

GSC Board of Directors Meeting
October 3, 2002
Winnett Lounge

The meeting began at 12:08 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Directors Present:

Steve Pracko, Graeme Smith, Michael Johnson, Marissa Mock, Jeff Bergthorson, Stephanie Chow, Heather Cox, Ileana Carpen, Chris Veasey, John Choi, Alex Tobias, Niki Galownia, Chip Sumner, John Dabiri, Ying Gong, Tim Lesko, Jason Cohen, Mike Fleming.

Directors Absent:

Isaac Chenchiah, Harish Bhat, Terrell Neal, Theofilos Strinopoulos.

Guests:

Jon Galownia, Juliane Fry, Brian Sisk, Gustavo Joseph, John Bender, Libby Mayo, Liz Johnson.

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

A. Introduction of Guests.

John Dabiri is a new director from Bioengineering, and Stephanie Chow is a new director from CNS. Gustavo Joseph is a member of the Caltech Y and wants to report on a recent ASCIT survey on the Honor Code; Liz Johnson is from the Caltech Project for Effective Teaching and will present the results of their TA survey. Juliane Fry is a candidate for Lab Reviews Editor, nominated by the Academics Committee. Brian Sisk is a *Technique* editor.

B. Additions to the Agenda.

Jason wanted to make sure that the money allocated to Prufrock for their Halloween party would be accessible by Halloween, and proposed a vote on this if necessary. Chip suggested we wait until we discussed the budget to address this issue.

C. Approval of the Minutes of September.

The minutes for September 5 were approved with corrections.

GUEST PRESENTATIONS

1. Results of the Survey of Teaching Assistants

Liz Johnson gave a presentation on the teaching survey the Caltech Project for Effective Teaching (CPET; formerly known as the TA Training group) distributed

last year. The report itself should be out in about two weeks, and accessible from the CPET website (<http://www.its.caltech.edu/~ta/>). The results of the survey will be presented to the Faculty Board by CPET. The purpose of the survey was to try to understand the teaching assistant experience at Caltech, identify areas of that experience that need improvement, and to see what teaching resources and programs would be useful. The survey was distributed to current Caltech students who have TA'ed at least once; there were 785 possible respondents and 308 people responded to the survey.

Liz went on to highlight some of the results of the survey. The faculty are perceived as valuing teaching less than the students value teaching (and less than students feel teaching should be valued). The most frequently encountered problems TAs had were: not having enough interaction with students, conflicts with their thesis advisor over the amount of time spent being a TA, and difficulty with the professor teaching the course. Survey respondents felt that things that would help them be more effective TAs were salary bonuses, TA evaluations from students, departmental and campus-wide TA training, and a TA handbook. 83% of the respondents plan to teach after they leave Caltech, and 40% had no previous experience teaching before arriving at Caltech. 50% didn't know how much they were paid to be TAs, and 31% reported getting feedback when it was available. Write-in comments highlighted problems with faculty members: there are both communications problems and a general feeling that the faculty are not interested in teaching. Also, a small but vocal percentage of the respondents felt that the Honor Code was not followed by students.

CPET has several recommendations arising from the survey. They have produced evaluation forms TAs can use to assess their performance and a handbook with information about being a TA at Caltech, which they handed out to first-year graduate students who will have a TA assignment. They have also begun a TA orientation program this year for all first years. They hope to have TA training events throughout the year for all levels of students, and to repeat the survey every few years. CPET recommends that the divisions provide incentives for good TAs (such as an honor roll), and clarify and/or improve how TAs are assigned. Also, the departments should reduce the number of grading-only positions, clarify the honor code policies for both students and TAs at the start of a course, and let grad students teach courses. Finally, CPET recommends that the Institute establish a Center for Teaching, that would benefit professors, postdocs, and graduate students. Also, the establishment of Master TA positions might be helpful, so that experienced TAs can help younger TAs. This concluded the presentation.

Ileana asked whether this information will be available on the Web; Liz said it would be posted on CPET's website in the next two weeks. Jason asked whether the GSC can do anything to help. Liz wasn't sure; Marissa said that maybe the GSC could, but she wasn't sure what. Chip recommended that CPET talk with the Academic Committee, since both groups share some common goals.

