

# MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting - Graduate Student Council  
Thursday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2004, 12:00 – 1:45 pm  
112 Parsons-Gates

**Directors Present:** Kimberly Beatty, John Bender, Jeff Bergthorson, Ileana Carpen, Jon Galownia, Niki Galownia, Joel Grus, Sidharth Jaggi, Julie Liu, Alisa Miller, Marissa Mock, John Murphy, Steve Pracko, Graeme Smith, Karen Smith, Matthew (Chip) Sumner, Alex Tobias, Lauren Webb

**Directors Absent:** John Choi, Stephanie Chow, Heather Cox, Michael Fleming, Surelys Galano, Ted Harder, Michael Johnson, Catharine Larsen, Amir Sadjadpour, Joe Zadeh

**Guests:** Fred Romberg (Campus Life), Jan Schonauer (Ombuds Office)

## I. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

### A. Call to Order at 12:02 p.m.

### B. Modifications to the Agenda

#### 1. Pre-approved e-mail votes (Marissa)

Marissa mentioned that when we voted on approving e-mail votes for the honor code and cost of living survey reports, we neglected to make a plan for recording the results of those votes. We will discuss this item when we discuss the other survey committee item.

#### 2. DVD Library (Chip)

Chip asked if we know anything more about the DVD library, but Marissa said she hasn't heard any new information.

### C. Approval of the December meeting Minutes [attached]

Chip has two modifications to the December minutes. In the discussion about medical savings accounts, it says that money must be spent on medicine, but it should say that money must be spent on qualified medical expenses. Also, in the discussion about recruiting new members to the social committee, the suggestion was that the committee hold a contest and not a drawing. The December minutes incorporating the above corrections were approved with 5 abstentions.

### D. Introduction of Guests

Marissa introduced our newest BoD member – Sidharth Jaggi from EE. The BoD went around the table and introduced themselves to Sid. Marissa also introduced Fred Romberg from Campus Life and Jan Schonauer from the Ombuds Office.

## II. ACTION ITEMS

### A. Steering Committee (Marissa Mock)

#### 1. Honor Code

Now that the report on the Honor Code from the GSC/WEST survey has been published and presented to the Faculty Board, we should take steps to guarantee that some benefit comes of it. Marissa has been contacted by EAS Division Chair Richard Murray, who is interested in holding discussions and information sessions with students and faculty in EAS. John and the GRB are interested in developing some “training sessions” for faculty and students in that Division that might become a model for other Division-level sessions. They’d welcome volunteers who would like to help out.

*Discussion:* The faculty Board has not yet taken any action on the honor code survey results; they want to wait for the undergraduate results (survey being conducted now). There has been some activity on the divisional level (e.g. Richard Murray from EAS). Marissa suggests that we use EAS as a model for other divisions. The GRB and other interested members should work on this model for improving the honor code. We should let other divisions know we’re working on developing a model for addressing honor code issues so they can watch or be involved.

There is some question as to whether the original faculty directory staff e-mail informing them of the honor code survey went out. Margo has asked the provost to send the e-mail out. John M. says that new faculty need to be made aware of how the Honor Code works. The honor code needs to be at the forefront of everyone’s minds.

Alex asks whether there is some concern that the survey results will adversely affect grad students. For instance, will there be rules that say only grad students can’t take take-home exams. Marissa says that she is personally concerned about this happening and is worried that there will be severe underreporting from the undergrads since the honor code is more indoctrinated in them.

John M. would like to see more institute-level thinking about the honor code. Chip suggests that if we have a solution it would help things happen.

Kim asks how closely the survey results match actual reported cases. The number of graduate cases is ~ 0.1% while the survey results were 23%. The undergraduate BoC chair says that the cheating rate is 2% while the number of cases is about ~10% (25 cases/year). Many of these cases are convictions.

Anyone interested in outreach planning should contact John M. Lauren asks how does the honor code apply outside of academic life. Chip would like to know whether the GRB has a consensus on when the honor code applies. It is John M.’s view that whatever is written down is how it is. This means that cases could involve things that are off-campus; for instance, a dispute between two students who are roommates would be covered by the honor code.

Kim thinks there should be a class on scientific ethics. John B. suggests that maybe the provost could teach a required first year course on ethics. Alisa questions whether training sessions are effective. People who cheat might not be affected by training sessions. Marissa would like to see a re-evaluation of the honor code to see whether it is realistic.

