

# MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting - Graduate Student Council  
Thursday, June 3rd, 2004, 12:00 – 1:40 pm  
Winnett Club Room or Lounge (Above the Bookstore)

**Directors Present:** John Bender, Alex Brown, Jonathan Galownia, Niki Galownia, Sidharth Jaggi, Amir Sadjadpour, Emily Schaller, Matthew (Chip) Sumner, Jennifer Witman

**Directors Absent:** Deniz Armani, Alexei Dvoretzkii, Andrea Martin, Eugene Mahmoud, Graeme Smith, Karen Smith, Catherine Ward

**Guests:** Stacey Boland (grad student and nominee for the search committee for the graduate dean), Terrell Neal (grad student and ACADOMA nominee), Steve Pracko (grad student), Mary Moreley (Registrar)

## I. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

### A. Call to Order -12:05

There was a quorum of directors present to start the meeting.

### B. Introduction of Guests

Our guests this meeting, Mary Moreley, Terrell Neal, Stacey Boland, and Steve Pracko, and the board introduced themselves.

## II. ACTION ITEMS

### A. Steering Committee (Amir Sadjadpour )

#### 1. Modifications to the Agenda

No one had any additions to make.

**ACTION:** There were no modifications to the agenda.

#### 2. Approval of the new ACADOMA representatives

Amir invited Terrell Neal to explain to the board why he was interested in serving on the Administrative Committee on Diversity and Minority Affairs (ACODAMA).

Terrell has been very involved at Caltech. He has served as a member of the BoD in the Underrepresented Committee, represented graduate students on search committees, and hosted YESS and MURF students. He has also helped with orientation and Caltech Preview events. He told us that diversity initiatives were important to him.

The second nominee for ACODAMA, Princess Imoukheude was unable to attend the meeting. Amir read a statement that she had e-mailed him:

Hello, my name is Princess Imoukhuede, and I am excited to be a GSC representative to ACODAMA. I feel drawn to this position because leadership in diversity has always been a cornerstone of my life. In the past, I chaired MIT's

Undergraduate Association Committee on Multiculturalism, and I created a highly successful symposium aimed at inspiring students towards social responsibility in the midst of academic excellence. My desire is to be a powerful voice for graduate students regarding diversity on ACODAMA. I would consider myself successful if I can help move Caltech to a place where diversity is appreciated and the campus climate for minority students and women has been improved.

**ACTION:** The board approved Terrell Neal and Princess Imoukheude as representatives to ACODAMA with one abstention

### 3. Approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies Search Committee Representatives

Amir announced that three students have volunteered to be the graduate student representatives on the Dean of Graduate Studies search committee. They are John Bender, Catherine Ward (absent) and Stacey Boland. He asked Stacy and John to explain why there were interested in serving on this committee.

Stacey Boland was recently a representative on the Dean of Students search committee recently and hopes to bring her experience to this new search committee.

John Bender offered if anyone else wants to serve that they were welcome. He was interested in serving because of his involvement with a study of the Office of Graduate Studies. He was one of the authors on the GSC report dated January 2004 “Functional Improvements in the Office of Graduate Studies for the Future of Caltech’s Graduate Program”.

Chip asked what happened to the Dean of Students search committee, on which Stacey Boland and Jenny Witman had served.. Professor Jean-Paul Revel had stepped down from the position, but had decided to resume his duties. Stacey said that the committee had pretty much finished their work prior to the announcement. They had given Margo Marshak a brief description of each candidate.

**ACTION:** The Board approved the selection of John Bender, Catherine Ward and Stacey Boland to the Dean of Graduate Studies Search Committee.

### 4. Approval of the May meeting minutes

Amir called for a vote to approve the May meeting minutes.

**ACTION:** The board approved the May meeting minutes with two abstentions.

### 5. Discussion with Mary Morley (Registrar)

Mary Morley has joined us today to discuss the new REGIS system with us. She asked for our input about the registrar’s office. She is seeking student’s view to prioritize implementing new features of the Regis system. She is also looking for new representatives for the REGIS committee. At other schools, the on-line system included class rosters and academic history available for both students and to the advisor in a more real time environment. She hopes to enhance coordination between Grad Office and Registrars office. The new system should help with paperwork and move work flow to various offices to an online format. This will improve the process. She is also looking for student representatives who would

work for pay. She would like to hear about areas where current services could be improved. She is also looking at customer service in the registrar's office. She would welcome student's comments over e-mail or in person.

