy Xiao an email (wendy.xiao@yale.edu) and she will forward it to the appropriate person.
   4. Make a report
      1. Option: Build more graduate student housing. This is unlikely to come about given the feelings of many people in the administration. Do people want more Yale owned housing that you sign up for in April and find out later? Joe (Public Health)—it benefits international students the most. Very hard to deal with sight-unseen rental of apartments. International students might also not have a credit score, no American references, etc. –it can be a really big problem. He emphasized that it is critical for some Yale resource to be there for international students.
      2. 95% of applications are housed, but Yale does not think it’s a problem because of the applications they get, they are able to fulfill almost all of them. This does not include the people who are not applying because they’re seeing that nothing is going to be available and then not applying.
      3. Andrey (Comp Lit)- we need all sorts of housing, but in terms of graduate student housing—should have a communal space if this is happening. Shouldn’t be compromising on this.
      4. Ben (Chemistry)- there are benefits to the Yale housing.—it felt very safe. Can bursar rent and not pay taxes on it.
      5. Andrew (genetics)—Not sure overwhelming interest is in more dorm space, but if there was a way to expand Elm Campus partners or the amount of apartments Yale owns, this would be great.
      6. Wendy (MD/PhD)- survey results that overwhelmingly show that we want apartments.
      7. Patrick (CMP)- what if we can get more money in our stipends? Concerns about taxability, but Wendy (MD/PhD) said some schools give non-taxable subsidies for housing.
      8. Joe (Public Health)- fan of bursaring rent, but lots of the desire for Yale housing comes with the administrative side of things—dealing with the landlords can be better for Yale owned property. No shoddy landlords, very reliable, not just a random person. Although Andrey (Comp Lit) said no this is not it. And there are lots of issues with maintenance.
      9. Emilio (Neuro). Is the interest that people want Yale as a landlord, or that other landlords cost too much?
      10. Liz noted that in the 1970s and 1980s there was a housing stipend, but it was revoked because there were concerns that it would suppress the housing market in New Haven.
      11. Fabian Eckert (Economics) said that about 80% of students are international in his department and like the dorm option. Cindy said the same thing about Statistics. Fabian- no one has complained about housing prices in New Haven (maybe because econ has higher end stipend amongst all graduate students?). Just difficulty of getting dorm room and uncertainty of that.
      12. Laura (Music)- an idea is for Yale to looking into sites that no one wants to deal with fixing—CT has had state subsidies to fix these sites up (partly environmental, partly developmental). Could be sold as Yale going green, going environmentally friendly. There are at least two sites in walking distance of campus—one in East Rock and one near Winchester.
      13. Fabian Schrey (Economics)- rising numbers of masters students—lots of 9 month long programs that start in August- do not need 12 month rental. Can try to get a sublet for over summer or something, but it is harder. With Yale housing it can be much more flexible for these students. Dorm room has 9 month options or 9 months plus 3 for summer.
      14. Anastasia (Slavic Languages and Literature) asked about conditions of these apartments. Wendy (MD/PhD) said terrible, but renovations are happening and they will come back new, but it will still be very difficult, if not near impossible, for non-families to get these units.
      15. Has anyone asked why landlords charge the amounts they charge? Because Yale doesn’t pay property tax, so they have to raise the amount of money to pay for it. Can something be done with this? Will landlords lower rent? Probably wouldn’t in the long run.
      16. Wendy (MD/PhD) said that Yale does pay something towards property taxes. Christopher (Linguistics) said they only pay 8 million which is 1/10th than what actual tax would be.
      17. Liz- will draft report, but not sure when it will be done. Will be crafting questions for GSA survey. And Liz has collected reports from the city regarding costs of rental here, vacancy rate, etc.
5. Resolution S16-001: In Support of the Faculty Code of Conduct
   1. Graduate school is only one without standards of conduct. A group of faculty and administrators made a code of conduct and gave to faculty with one month to give feedback. Code of conduct was published in September in Faculty handbook and lots of people were upset. Code includes information like what are your responsibilities and examples of not fulfilling responsibilities. It does NOT, however, include information on reporting un-fulfillment or disciplinary procedures. Faculty were very frightened and upset by this, but also upset that they felt like they did not get to help craft the goals. The GSA is also slightly upset as the committee who came up with the code was entirely faculty members. There were no students or trainees of any sort. It was then approved by all deans of all schools, president, and provost. Faculty did not actually approve it—the deans of the schools did. Content note: Before there were business, sexual, research standards, but now mentoring and teaching has been included.