**ACTION:** Anyone interested in outreach planning should contact John M.

2. Committee representatives reporting

It became clear at the last meeting of the Faculty Board that certain things that happen in Faculty Board Committee meetings CANNOT be shared with people outside of that committee. The guidelines for representatives that we adopted last year [attached] must be updated, as they now ask for written reports from representatives.

It will be tricky to balance the need for our representatives to gather input from the BoD and other graduate students about the graduate student position on the issues while maintaining the confidentiality of the committees. Marissa suggests the following text be inserted into the guidelines in place of 3a:

- a. Our committee representatives, after each meeting, should ask the other committee members there if there is anything that must be kept “committee-confidential.” Naturally, they will not share this information with others. On other, “non-confidential” matters, our representatives will be expected to verbally solicit input from the BoD and other graduate students, but they must never share detailed written notes (“minutes”) of what occurred at the meeting without formal approval of the committee and the Faculty Board.

and this text in place of 3d:

- d. Some Faculty and Institute Committees operate under a requirement of strict confidentiality; in that case, the candidate will not be expected to provide even verbal reports. Given the lack of oversight, representatives to such Committees should be chosen with great care to ensure that they will adequately represent the needs of graduate students.

Discussion: After each committee meeting, Marissa would like committee representatives to ask what can and cannot be shared with others and whether it is permitted to solicit opinions on the topics discussed.

Chip said that last year they had a communications task force. Only administrative people were at the first meeting. At the meeting, Chip mentioned how difficult it is to do our job with this culture of secrecy. He was told there is not a culture of secrecy on campus and that anything he is told at a committee is not secret unless explicitly told it is secret. Ileana said that at later meetings, they reversed themselves and said that things are confidential and cannot be put up on websites.

Marissa would like to have a system whereby we get info to the students we’re representing. Chip points out that these guidelines apply to faculty but not administrative committees. However, the new guidelines we are discussing would be good for both type of committees. For us to keep track of things that go on, we should ask about confidentiality after each meeting. Kim suggests that we talk to the committee chair and say that we will share anything herein out unless told otherwise.

Marissa says that will be fine so long as representatives can negotiate that deal with individual committee chairs.

One slight conflict in views is that in David Goodwin's view, students are there to provide an individual perspective while our view is that students must represent the entire student body.

Chip suggests adding "although they must still do as much as possible to ensure they represent a broad student viewpoint" to the end of the 2nd sentence in 3a.

Steve would like to see something to ensure continuity between old and new representatives. New representatives need to know what has been going on in the committee. It should be the position of student representative that has the right to know things and not specific people. However, the old representative is still bound by confidentiality. We should recommend that representatives keep written notes to share with old representatives. Do we want to add a clause where personal written notes can be shared with new representatives? To the end of 3a we will add a comma and then the following text: "except when such written notes are shared or presented to another representative to the committee. However, representatives are still bound by confidentiality agreements after their tenure on the committee."

**ACTION:** The text as modified in this meeting was passed with one abstention.

## **B. Graduate Housing Committee (Catharine Larsen)**

### Graduate Life Office

In meetings with Tom Mannion and Fred Romberg, advice on graduate student services has been solicited. It is our position that graduate student life is strongly academic and that graduate students need more avenues to deal with issues arising in the research setting and not necessarily the residential setting. Since the Graduate Life Office is in the process of being formed, now is a good time for us to give essential input to Student Affairs. We would like the Housing Committee to draft a document that enumerates the functions we would like to see in the office and gives concrete ideas for projects and goals.

*Discussion:* Catharine told Steve that she can't come to future BoD meetings and asked if someone else wants to be housing chair. Fred asks in assessing what a graduate life office would do, is it best to have the housing committee look at it or have a separate committee do it? He believes that there might be a difference in scope between the charter of the Graduate Life Office and the purpose of the housing committee. Fred needs and welcomes the help and would be interested in leading committee that examines what a graduate life office should do. Chip suggests that the Dean's report could address these issues. One suggestion for the office is that ongoing contact and programming would be helpful. Should this be the job of the QoL or a new committee? Fred wants to go outside of Caltech and look at other offices at Stanford and other schools. Marissa says that this job might be for QoL but it should involve all committees. Perhaps we need a committee with representatives from all the committees? Or should it be the whole BoD who examines this issue? Should we have a special section in our regular BoD meetings? The problem with discussing this in our BoD meetings is that we might want to meet more than once a month and we don't want this issue to consume too much time at

every BoD monthly meeting. Chip is unsure whether the Graduate Life Office and the Dean's Office should be separate. It is suggested that we wait and see what comes of the discussion of the dean's report to take place later in this meeting. We may decide to form a graduate or campus life committee made up of many members of the dean's committee.