Jon Galownia asked about the lab survey that Andrea has been working to promote. Mary said that they already have six filed. She said that students complete them while their paperwork was being processed in her office. Jon Galownia thought that their might be both a lab survey and an exit survey, however Steve thought it was the same survey in different forms.

Chip asked whether students leaving with a terminal masters also received the survey. Mary replied that they did. John Bender then asked if there was a terminal masters blank on the lab survey form. Chip also wondered whether the survey was clear if a student had multiple advisors.

The conversation turned to discussion of the new 'REGIS' system. Chip said that REGIS required personal information including social security number and birth date in order to obtain password. Niki said that she had called the registrar to avoid giving this information and had obtained her password that way. Mary inquired if Niki had been asked questions over the phone. Niki didn't recall being asked any questions.

Stacey noted that the faculty minutes had commented that there would be a degree audit via the 'REGIS' system. Mary confirmed that this would be the case and said the timeline would be 12 months. She said that another feature that would be added was on-line add/drop forms.

Jon Galownia asked if the registrar's office was aware of the course reviews and the TA evaluations. Chip said CUE was working on a course reviews for the core classes and would later be rolled out across the university. Mary said Dr. Frasier mentioned it to her but she didn't have many details. Amir commented that Jeff might have more information.

Chip asked about whether the system was capable of degree audits with old versus new requirements. The system can handle keeping track of each catalog. Mary said that students might even be able to compare different years requirements.

Stacey said that she would like to get notices for grade corrections. She requested the system could send e-mail to let students know. In the past she had received the wrong grade due to an input error, but she wasn't aware of it until she requested a transcript.

Mary mentioned that the drop-add period is much longer than other schools. Mary asked if we though this would be changed. Jon Galownia said the undergrad would rebel if this was changed. Chip added that the purpose of the long drop-add period was to allow students to find out their midterm grades before making the final decision to continue with a class.

Sidharth was concerned about fines for late registration, particularly if advisors didn't approve the schedule in time. He noted that some advisors won't use the system. Mary is monitoring the e-mail from the system to track advisors concerns with using the system. Mary said that fines won't be accessed for students if advisors don't approve or respond within the given time. Jon Galownia, Niki, Stacey said that the e-mail students receive indicates that it is the students responsibility to insure that their advisors approve their schedule in time. They

requested that the e-mail be changed to not indicate that it is the student's responsibility.

Sidharth said that the GSC would be happy to send an e-mail on Mary's behalf. Chip added that the academics committee would probably like to send a member to join the student committee.

Niki asked if the transcripts were available via an on-line order. Mary said that they were not. Niki added that she would like this option. Amir said he just e-mailed Tess to request a transcript; however Niki said that she had not been able to request a transcript by e-mail.

**ACTION:** Discussion.

We took a break for lunch at 12:40.

Amir announced that for a trial period the underrepresented students committee would like to provide food each month to encourage clubs to be involved with the GSC. The food this month was ordered by the Friends of Iranian Culture at California Institute of Technology. Lunch will continue to be funded by the GSC.

#### 6. Discussion of the GSC Banquet for last year's BoD

Niki started the discussion by noting that the banquet was technically for the previous year's BoD. She noted that it had been budgeted for the previous year. Alex said that we had plenty of money and John Bender mentioned that we had plenty of retained earnings. Chip wondered how much money we should spend on ourselves and noted that in previous years he board had to pay for part of the event.

The retreat was then brought up. Because Capra ranch has been closed it will be more expensive. Steve said that there was to be an endowment for student group retreats, so we might not need to pay at all. John Bender then stated that the best way to spend money was with more socials and parties.