2. Caltech Y Survey on Honor Code

Gustavo remarked that his presentation tied in nicely to Liz's comments about the honor code. ASCIT conducted a survey of undergraduates and undergraduate alumni about perceptions of the honor code, and it seems that it is not clear to the Caltech community what the honor code means. Different people within the same segments of the community have different ideas about the honor code. When Caltech was founded, the honor code stated that the "helpfulness of every watchful friend will take the place of the educational police officer." Honor codes at most institutions require people not to lie, cheat, or steal; typically, there are limitations on the honor system (for example, one university limits their honor system to a geographical location).

ASCIT surveyed both alumni and current students. They found that in the past, the honor code was perceived as covering mostly academic issues, but currently the honor code is thought of as an all-encompassing code of ethics. In the past, 95-100% of people were thought to follow the honor code as it related to academics, whereas today 90-95% of people are thought to do so; around 60-80% of people are thought to follow the honor code as it relates to non-academic issues (both in the past and currently). Although the honor code has been extended to non-academic areas of life, people don't seem to feel that others are following the honor code.

The Y feels that a campus-wide discussion of the honor code might be useful. There also needs to be more uniformity across campus as relates to the honor code: the Faculty Handbook, the BOC, and the GRB have three different statements of the honor code. Also, the phrasing of the honor code should be both meaningful and useful (that is, it should not be so general that it loses all meaning).

Jason mentioned that the BOC (for undergraduates) only deals with academic issues, while other issues go through a Routing Committee and Deans. He asked why this happens. Gustavo said he didn't know, and that the comment showed that a campus-wide discussion was needed. There are two points on which the GSC and GRB might be able to help the Y. First, the Y would like to survey the graduate community about the honor code. Also, the GSC and GRB could help in hosting and chairing a discussion about the honor code as the campus-wide discussion takes shape. Chip said that we were interested in helping. Gustavo asked who he should contact, and Chip pointed out John Choi as chair of the GRB.

3. Lab Reviews Editor

Jason introduced Juliane Fry. She came to the last academics committee meeting and was great; she is enthusiastic about the lab reviews and will be a great editor.

Chip asked if Juliane had any comments; she asked about current surveying mechanisms for getting opinions from exiting graduate students. There doesn't seem to be a formal mechanism, but perhaps we will email students periodically asking them to fill out the survey. Juliane might make this web-based.

Juliane was voted in as the new lab reviews editor.

4. *Technique*

Chip mentioned that the *Technique* has been swallowed by the printers. Brian said that it was two weeks overdue because of a problem at the printers, but they will make sure that it gets to the first-years if they have to knock on doors and hand them out. Chip said that we need to have some sort of institutional memory for the *Technique* and that we need to keep the information somewhere, so that the editors do not have to waste time duplicating efforts. Chip also suggested that we have earlier deadlines next year so that everything gets done.

Jason said that the secretary would be the logical person to keep track of the *Technique* documentation. Heather said it would be fine, but asked whether she would have to do legwork that the editors currently do to get new information. (She won't.) Ileana is also organizing the documents comprising the "memory" of the GSC, so between the two of them it should get done. Chip suggested deciding this later.

Chip then brought up the issue of the *Technique* website. Kevin Scaldeferri designed the original website with great functionality, but ITS would not host it because there was too much interactive scripting on the site. The site was hosted on a different computer, which was attacked by a virus and went down. Kevin offered to re-create it, but we might want to lose the functionality and move it to ITS, where there will be backups and virus protection. The board decided by consensus to move the website to ITS.

HELP WANTED

1. Moving into the SAC

Chip said that we had two rooms in the SAC, with a conference table and some office space. We need people to help move our stuff from the current shack to the new office. Ileana volunteered to serve as a "moving meister" and organize the effort. Chip and Ileana said that every board member should really help with the move; Ileana will make it flexible enough that people can come help whenever they have time. Chip thought that we might be able to move stuff that is currently stored in the Y to the office space, too.

Jason suggested that we should make sure the offices are not on the South Master key. Chip said he wanted to get a combination lock or (ideally) a card swipe access system, and said this was a good point. Mike Johnson asked if there would

be room for buckets, water guns, lights, etc.; Chip said there was lots of room. Ileana said that we would need to trash some of our old stuff anyway. Mike J. mentioned that the Y only has DJ equipment right now, and that it's probably better to leave that with the Y at this point.