**ACTION:** A GSC committee, not necessarily housing, should give input to Student Affairs regarding what we would like to see from a Graduate Life Office. This input should look closely at the GSC report regarding the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

## **C. Publications (Steve Pracko)**

### 1. Committee Chair

If the Publications Committee can't decide upon a new chair at its December meeting, we would like to open the call up to the entire BOD. The chair of this committee needs to be a good motivator, as, unlike some of the other committees, major projects don't often come to us — we have to take the initiative and seek them out.

*Discussion:* John B. says that as the new newsletter editor, he could be publications chair once he is no longer executive director. Would Steve be willing to wait until May and stay publications chair until then? Steve says that he is willing to wait.

**ACTION:** John B. volunteers to be publications chair once his term as GSC executive director ends in May.

### 2. Newsletter Bonus

The Newsletter Editor (Steve Pracko) is paid \$50 per month for preparing the GSC Newsletter. During Steve's tenure as editor, he has helped the Newsletter to grow in both content and quality, making the job significantly harder than when he first began. Recognizing these efforts, the BoD voted to authorize an additional performance-based bonus of \$50 for the Newsletter Editor. Each month, the BoD must vote to decide whether the Editor deserves this bonus for the most recent edition of the Newsletter.

**ACTION:** Steve's newsletter bonus for December was passed with one opposed.

*Discussion:* Fred has a question about our newsletter - he's never seen a copy in his office. The reason why is because it's entirely online now. Maybe offices would like to put out copies on their desk. People besides grad students do get e-mails about the newsletter. Maybe we should let people sign up for the list. Chip suggests that we should use the distribution list maintained by Graphic Arts that goes to all secretaries and ask secretaries to post a copy. Do we want to send newsletter announcements to all faculty and administrators? Marissa says that the faculty list is closely guarded. Steve says that the announcement currently goes to 50-60 faculty and 50-60 administrators. It seems like this is a good system. We should put something on the website that says if you want to receive newsletter announcements, you should e-mail this person.

**ACTION:** As Compczar, Jon G. will add to the website a sentence that explains how to be added to the list that receives newsletter announcements.

#### **D. Survey Committee**

##### Survey Committee Gift

At the last board meeting, we had a discussion about gifts for the Survey Committee. The issue was raised because Heather wanted to purchase something for the members of the survey committee. Heather has looked into the coffee mug prices a bit more and has found a store that will sell mugs, personalized, for \$3.30 each as long as at least 12 are ordered. There would probably be an extra charge for shipping. This might make a nice gift for Miriam Feldblum and Mike Alvarez, too, who were both extremely helpful to the committee.

The subject of gifts was to be discussed on the gscbod mailing list, but the only comment on the subject was provided by Heather, who reiterated her desire to buy everyone something small, like a mug. :)

**ACTION:** The vote to allocate funding for mugs for Survey Committee members was passed with 2 abstentions.

*Discussion:* Kim doesn't want to forego giving the committee any money just because Heather is not comfortable accepting money. Except for the coding, the survey committee members didn't expect money for their efforts. Kim says that any staff member would be paid for doing this work. Ileana suggests that instead of giving cash, we should give a nice gift. After all, we are a volunteer organization. Kim thinks that we should carefully consider whether we should pay for certain tasks. The survey committee reached the conclusion that its members couldn't invest so much time again for future reports so they secured MHF funding for future reports. They decided not to ask for money retroactively for their past work since it was a volunteer effort. John M. points out that people have other motivations than money to do GSC work. Kim thinks that money is better than gifts that people don't want. The GSC should budget for future reports. Marissa thinks that before starting large projects, the GSC should more carefully consider whether positions should be paid (i.e. survey editor). Jon G. thinks if we do decide to pay people, we should keep the pay small because some people do it for other motivations. Lauren points out that paid positions such as the Technique editor have oversight but the survey committee didn't have any oversight. John M. suggests that we should fundraise around campus before undertaking major tasks. Alisa thinks it is reasonable to recognize people who put in a lot of effort (not only survey committee but perhaps committee chairs). Marissa thinks we should discuss paying volunteers over e-mail. Perhaps instead of cash, we could have recognition dinners. Jon G. brings up the fact that if we pay for volunteer work, we will waste a lot of time at meetings discussing how much we should pay for each thing. As a student who has to pay dues, Lauren wonders how the student body would feel about us using their membership fees to pay ourselves. Alex is in the process of examining our budget.