On the subject of the Banquet, Amir stated that he would like both this year's board and last year's board to attend so that they can have a chance for discussion. Stacey said that this made sense to her. Amir asked if there were any other thoughts. John Bender asked if spouses would need to pay for the event. Niki said that they were not paid for. It was considered a conflict of interest, but they could elect to pay and attend. John asked when we would have a budget. Chip suggested that we vote to provide a per person cost for Niki so that she can make a reservation. Niki thought that \$30 would be a good sum. Alex suggested and we voted for \$30 per person capped at \$1000.

**ACTION:** There was a vote and the budget was approved. Niki volunteered to coordinate this event.

#### Agenda addition: Retreat

An item was then added to the agenda. Chip said that the last GSC retreat was in January which was too late. August and September, with NSO (new student orientation) are not the best time either. So July and October were suggested. In the past the retreat started Friday evening and went through Sunday morning. The

business of the retreat was Saturday from 10am to 6pm. Other time was used for team building and socialization. In previous years the triumvirate organized the event. Last year, however, vice Chair was in charge.

Chip said Capra Ranch had joint cooking facilities. Niki said we will need around \$700 for the property in Arrowhead. Last year, Lauren Webb looked into a place in Newport beach, but the decision was not to hold the retreat

Amir will ask Deniz to be in contact with Lauren, Niki and Siddarth about location.

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

### 1. New Faculty Health Committee Representative

Emily Schaller has volunteered to be the new student representative on the faculty health committee for this year. QoL recommends the board approve Emily for this position.

**ACTION:** Vote to approve Emily Schaller as Health Committee Representative.

Emily has volunteered to be added to the health committee to replace existing ones as they retire.

Board voted to approve

## **C. Bylaws Committee (Matthew Sumner)**

### 1. Vote on amended Bylaws, section 3.03

Chip called our attention to the following section of the bylaws:

“The Board is limited in what can be amended without a full vote of the members by Article XIII of the Bylaws. Consider that “...the Board may adopt, amend, or repeal Bylaws unless the action would **materially and adversely** affect the members' voting rights. The Board may not extend the term of a director beyond that for which the director was elected (8.01).” With this and other restrictions of Article XIII in mind, the Bylaws Committee has drafted a revised version of section 3.03. ... The new Bylaws provide for late nominations of directors-at-large, and they prohibit current directors from giving written endorsement of nominees. Several other points of confusion are clarified in the revision.”

Chip gave each director an updated copy of the proposed bylaws amendment. He reminded us that the board can only approve the amendment if they deem that it does not ‘materially and adversely’ affect the students’ rights. John asked what the were the arguments for and against the issue concerning the negative affect on student’s rights. Chip suggested that we revisit that issue after considering the amendments.

Chip then went over the amendments. He said the new wording made it clear that current directors can’t sign their own petition or that of other directors. It also made clarified that after the ten day waiting period if there were too many applications for director at large the board would vote to select a candidate.

Another important change is if there must be 10 members in an option to get representatives, they could affiliate only with other small options. They can now affiliate with larger options. John Bender clarified that even if there was two small option then they could still go to larger options.

Sidharth asked what is the difference between option reps and directors at large.

Chip said that there wasn't a difference in practical way and that there wasn't a specific role spelled out in the bylaws.

Chip said that there would now be a 10 day waiting period for late option representatives that would allow for other members of the option to be considered. He also stated that it would be harder to stack the board because that there would be more people from more options, there is still a 10 day window, all nominations are considered simultaneously, only one Director at large from a single option per could be elected in each 4 week period. The first things that would occur in a meeting is that must be a vote on directors at large. If there is a surplus, they would be rank ordered vote.

Alex asked how the rank ordered vote would be administered. Chip said that the board could choose how to do it. He also clarified who could not sign a nomination form; only current board members are excluded.

Amir asked for special case Min Tao, that requiring signatures from 6 different options is harder, we need help her help. He mentioned that the Bylaws are there to help facilitate the way the GSC works and not to be a burden.

Chip pointed out that the GRB administers the honor code. Their bylaws are protected. If an option feels that there has been a violation, they could review the situation. John Bender said that we are trying really hard to prevent someone to take unfair advantage of the board. But since we already have an honor code it shouldn't be a problem. Chip said that the bylaws were originally voted upon in a way that included these restrictions so in that spirit the amendments were needed.