   2. FAS senate now exists, and they are considering whether they agree with cods of conduct. Senate will likely reject them for the above stated reasons. Impact is minimal, though because the FAS senate is an advisory board with no real power to reject them. The action could make provost think of revising them, worry that FAS senate is going to try to make their own.
   3. Where does this put the GSA? Unclear. We were approached by someone who said he thought that our approval might help FAS senate to approve them but were not sure we want to support them. What are we going to do?
      1. Emilio (Neuro)- We did not get input- when the other codes of conduct were made, did students get to give input? Liz-We do not know because they were put into place so long ago. Emilio is unsure we should be offended that we weren’t included.
      2. Andrey (Comp Lit) mentioned that we have had rules and procedures in place, but people go through procedures and come out unsatisfied. Does there need to be input by everyone? Probably not, but at least consolation with people who went through the process and were left unsatisfied.
      3. Joe (Public Health) is unsure we should support regulating mentors.
      4. Wendy (MD/PhD)- but do we support code of conduct?— overwhelming yes. If it is not approved, there might be nothing. But other issue is that we want a little bit of input into how we think faculty should conduct themselves as mentors and advisors. How can we do this without putting the code of conduct in jeopardy?
      5. Christopher (linguistics)—assuming that we like everything in it (possibility, but not guarantee)—Could make recommendation, resolution, expression of concern, etc. that there are not the supporting regulations currently in place for reporting and enforcement. We can take this angle, which presupposes an approval of the code of conduct.
      6. Katie (Psychology) said that we would want to add to it because it is very general and vague. Be a good mentor, don’t discriminate, etc.
      7. Liz- initially we were going to vote on the resolution because the FAS senate is voting on this tomorrow, but in discussion before meeting Mark (Music) said our recommendation might come out better after the decision—as more of a response to what happens rather than a preemptive move.
      8. Laura (Music)- if we do nothing tonight, does this influence how they vote tomorrow? Doing anything tonight won’t do anything tomorrow. They would see our support or lack thereof and just consider what we say, but it likely won’t sway them.
      9. Emilio (Neuro)- Whatever happens tomorrow, could we invite someone from the FAS senate for the next meeting to talk about it? Rachel and Liz met with the current chair of the senate Beverly Gage—could invite her.
      10. Patrick (CMP)- Keep in mind that the FAS is not entire faculty at Yale. Not sure that FAS senate should be the one making the decision on this. This is a broader issue. 2500 medical student faculty 1100 FAS faculty.
      11. Andrey (Comp Lit)- This is a big step towards changing how faculty behave and how they’re held accountable. We could be risking letting the faculty wing this, and basically get a code of conduct without much effort or thought. Now they can just say they have a functioning code, even though it is extremely vague and has no information on reporting and discipline. Not enough people have been asked about this.
      12. Emilio (Neuro)- faculty had chance to comment- can they say they weren’t given a chance?? Liz said they could have given comments and they were ignored.
      13. Jeremie (Comp Sci)- criticism is not that committee was appointed by administration, but that administration might use this code against dissenting faculty later on.
      14. Andrey (Comp Lit)- Many professors do not take these kinds of things seriously, and would hate for the GSA to support something that is not taken seriously by the faculty.
      15. Christopher (Linguistics)- It is a statement of principles NOT a code of conduct.  We can’t hold them accountable to because it is a statement of principles. Maybe we do NOT have a place to comment on a statement of principles?
      16. Patrick (CMP) disagrees- we should be very interested in statement of principles. Need to expand on the mentoring and mentee relationship and power dynamics. Material is in there, but pretty vague. We are directly affected by these documents. There is no procedure in place to punish people who do not adhere to them, but it’s likely that this information would be added in the future (hopefully). And this is why there might be resistance—faculty members know what is coming. Student code of conduct says that if you don’t do what’s here, you’re in front of a committee. Andrew (Generics) says this same sense of responsibility is not codified in this document. Who is responsible for final implementation decision? Technically already implemented. Faculty handbook on provost website.
      17. Faculty are upset that the consequences could be severe? They don’t know what is going to happen and the administration is going to use this to punish people. Who says you violate something in the code? Committee of faculty? Will it be committee of administrators? Makes it scarier for faculty.