Out of \$50,000 we spent approximately \$3000-\$4000 on ourselves. We should examine the overheads of other non-profits.

Marissa would like everyone to take two fliers for the cost of living survey report to post around campus.

Marissa would like to discuss record-keeping of e-mail voting. It is her suggestion that we add the honor code and cost of living results to these minutes. In the future, we will add the results of votes to the updates and reports section of the previous month's minutes. If there was any discussion, a brief summary will be included. The tally of votes will be the same as in our meeting minutes – the numbers of opposed and abstentions but not the numbers of approved will be recorded. Chip suggests that we should add this to the Code of Law on the website. **ACTION:** The vote for establishing a procedure for publishing results for pre-approved e-mail votes was passed. A brief summary of the discussion and a tally of the vote will be recorded in the previous month's minutes. We will then vote on those minutes at the next month's BoD meeting.

#### Results of Honor Code Survey Report E-mail Vote:

The vote to put the GSC name and implicit stamp of approval on the Honor Code survey report was conducted over email from Nov. 19, 2003 to Nov. 20, 2003. The vote passed with 2 against.

#### Results of Cost of Living Survey Report E-mail Vote:

The vote to put the GSC name and implicit stamp of approval on the Cost of Living survey report was conducted over email from Dec. 16, 2003 to Dec. 18, 2003. The vote passed unanimously.

Jeff thinks that quickfunding should have something a similar system to record our decisions. He will include quickfunding decisions in the updates and reports section under the budget committee.

### **E. Dean of Graduate Studies Committee**

We have the final draft of our report regarding the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies [attached].

*Discussion:* Lauren noticed a split infinitive – “to actively consider” should be “to consider actively.” The committee decided that split infinitives are not technically incorrect. There may be minor typos such as an extra “the.”

Alisa thinks that the executive summary seems a little forceful in the way it begins. To soften it, we should move the italicized sentences from the introduction to the beginning of the executive summary.

Chip thinks we should do some formatting such as adding in a title page. John B. says he needs to give the final report to Margo by 5 p.m. today.

Marissa briefly went over the history of the committee. The major suggested change within the report is to remove the clerical duties of financial aid and admissions from the Dean's office. These functions would then be performed by the admissions and financial aid office or the options (in the case of admissions). Removing these functions from the Dean's office frees up the dean's and staff's

time. We would like to see a full-time associate dean and two low-level secretaries. The Dean's office functions would include innovative policy-making, looking at peer institutions, sitting on committees, and advocating for grad students. One of the politically sensitive sections is the Current Problems section. Margo thought she might have problems pitching the report because people wouldn't see what was wrong with the office now. We put a section in that we hope is diplomatic (we had avoided it before for diplomatic reasons). If approved today, Margo and Dean Hoffmann will be presenting the results to IACC.

Kim asks whether the GSC will have representation on the search committee for a new Dean. Yes, we have been informally promised that our input will be solicited. Margo has already asked us for input. Not that many people will want this job.

We won't get everything we ask for in this report, mostly for financial reasons. For example, there will probably be only one instead of two secretaries. Margo has been actively giving us feedback on our suggestions. We know that the recommendations are mostly acceptable to her already.

Besides Margo, other people would support us being on a search committee. When Chris Brennan stepped down as VPSA, the GSC wrote the president and said we wanted to be on the search committee and he supported us.

Steve does not agree with the statement on page 5 of the report that says graduate school is not a culling process. Some options have a different philosophy and do weed students out. We shouldn't tell the grad office that they have to support one option's philosophy over another. Chip asks if there are any options that do weed students out because he is not aware of any that do so. The idea behind that statement is that the Dean's office should believe in each student's ability. Perhaps we can change the wording. Jon G. thinks that there are some students who shouldn't be here but that graduate school shouldn't be a culling process (i.e. expect that some people will leave). Caltech shouldn't admit more students than it can handle. The Dean should give students the benefit of the doubt. John M. thinks that exit interviews will address this concern by making sure that people are leaving because they want to and not because of a failure in the admissions process. Steve thinks it is the humane response to say that graduate school shouldn't be a culling process but from the institute point of view it may not be the best viewpoint. Some people who look good on paper are not good researchers. John M. says that the principle of the report is that happy grad students will improve Caltech. It is decided that we will remove the phrase "culling process."