Jon Galownia said that requiring 20 signatures for late director at large nominations was too discouraging. Sidharth said 1 month waiting period before voting on the new director was harsh. Chip said he wanted to prevent a new member from having a vote at having a new meeting immediately. John Bender said waiting to have a vote isn't a really a difficulty.

Chip returned to the issue of the special exemption for Min. Steve suggested that she become the acting chair until she became a full director. Amir asked about reducing the requirements for the late nomination of directors-at-large. There was a consensus to change waiting period to 3 weeks for Director at large, reduce to 12 people and 5 options.

Niki felt that it should be a little harder to make it be more work so that nominees would make it more of a priority. Jon Galownia agreed and said that it would be harder. After a straw pole, Chip announced that 12 signatures and 5 different options represented is the official action. John Bender requested we vote on all these corrections as a block.

Alex pointed out that the retiring directors can't nominate next year's board. Chip said that would limit the current board's power to influence next year's vote. Emily pointed out that it requires only two signatures to be an option representative which doesn't present a hardship for a nominee.

Before calling for a vote Chip said that we can't vote in favor of the amendments if we would be decreasing member's rights. When asked why these amendments might decrease member's rights, Chip said that we are diluting the votes of the on time nominees. However the counter to that argument is that there are more representatives. Niki pointed out that we would also get more done, which benefits

the members. Jon Galownia reminded us that the precedence is set based on votes for option representatives.

(Secretary's note: This is the final text of the amendments)

**Section 3.03. Election and Term of Office.** Directors shall be elected by written ballot of the members at the Institute during the second week of the spring term of the academic year in accordance with Section 2.08 and this Section 3.03.

(a) **Qualification.** Only currently enrolled students of an academic option of the Institute may be elected as a director of the corporation by the members enrolled in that option.

(b) **Election.**

1. **Nominations:** The graduate students of the Institute shall be notified of a forthcoming election of directors no later than ten (10) days before nominations for directors are due. Directors for an option shall be nominated by written endorsement by two members of such option other than the nominee; all nominations shall be accompanied by the written consent of the nominee. Nomination of each director at large requires the written endorsement of ten students other than the nominee representing at least four different options and shall be accompanied by the written consent of the nominee. Written endorsement from directors currently serving on the Board cannot be used to satisfy the requirements for nomination as an option representative or a director-at-large.

2. **Selection of Option Representatives:** With respect to a particular option, if the number of nominees is equal to or less than the number of directors that such option is entitled to elect, as determined under Section 3.03(c), the nominees may be declared the directors without election unless an election is requested by five (5) or more members enrolled in such option. Otherwise, if the number of nominees is greater than the number of directors, an election of the members in that option shall be held. A simple majority of a quorum of the members voting at such election shall be required to elect a director.

3. **Selection of Directors-at-Large:** If more nominations for director-at-large are submitted that are allowed under Section 3.03(c), the selection of directors shall be made by the Board pursuant to Section 3.03(d).

(c) **Determination of Number of Directors.** Members in each academic option in which ten (10) or more members are then enrolled shall be entitled to elect one director for each fifty members, or fraction thereof, currently enrolled in the option. One director-at-large is authorized for every 200 members in the corporation or fraction thereof. Members in each academic option in which fewer than ten (10) members are then enrolled (an "Underenrolled Option") shall affiliate themselves, for purposes of electing a director, with one or more other academically related Underenrolled Options, so that the total enrollment of the affiliated Underenrolled Options is at least ten members. In the event that an academically related Underenrolled Option cannot be identified, an Underenrolled Option may affiliate itself with an academically related Option having ten or more students. Any disputes regarding affiliation of Underenrolled Options shall be resolved by the GRB Chair

pursuant to Section 3.03 (f) below.

(d) **Directors-at-Large.** The directors at large shall be nominated by the members of the corporation, as provided in Section 3.03(b) above. The nomination shall be presented to the Council by the nominee, and the Board of Directors of the Council shall vote to confirm or reject the nomination by a simple majority of a quorum of the Board. The vote to confirm or reject nominees for director-at-large must occur at the first Board meeting after nominations have been submitted and after the ten-day waiting period for simultaneous late nominations (described in Section 3.03(e)(2), below) has passed. Except for the special case of multiple late nominations from a single option (see Section 3.03(e)(2), below), the Board must vote to confirm or reject the pending nominees before taking other votes. In the event that the number of nominees exceeds the number of vacancies, the Board may first vote to determine the order in which nominees will be confirmed or rejected; once enough nominees have been confirmed to fill all vacancies, remaining nominees shall be automatically rejected. The timely nominees for director-at-large shall be confirmed or rejected by the incoming Board during the annual meeting held according to Section 3.06.