ACTION ITEMS

1. NSO Follow-Up

Chip commended Marissa for her excellent job on NSO, and the board gave her a round of applause. Thanks to all for helping -- particularly Jeff, Michael J., Jason, Ileana, John Choi, Ying, Steve, and Alex. Marissa said that the organizers will have a meeting about the NSO events on Monday afternoon at 4 pm, and if anyone has any feedback, they're welcome to come. Stephanie asked if next year, older graduate students could be contacted so that they could know of events that were open to older students; she missed the pub crawl. Chip thought that next year we could send out one e-mail about all of the events to the graduate students.

2. Purchase of St. Luke's Hospital

A campus-wide brainstorming session on what could be done with St. Luke's Hospital was held some time ago; Ileana and Cynthia Collins (a member of WEST) were the two graduate students in attendance. Ileana reported on the brainstorming session.

The St. Luke's property has a hospital (which has been shut down) and several other buildings. There is an old convent and a child care center that is still in operation in one of the smaller houses. The property would be almost free; the real cost of purchasing the property would be in renovating it. It is about five miles from campus, and almost any use for the property would involve having a shuttle service; some uses would necessitate a 24-hour shuttle service.

Several ideas emerged from the brainstorming session on how Caltech could use the property. It was suggested that it could house graduate students (perhaps as swing housing), postdocs, or faculty members. Ileana was adamantly against moving the graduate students there as swing housing. Someone asked about moving the undergrads there; Ileana said that Caltech did not want to do that. The property might be used for administrative offices or for research programs on campus that do not involve many graduate students. It could be used as temporary lab space, for labs whose usual space is being renovated. There is commercial space nearby, so one suggestion was that the property be used to link to Caltech start-up companies, which could use the commercial space. Other ideas included using the property as a temporary athletic field, for music programs, or as a conference center. The child care center could also be expanded and used by the Caltech community.

One problem with the property is that no one is sure which buildings will be declared historic monuments. St. Luke's was built in the 1920's. If the buildings

cannot be razed or renovated, this could pose a problem. Heather asked whether the property is going to be bought. Ileana replied that the administration has not yet decided whether to make an offer; other people will no doubt also bid on the property. Also, they do not want to have any publicity about the possible uses of the property before the offer is made. Ileana mentioned Ambassador College as an example of a property that was bought by someone (not Caltech) but could not be used, and so turned into a money sink.

3. Serra Focus Group

President Baltimore hosted a focus group to discuss the Serra artwork. Chip introduced this topic by saying that Graeme, Steve, and Libby were all in attendance, and that it seems that the sculpture will be installed. However, some student activists will continue to protest this decision. Chip said that given the number of students who oppose the sculpture, the GSC might want to reconsider its position on the sculpture and make a formal statement officially opposing the sculpture.

Graeme then reported on the meeting. He said it started with a half-hour presentation by President Baltimore on the merits of the Serra sculpture, in which he discussed the aesthetics of the project. President Baltimore said that there would not be a sculpture by anyone other than Serra, and that Serra would not be changing his design. He facetiously suggested that the students would have him donate the money for the sculpture to the city symphony (a suggestion that the BOD seemed to like).

There was a rousing discussion about the sculpture. Ileana asked about the financial aspects of the Serra sculpture. Libby said that Broad gave money specifically for a sculpture by Serra. Steve explained that Broad donated half of the cost of the sculpture, but donated this on the understanding that a Serra piece would be installed. Jason asked if the location of the sculpture could be changed; Graeme and Libby said that it was a site-specific piece. Steve mentioned that the proposal had been created from a sketch of the site, and that the actual site had a four and a half foot grade instead of a nine foot grade. John Dabiri mentioned that at his undergraduate campus, they had a Serra, and it was spray-painted every year; he asked whether there would be an anti-graffiti budget. Steve and Libby said that the issue came up, but they were told that the piece would have an anti-graffiti coating. (This assertion was generally scoffed at.) Jason asked about the possible uses of blowtorches. Steve and Libby both said “No!” loudly, and said that the President became extremely angry at that suggestion in the focus group. Jason said that he knew that undergrads had access to these things, but Steve and Libby reiterated the President’s reaction to a comment in this vein.