      18. Mate (CBB)- seems like an unfinished document that was accepted too soon- Liz thinks this is a possibility. Christopher (Linguistics)-Wants people to have say in what the procedures would be. It may be wise for us to wait for what the FAS senate says then issue statement at next meeting. Then we can agree, disagree, qualify, etc.
      19. Liz- Current resolution draft says we support the standards of conduct, but we think these are bad and any changes that are made should be made with consultation of all parities involved. This doesn’t have to be the resolution!
      20. Katie (Psychology) will take notes and then heavily edit and send it around before the next meeting. Liz will likely invite Beverly Gage to come and give us a good run down of what is going on and what happened.
      21. Andrey (Comp Lit)- “in consultation with students” might be a bad phrase since it has been taken advantage of in the past.
6. Payne Whitney Extended Hours Pilot Tracking
   1. How has the gym been tracking the extra hours usage? Numbers have been very good and the administration is very pleased. Don’t know whether it will continue, but they’re very pleased with what they see. Tracking use in two ways- they were only counting swipes in the last hour before, but that doesn’t count people who were already there before the extra hours began, but who have stayed. Now they are doing an informal head count during extended hours.
   2. Paul (Chemistry)- any idea on when information will come out on whether this is a permanent change? Liz said they’re budgeting now so it would be in the next month.
   3. Joe- (Public Health) concerned with what the administration will do about actual numbers and how they will interpret them. But Liz said it seems like the administration is pushing for it and they just have to find money for it.
7. Concerns from the Floor
   1. OCS doing trying to see how to better help graduate students. OCS has a science rep already, and they’re hoping to get a humanities or social sciences rep. They are interested in finding out what humanists and social scientists want. Interested? Send Liz an email. There will be an election at the March 2 meeting of any interested reps.
   2. Alex (Philosophy)- in process of putting together Feb newsletter- anything to advertise, send to Alex (tongjia.zhang@yale.edu) Liz said we will put in something about the OISS tax fund delay issue. Update has been posted.
8. Adjournment
   1. Meeting adjourned at 7:59 PM

**Parliamentary Procedure Basics Reviewed**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Purpose** | **To Enact Motion** |
| Main Motion  “I move that…” | To take action on behalf of the body | Second needed. Debatable. Requires majority vote. |

**Privileged Motions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Purpose** | **To Enact Motion** |
| Call for orders of the Day  Chair asks if there are any objections to the agenda. | Asks Assembly to stick to the agenda | Not debatable; approved unless there is an objection, requires 1/3 to sustain. |
| Adjourn  “I move to adjourn” | End of meeting | Second needed. Not debatable. Not amendable. Meeting closes unless there is an objection, otherwise immediately voted upon and requires majority vote. |

**Subsidiary Motions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Purpose** | **To Enact Motion** |
| Table Current Business  “I move to table the current business…” – Indefinitely or a set amount of time. | To lay one matter aside temporarily so that a more urgent matter can be considered. | Second needed. Not debatable. Not amendable. Requires majority vote. |
| Call the Question  “I move the previous question” “I call the question” | Closes debate and forces vote. | Second needed. Not debatable. Not amendable. Requires 2/3 vote. |
| Motion to Limit or Extend Debate  “I move that debate be limited to (or end at)…” | Limits or extends debate. | Second needed. Not debatable. Not amendable. Requires 2/3 vote. |
| Motion to refer  “I move that we refer the question of…to…(name of group) for…(further study) | Another group considers the motion and may change or modify the motion and then present it to the assembly. | Second needed. Debatable. Amendable. Requires majority vote. |
| Amendments  “I move to amend the motion by…” | Used to change a motion. Change must be related to the subject of the motion. | Second needed. Debatable. Amendable. Requires majority vote. |

**Incidental Motions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Purpose** | **To Enact Motion** |
| Point of order  “Point of order” | A question about the process or a particular motion. Typically to call attention to a mistake in parliamentary procedure or a question of Scope based on the Charter and Bylaws. | The member addresses the Chair. She/he need not be recognized before speaking, She/he may interrupt a speaker who has the floor. Automatic if granted by the Chair. No second needed. Not debatable. Not amendable. No vote. |
| Point of information  “Point of information” | To ask about the particular motion | Automatic |
| Parliamentary Inquiry  “Parliamentary Inquiry” | To ask about the particular process | Automatic |