(e) **Late nominations.** Late nominations for option representatives and directors-at-large shall be accepted according to the following rules.

1. **Late Option Nominations.** If no nominations for director are received from an option for one or more seats on the Board of Directors, those seats may remain unfilled. If after the deadline for regular nominations, there remain vacant seats within an option, upon subsequent nomination of a director by the written endorsement of four (4) members of the option (other than the nominee or current directors), accompanied by the written consent of the nominee, the nominee shall be declared a director for that option without election. In the case of simultaneous late nominations of more candidates than there are vacancies, a byelection of the members shall be held. Late nominations for option representative from a given option received within ten days of the first late nomination for that position shall be considered to be simultaneous nominations, and a late nominee shall not be allowed to serve as a director until the end of that time period.

2. **Late Director-at-Large Nominations.** If after the deadline for regular nominations, there remain vacant seats for directors-at-large, late directors-at-large may be appointed if the nominees fulfill these three requirements: (1) the nominee must submit the written endorsement of twelve (12) members of the corporation (other than the nominee or current directors) representing at least five (5) options; (2) the nominee must submit their written consent; and (3) the Board of Directors must confirm the nominee pursuant to Section 3.03(d). Late nominations for open director at large positions received within ten days of the first late nomination for such position shall be considered to be simultaneous nominations. In the case of simultaneous late nominations of more candidates than there are vacancies, directors shall be selected through the confirmation process pursuant to Section 3.03(d). Once a director-at-large vacancy is filled by late nomination, nominations for another director-at-large vacancy from a member of the same option or an affiliated option cannot be voted on for at least three weeks, even if those nominations were

submitted simultaneously. Any other nominations for director-at-large received during those three weeks shall be considered simultaneous. After the three weeks have passed, the Board shall vote to confirm or reject the late nomination(s) at the next Board meeting pursuant to Section 3.03(d).

(f) Administration and Supervision of Elections. The Chair of the Graduate Review Board (GRB Chair) shall administer and certify the annual election of directors, as well as any by elections that are necessary. The GRB Chair shall have the authority to promulgate rules and regulations regarding how elections shall be held, and may delegate his/her authority to administer and supervise such election to other committees and/or individuals selected by the GRB Chair.

**ACTION:** The amendments were approved with one abstention. Chip updated the nomination form.

2. Vote to approve Min Tao as new Director at Large

Amir said he would ask Min to act as the acting Chair of the underrepresented students committee.

**ACTION:** Vote to approve Min Tao will be taken at the next meeting.

**D. Budget Committee (Alex Brown)**

1. Teaching awards over budget

Alex said that the TA and teaching awards will go over budget from \$250 to \$450 this year. We will budget \$600 for this award in the future pending approval of budget. Alex explained that this additional cost would allow for a cash award and a plaque for each of the recipients. Amir said that to make to make the award more prestigious give check to TA and engraved pens for the awards for the mentors and teachers.

Jon Galownia asked why \$600. Alex said that this is the amount he reported to Office of Student Life but could be changed. Steve asked if the money awarded would be per TA, as in some years there are multiple TA's awarded. It was pointed out that we will vote to approve next years budget later, this vote is for only this year's change. Steve asked again if each TA should each get money. John Galownia, John Bender and Amir suggested that we vote ad hoc on that question.

**ACTION:** The change to this year's budget was approved.

2. New issue: Clarification of email voting for Quick Funding

There is a change in the way that the e voting is held. Alex asked what we should do if the case arise that there is 5 at full funding and 5 at partial funding. He suggested the following change.