Brian mentioned that the sculpture might be spray-painted by Pasadena gangs, and not by people at Caltech. Gustavo said that it was clear that the community dislikes the wall, and asked whether the City could somehow block its construction. Graeme said that the city just needs to confirm that the sculpture

meets the criteria for a “monumental artwork.” Gustavo asked whether this was true, saying that it is on the outskirts of Caltech, so the City will have an interest in the aesthetics of it. Libby said that there has already been aesthetic approval by the City. Steve mentioned that Caltech’s protocol people have already approved it, and the issue is now how many dollars are spent on the work. Libby said that another consideration will be whether the sculpture actually meets the definition of monumental art, and that will be one argument she will pursue with the City.

Chip asked whether the GSC should come out against the wall. Jason said that he would like to see students on committees designated to approve the architecture and art of new buildings. Alex suggested we make a statement against the process of selecting the sculpture, but not the sculpture itself. Gustavo asked again whether there wasn’t some way to stop the construction of the wall. Steve said that according to David Baltimore the construction was not a “done deal;” Gustavo said that in that case, the construction could be stopped. Jason suggested that we put a new member on the City Board by organizing a write-in campaign.

Chip said that he wanted to get back to the issue of the GSC coming out against the wall, and asked Libby if she would like the GSC to support her in her battle against the wall. Libby said that it really didn’t matter to her and was up to the GSC. Ileana said we should make a formal statement; Graeme said that we should oppose the process by which the wall was chosen. Mike Fleming asked what was wrong with the process and how it should have been different. Steve said that the Art Committee didn’t have any choices other than Serra; Graeme added that the only role of the Art Committee was to bring up the names of five sculptors. Only Serra was asked to provide a proposal, and when the Art Committee asked to see other proposals they were told that it would be too expensive. Tim said that given the level of opposition to the sculpture, the GSC should say that they want to see a halt to the installation. Jason suggested that the GSC recommend mandatory student representation on the Art Committee. Jeff said that the Art Committee had no voice in choosing the sculpture, so that wouldn’t have helped in this case. Stephanie asked whether the GSC could nip things like this in the bud if they knew about them because of student representation. John Bender asked whether the opposition was just to this piece, and not even to Serra in general. Tim suggested that the GSC was opposed to the way this art was selected and presented to the campus.

Two votes were taken. The motion for making a formal statement opposing the installation of Vectors failed by a narrow margin. The second vote, on having the GSC make a formal statement opposing the manner in which Vectors was chosen, passed.

4. Representation on the Arts Committee

The conversation segued into choosing student representatives for the Arts Committee. The Art Committee contacted Chip and is interested in having one graduate student and one undergraduate student sit on the committee. Stacey

Boland was suggested as a good person and has been contacted to see if she would be interested. John Bender also expressed an interest in the position. We can have a vote or they can split the duties; we decided to table the issue until a later date.

5. Lab Reviews

Chip introduced this topic. Earlier, we decided to keep the lab reviews IP-restricted, but Chip talked to some Directors later who were concerned about this outcome and who didn't understand what the discussion was about. Given this, Chip felt it would be a good idea to talk about this again and see how people felt.

Mike Fleming gave a bit of background. The lab reviews surveyed recent alumni and exiting graduate students; their purpose is to get information to incoming students about their department and, eventually, potential advisors. The faculty opposed the idea of having the lab reviews, but the GSC did it anyway. The results were fairly positive and the faculty now like the lab reviews. They are on an IP-restricted part of the GSC website. This makes them unavailable to incoming students.

Jeff asked whether the lab reviews surveyed graduating students or students who leave the program. Chip said that they try to catch people who just exit the program, but it's more difficult. John Dabiri mentioned that course surveys are only seen by the professors who teach the course, and asked why the lab review information should be any different. Chip said that the GSC was opposed to the course survey information being seen only by professors; it was also pointed out that donut.caltech.edu is not IP-restricted, and it is an undergraduate site that has course reviews on it. John asked what would happen if the results were not favorable to the faculty. Ileana asked why we're so frightened of doing anything concrete. Heather suggested that we might be effectively putting out bad press about Caltech if we do this, and that we should be interested in attracting good graduate students.