How realistic is it to recommend that admissions be taken out of the Dean's office but still expect that the Dean will oversee and audit the admissions processes? We would like the Dean to oversee trends. Kim asks what happens when an option doesn't admit good applicants but then the Dean has to advocate for those poor students? This is a self-correcting problem because options always want good students.

There was much thought given to what tools the Dean will have to do his/her job. The Dean will still control institute fellowships and set TA policy. If an option doesn't admit women in a reasonable rate, the Dean can cut fellowships and TA money. However, the Dean's real power will be through personal persuasion and political skills.

Fred asks whether it might be to the GSC's advantage to hear any feedback from Margo before approving the report. We've had feedback from her and indirectly from the provost the whole time we were developing our report.

**ACTION:** The vote to approve the report with the changes discussed today along with minor typo changes was approved with one abstention. We are satisfied that the report states our position and we will now have to negotiate for what will actually happen.

Steve suggests that we send an e-mail to Fred with a link to the report once it is posted.

**F. Budget Committee (Alex Tobias)**

Alex asks that everyone give him receipts, especially for the past fiscal year. NSO was underspent and he wonders if this is because people haven't turned their receipts in yet.

Meeting adjourned: 1:40 p.m.

### **III. UPDATES AND REPORTS**

**A. Academics Committee (Jeff Bergthorson)**

1. Course Reviews:

VP Marshak suggested that we bring questionnaire that contains the questions that will be asked to the appropriate parties (Provost, Division Chairs, etc.). The purpose of these reviews is to:

- 1) Provide information to students when choosing courses
- 2) Provide feedback to TAs about how to improve their teaching skills
- 3) Provide feedback to faculty on the course and their teaching

We are working with Kathryn Hsu, chair of the ASCIT Academics & Research Committee to produce a form that will be acceptable to both Graduate and Undergraduate students. We are also going to meet with Scott Fraser, head of the Core Curriculum Committee, as that committee has been charged by CUE (Council on Undergraduate Education) to design a web-based feedback and evaluation system for the Core undergraduate classes (Phys 1, etc.).

2. Everhart Lecture Series

The lectures have been scheduled for Feb. 4 (Houman Hemmati), March 10 and May 5 (Melinda Kellog and Shane Ross). Lectures will be in the Lees-Kubota lecture hall, 4pm. Lectures will be webcast at no cost to the GSC.

3. GSC Teaching Awards

Amir and Sherry Suyu of the Academics committee have volunteered to organize these this year. They currently have 8 nominations.

4. Lab Reviews:

Have been posted.

#### 5. Workshop

Workshop - "How to deal effectively with your advisor" - will be held in late January or so. The Ombuds office and CDC have agreed to help out with planning and funding.

### **B. Graduate Housing Committee (Catharine Larsen)**

#### 1. CITNet in the Catalinas

The Catalina Housing complex is being wired building by building for the long-anticipated Ethernet connection.

#### 2. Catalina Housing Policies

They are updated online in nearly final form, including noise, fire, and links to Student Affairs' event registration site. <http://www.its.caltech.edu/~cats/policies/>

#### 3. Lease Violations

A report of graduate students renting out one of their two bedrooms to multiple couples after sending away the son who was the only reason they got a 2-bedroom property is being investigated. The complaint made by a graduate student was forwarded to the GRB as it is also an Honor Code violation.

#### 4. Faculty Housing Committee

Results from that meeting are fairly hush-hush.

### **C. Publications (Steve Pracko)**

#### 1. Technique

We're still working on the selection process for the next Technique editor(s). We hope to work out an arrangement with the Graduate Office so that the GSC has oversight over how and when payment is made to the editor(s).

#### 2. Display Case

The display case saga continues, as Caltech is now not certain if there are steel tubes in the Winnett staircase or not. Even if there aren't, they don't want to cut into the structure too much, so we may need to go with a shallower case or only partially recess a deep one.

#### 3. GSC web site

Jon Galownia has been toying around with a new design for the web site, and we may want to consider letting him do the whole job (we would need to decide upon payment in advance if we go this route). The Pubs Committee needs to discuss this among ourselves first.