(Secretaries note: the final text is shown here)

“4. If at least 5 people and at least 60% of respondents vote for Fund, the event is approved for full funding. If not, but at least 5 people and at least 60% of respondents vote for *either full funding or funding a lesser amount*, an award for the

median proposed amount (counting (a) Fund votes as a vote for the full amount requested) is given. If at least 5 people and at least 60% of respondents vote for Do Not Fund, funding for the event is rejected.”

**ACTION:** The clarification to the quick funding rules was approved.

**E. Publications (John Bender)**

1. Newsletter Bonus

The Newsletter Editor (John Bender) is paid \$50 per month for preparing the GSC Newsletter. The BoD has voted to authorize a 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:** The newsletter bonus was approved with one abstention.

**F. Academics Committee (Amir Sadjadpour)**

1. Lab Review Survey

Amir said that an e-mail address has been created just for the lab review editor ([surveyed@caltech.edu](mailto:surveyed@caltech.edu)). [see discussion in Updates and Reports] Every time someone submits a thesis, the lab review editor will be notified. However this creates privacy concerns since the e-mail will be sent closely after someone graduates. However, only the lab review editor would see this change. We were asked to discuss privacy concerns.

John Bender felt that the privacy was insured because only the lab review editor would see the changes. Jon Galownia thought that it would be good idea to state it was confidential. John Bender asked what happens to the paper copies at the registrar’s office. The response was that they were help until the lab review editor picked them up.

Jenny brought up that the minutes will reflect Natalie’s clarification that the Office of Graduate Studies hands out the final paper work, but that they would be happy to add the survey to the packet. Apparently the registrar gives the survey’s out on an ad hoc basis. Emily asked if there were two packets of paperwork, one from the Office of Graduate Studies and one from the Registrar’s office. John Bender said there is just one packet. He was concerned that there might be double counting if given out several times.

(Secretary’s note: This is the text of the clarification from Natalie)

“The final paperwork is actually submitted to the Dean following a successful defense and the Registrar's office notes the information in their database based on information from the Graduate Office. The Registrar verifies the date candidacy was approved by the Dean, two weeks prior to the week of the exam and then does not handle the actual exam form again until a month or two following commencement. If Tess is willing to hand out the survey at this time, that is acceptable to the Graduate Office, but the plan above needs to be clarified to reflect this change. Also, the packet of paperwork that every student receives prior to defending is provided by the Graduate Office and not the Registrar.”

The board wished to have the minutes reflect that the GSC would encourage the Graduate office to work closely with the Registrar's office.

**ACTION:** Discussion of privacy concerns.

**G. Final Notes:**

Amir would like us to schedule vacations to avoid the meeting time. He wants to stress the importance of the BoD meetings.

Chip said that people by default don't want to go to the retreat, so that we have a potential barrier but that would need to overcome. However it is really a great opportunity to plan.

Niki said that it would be hard to find a weekend that everyone was free and that we must start planning ahead of time and inform the Board much earlier.

Meeting adjourned at 1:40pm

**III. UPDATES AND REPORTS**

**A. Quality of Life (Jonathan Galownia)**

1. Steele Lab Update

Faculty and administration are aware of graduate student computing needs. We have been assured that some form of computing accessible to graduate students will remain after the Steele lab closure.

2. Safety

Graduate student safety concerns were presented to the division chairs and Margo Marshak. The division chairs were interested and in some instances surprised by the concerns we brought. No immediate action resulted from the presentation, but QoL will continue to bring the issue to the attention of Faculty and administration.

3. Health Insurance

Re-negotiations with Chickering will begin soon. An email should be sent to the graduate student population to make sure we have to most up to date list of graduate student concerns and praises to present during negotiations.

4. Dental Insurance

The dental plan will be re-negotiated this year. Preliminary meetings indicate that very few plans exist which provide good basic coverage and good extended coverage. If possible, we would like to increase our coverage, but this will most definitely increase our cost. How much are graduate students willing to pay for a better plan? We will need to send an email to gauge interest and commitment of the graduate student population.

**B. Budget Committee (Alex Brown)**

### 1. Office of Campus Life Proposal

I have submitted a request to the office of campus life for \$15,000. Our request includes a preliminary budget.