Alex asked whether there was any point to having glowing lab reviews available to everyone. Gustavo said it would be beneficial for people to see the results; even if people aren't happy, if they've stayed, it would show incoming students that Caltech has benefits which outweigh certain students' unhappiness. Jeff asked who would ever see or visit the site. (It is already indexed on the Caltech search appliance; Mike Johnson mentioned that people can see summaries of websites that are IP-restricted by using Google.) Alex said someone choosing a lab could use the information. John suggested that there were other ways of finding out about labs. Ileana said that some people don't visit or cannot visit. Juliane added that some people don't have access to informal networks of information. Jason said that people will find the lab reviews, and added that Berkeley had a similar thing for undergraduates.

Several people said that it was much more useful to talk to people in a lab than to read the lab reviews. Jon Galownia made the point that often people in a lab will not say “don’t come” because they need new lab members to join if they’re going to graduate! Many people laughed and agreed. Juliane said that the lab reviews do not represent a letter-grade stamp on a professor, but often discuss personality traits, such as hands-off or hands-on, that are not judgmental but are very useful for new students to know.

A vote passed to lift the restrictions on the lab reviews website.

6. Member E-mail List

We skipped this topic due to lack of time. Basically, we need to update our member e-mail list because the Directory Staff listing does not reach all graduate students.

7. Academics and Advising Issues

Mike Fleming reported on a recent conversation with Marianne Bronner-Fraser about increasing student representation on faculty committees. Mike said that the advising survey showed that many students at Caltech were happy, but some were not, and some classes were ridiculously difficult and/or badly organized. Some representatives from the Academics Committee met with Professor Bronner-Fraser and discussed this; she said she would charge the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC-2) to look into some of these issues. Specifically, she mentioned:

- uniformity of policy across departments;
- student-advisor conflict and how it should be handled;
- how professors use course feedback;
- normative time (the time it takes students to earn their doctorate).

We would like to get together a group of students (one student for each division) and decide what we can tell GSC-2. It is reporting back to the Faculty Board in December. The Academics Committee has selected Mike to head up this effort, and he has some people who might be interested. If anyone on the BOD is interested, they should contact Mike, and if they know other students not on the BOD who might be interested, that would also be useful. Jason asked if anyone was interested; Stephanie volunteered. There will be a meeting on Monday afternoon at 3 pm to discuss these issues.

8. Budget

Chip passed around a copy of the 2002-2003 budget. He mentioned that one large change is that we are no longer funding umbrella organizations, and instead trying to fund events directly. Alex ran through the budget rapidly. He said that the Budget Committee tried to figure out a rational way to provide clubfunding. Attendance at events and/or club membership was considered in relation to the “per-capita” funding available to the GSC, so that we would get the maximum return for our investment. They also favored clubs that advertised well and held open events, rather than closed clubs that seemed to be asking for funding for the

members' hobbies, and considered past use of GSC funding. Alex asked if there were any questions. Marissa asked whether the Tech could advertise that it allows grad students to write for it, because she wasn't aware of that and we're giving them money. Alex said yes.

The budget was passed.

9. Newsletter

Steve's bonus was passed. Steve wants some ideas for an entertaining or fun project/contest for the Newsletter; if anyone has any, contact him. Alex suggested a political cartoon. Chip thought that the Piled Higher and Deeper Stanford graduate comic series had published a book, and it would make a good prize.

REPORTS

1. Moore Fund

Alex said that the first committee for the Moore Fund has finished up and made recommendations to Gary Lorden, who will then recommend things to David Baltimore. The money will indeed be available, and might be as much as \$180K/year. The Fund will probably begin accepting applications in winter term.

2. Alcohol Committee

No urgent news to report.

3. Fire Policy Committee

Chip mentioned that we decided before not to have someone on this committee, but they are making rules that don't make sense for grad students (for example, people couldn't barbecue and drink beer at the Cat rec rooms under the current policy) and so we might want to have someone get on this committee. Jason concurred.

4. Grad Student Handbook

Ileana talked about this (actually, right before the budget committee report, but we'll include it here for clarity). Ileana will be organizing the effort to put together a graduate student handbook, and asked everyone to send her any useful information they might have. The Academics and Quality of Life committee will probably be involved in this.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academics

Jason reported that at the last meeting, the Academics Committee discussed meeting with GSC-2 (as Mike Fleming mentioned earlier), Juliane's appointment as Lab Review Editor, and course evaluation guides. They need to get questions and wording sorted out for these. Jeff mentioned that he thought we'd gotten permission to use the official course evaluation information a while ago. Jason

hadn't known about that. Chip said he would look into it and asked Jeff to send Chip an email reminder.