#### 4. Handbook

Is still up in limbo and would be a good first project for a new committee chair to get under control.

## **D. Quality of Life (Jonathan Galownia)**

### 1. Lab Safety

We met with Caz, Margo and Dean Hoffmann to further discuss graduate lab safety. Caz explained the structure and hierarchy of the safety system and the various safety nets in place. QoL indicated the parts of the safety structure which were not functioning properly, with major emphasis on the safety officer network. Reliability problems and public image were also discussed. By the end of the meeting, all agreed that a unified, top down approach and clear policy would be most beneficial to lab safety. Dean Hoffmann invited us to the GSC-II committee to present our concerns to the faculty, and suggested that an active committee should be formed to address safety concerns. Caz promised to begin regular submissions to the graduate student newsletter

### 2. Benefits

See the December GSC Newsletter for details. Graduate students may now participate in the Institutes Tax Deferred Annuity program to the extent they have W-2 wages and meet other eligibility guidelines. Elida Guillen (x6483) is the primary contact in Caltech HR. So far, Benefits has not yet determined how to interface with Caltech payroll to implement the policy for graduate students. Elida will contact students who have expressed interest in the plan as soon as a solution is found.

### 3. Health Insurance

See the December GSC Newsletter for details. Tom Schmitt has named Anita Jarvis (x4665) as the primary on campus student contact for health insurance issues. Tom has also agreed to include the QoL committee in yearly negotiations with Chickering regarding small changes to the health insurance plan. The prescription problem has still not yet been completely resolved. We are not sure at this time what additional work has been done to solve the problem, but HR did release an email and a newsletter report detailing the workings of the temporary fix.

# Student Representatives

*Approved by BoD vote July 18, 2002*

*Modified by BoD vote Jan. 8, 2004*

The GSC is often faced with the need to provide student representation for an Institute Committee. Sometimes, we are contacted by others and asked to provide a representative to a given Committee; on other occasions, we need to contact the Chair of the committee to request that he or she include a student representative.

According to the Institute's bylaws, Faculty Committees are required to include graduate student representatives. Administrative Committees have no such requirement, although the Chair of the committee is often willing to allow student representation.

At least once per year, the GSC officers should look through the listing of Faculty and Administrative Committees (in the back of the course catalog) to ensure that we are not missing an opportunity for student representation. We should be well-represented on all Faculty Committees that are relevant to graduate students, and every effort should be made to secure representation on relevant Administrative Committees.

## Guidelines

1. When a student representative is needed, the relevant GSC Committee(s) should identify good candidates; however, final approval must come from the BoD.
2. In order to find the most qualified representatives, the BoD is encouraged to use the following order of precedence, although exceptions can be made when appropriate.
  - a. Students who serve on the relevant GSC Committee(s) are likely to have the best knowledge of the issues and should be given priority.
  - b. If no one on the GSC Committee(s) is willing to serve as a student representative, or if no "relevant" GSC Committee can be identified, then an attempt should be made to find a representative from the BoD.
  - c. Failing that, the BoD should seek representatives from the entire student body.
3. Students who represent the GSC on Institute and Faculty Committees **MUST** agree to maintain close contact with the GSC.
  - b. Our committee representatives, after each meeting, should ask the other committee members there if there is anything that must be kept "committee-confidential." Naturally, they will not share this information with others, although they must still do as much as possible to ensure they represent a broad student viewpoint. On other, "non-confidential" matters, our representatives will be expected to verbally solicit input from the BoD and other graduate students, but they must never share detailed written notes ("minutes") of what occurred at the meeting without formal approval of the committee and the Faculty Board, except when such written notes are shared or presented to another representative to the committee.

However, representatives are still bound by confidentiality agreements after their tenure on the committee.

- c. If the Institute Committee covers topics that are relevant to a GSC Committee, the representative will be expected to attend meetings of that Committee. The Chair of the Committee will be responsible for maintaining contact with the representative, and reports should be included as part of that Committee's minutes.
- d. If no relevant GSC Committee can be found, the GSC Executive Director shall be responsible for maintaining contact with the representative, and reports should be included as part of the BoD minutes.
- e. Some Faculty and Institute Committees operate under a requirement of strict confidentiality; in that case, the candidate will not be expected to provide even verbal reports. Given the lack of oversight, representatives to such Committees should be chosen with great care to ensure that they will adequately represent the needs of graduate students.