## **C. Academics Committee (Andrea Martin)**

### 1. Teaching/Mentoring Awards

Awardees are Prof. Wilhelm Schlag for the best teacher. Prof. Kip J. Thorne for the best mentor. Francesco Ciucci for the best TA. The awards will be presented at the Wednesday June 9<sup>th</sup> Faculty Meeting. Sherry Suyu and Amir Sadjadpour will be presenting the awards.

### 2. Lab Review Survey

We are preparing to send out a mass mailing to all students who have graduated with PhD in the past 5 years. When this survey was initially started, it was sent out to students who had graduated in the past 10 years, and many responded. I am coordinating this effort with the Alumni Association (Head Director Andrew Shaindlin). They have all of the mailing addresses for these alumni. We are applying for funding for postage/postcards from the Moore-Huftstedler Fund on July, 6.

To improve advertising for future graduates on campus, in addition to the monthly GSC newsletter advertisement, we are looking at two-fold program: Library and Registrar announcements. Because the path by which it received past approval was not clear, I received approval for this program from VP Margo Marshak on Tuesday. This approval has allowed me to move forward.

However, I'm continuing to look into who approved it previously. So far, the trail has given me the following information:

From Alex Bäcker (previous Acad Committee):

- Ombudsperson Helen Hasenfeld worked on the survey and liked it
- Caltech/JPL legal counsel Victoris Stratman approved it (said there weren't any legal problems with it).

From Janis Schonauer (ombuds office):

- The Grad office didn't approve it for inclusion in the exit packets
- She suggested that Prof. Kiewiet (Dean at that time) might know more information; however he didn't recall this survey, only the graduate course review (which was also the only review I found in the Faculty Board meeting minutes)

Additionally, I believe the Bursar's office didn't approve it to be included in their exit packet (but I'm not sure).

### *Library Plan*

Premise: Once a thesis is finalized, in addition to being approved by the thesis committee, it has to be submitted to the library for the relatively new electronic thesis database (ETD). Because every graduate student, independent of option, is required to go through this process, it is an ideal way of contacting students.

Initially, I had hoped to set-up a system whereby once a thesis is submitted electronically, the person will be redirected to our survey. However, the ETD is managed on a national level (think: Web of Science). Graduate students submitting a thesis are not actually connected to a Caltech server. This means that if the system was set-up how I had initially envisioned, all graduate students (nation-wide) would be directed to our survey. There is a positive side to this system.

When a Caltech graduate submits a thesis, the Caltech library system is notified via email. After several emails, Kim Douglas, the head librarian, approved of the general premise of our idea and suggested that I talk to Betsy Coles, the person who runs this database for Caltech. Betsy offered to add a “durable” email alias to this list. This e-mail alias would be administered by the lab review editor. However this does bring up privacy concerns which lead to the action item above.

#### *Registrar Plan*

Premise: In addition, one of the other final steps is submitting the final paperwork with the Registrar’s office (the signatures of the thesis committee confirming a successful defense, approval of curriculum for PhD by committee) for approval by the Registrar. Because every person gets a packet of this paperwork immediately before defending it is another ideal method of advertising our survey to them, because they can always choose to ignore the e-mail from the lab review editor. My thought is additional advertisement never hurts anyone.

While previously the graduate office and the bursar’s office were against including our survey with paperwork, they now seem more open to the idea.

Clarification sent by Natalie Gilmore:

“The final paperwork is actually submitted to the Dean following a successful defense and the Registrar's office notes the information in their database based on information from the Graduate Office. The Registrar verifies the date candidacy was approved by the Dean, two weeks prior to the week of the exam and then does not handle the actual exam form again until a month or two following commencement. If Tess is willing to hand out the survey at this time, that is acceptable to the Graduate Office, but the plan above needs to be clarified to reflect this change. Also, the packet of paperwork that every student receives prior to defending is provided by the Graduate Office and not the Registrar.”

Plan: After meeting with Mary Morley, the Registrar, and Tess Legaspi, the main registrar office contact for graduate students, we have agreed to set-up an additional advertising system when final paperwork is submitted to Registrar. This will involve Tess copying and handing out paper copies of our survey to students when they arrive to hand in their final paperwork to be approved by the Registrar. Tess has agreed to keep filled out copies of the survey until the lab survey editor can pick them up.