Also, the committee discussed teaching awards. Submissions will be collected at the end of every term, and the awards will be handed out every year. The committee will look over the applications and setup rules and guidelines for selecting the awardees. Over the next month or two they will need to get word out about the awards.

Marissa asked about the SURF survey. Jason said it is completed and 38 responses had been received, and that we need more feedback. Marissa asked how many people had SURFs this summer. Jason said that no one knew; when he talked to the SURF office, they said that they only kept track of how many faculty had SURFs.

2. Budget

Alex said that since we had already talked about the budget, there was nothing else to report.

3. GRB

John Choi said there was nothing to report.

4. Housing

Steve said that the Housing Committee really needs new members! Since we were pressed for time, he referred everyone to the agenda. At their next meeting, they will discuss the housing survey, the ethernet estimate, and housing office issues. There is a chance that a wireless network would be easier to install in the Cats for now than hooking up ethernet, so they are looking into that.

From the CHCC report, the annual barbecue is coming up (last year there were more than 300 people in attendance). Also, the CHCC's have more authority now, so they are making some infrastructure improvements. For example, they are going to have a card-swipe system installed for using the laundry machines (in the north rec room) as a test. A new TV is going to be purchased to replace the one in the central rec room. Steve referred people to the agenda for more happenings; the CHCC report and infrastructure improvements are included below.

From the Agenda:

CHCC report

- Annual huge BBQ on Thursday 10/17 (last year had 300+ people in attendance)
- Pumpkin carving event tentatively slated for Sunday 10/27 - scary movies (like Harry Potter!) included.

- Catharine is looking into events that will be similar to WEST's "Lunch with ..." series, to include representatives from different campus offices.

Infrastructure Improvements

- We are designing the rec room reservation sheets.
- Bulletin boards may be installed near mailboxes and by rec room reservation sheets.
- A card-swipe system will be installed in the north laundry room for a test run.
- A new TV will be purchased to replace the old one in the central rec room, and the amplifier in the south rec room will be replaced (eventually).
- We may experiment with changing the ground floor patios to allow in more light in
- We will look into acquiring an air hockey table.
- Work on improving the recycling center signs continues.
- Revamping of the web site has begun

Jason also mentioned that he would no longer be sitting on the Faculty Housing Committee, so there will need to be a new GSC representative there. It is especially important right now, with swing housing considerations being decided. Steve said that he would attend in the short term.

5. Quality of Life

Jon Galownia gave the Quality of Life report. Niki is setting up a meeting with Marianne Bronner-Fraser (including Heather, Marissa, and Sarah Heilshorn). The Quality of Life website has a health insurance summary up, and Kevin Austin is reviewing a summary of on and off-campus counseling information. They are also working on the graduate student handbook. Mike Fleming mentioned that he would like to see some of this stuff linked to from the main GSC page; there was some discussion about revamping the GSC webpages, but we quickly went on.

6. Social

Jeff referred people to the agenda to see all of the new events the Social Committee has planned. He said that the Social Committee is really going to need volunteers from the whole BOD to help plan these events!

From the Agenda:

Upcoming Events

- US/WEST GUSH & Beckman Lawn Party
- GSC BBQ
 - We will try to organize the BBQ for the Friday after midterms; location suggestions are welcome.
 - We need lots of volunteers to help buy and prepare the food.
- Fall Term party – probably Nov. 14

- Theme: "Casino Night" or "Drinks of the World"
- New Gushmeister - Nathan Lundblad
- New event ideas:
 - Trip to game show
 - Paintball/laser tag
 - Cooking classes (with health advocate)
 - Micro-brewery tour
 - Wine tasting at the Athenaeum

7. Underrepresented Students

Marissa said that Games Night was very successful, and the GSC now owns a Playstation. We have to figure out what to do with it; the US Committee thought we might give it to the CHCC's for Catalina residents, or we could give it to the Y to loan out. Steve said that the CHCC's had discussed getting a Playstation and had decided against it, so he wasn't sure they wanted it. Tim didn't want to give it to the Y, since he felt it would be destroyed there. Much discussion ensued. Finally, we decided to keep the Playstation in the GSC office. Steve said that we might be able to get the old TV that the CHCC's are getting rid of, or we can loan it out to board members on a "you break it, you buy it" policy.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM.