Resolutions Reviewed:

1512A: Resolution to Create the Graduate Sexual Assault Prevention & Response Project, and to Amend the Bylaws and Budget

The University recently established the Confidential Care Advocate’s Office, including submitting requests for space in MLK basement which would directly help graduate students.

Because of the confidential nature of the “response” front, and the varied nature of survivor’s response preferences - whether they would want to be a part of a public community or not - which is entirely their choice, it is the sense of the committee that the community building nature of the “Projects” may not be readily embodied with this project.

Perhaps we should look into meeting with the Confidential Care Advocate’s Office, inviting them to a GA meeting and seeing what their thoughts are and find out how we can best assist, advocate, and determine what trainings may be necessary in this instead of creating a project without a clear direction for action.

Depending on their thoughts, perhaps a cost-sharing memorandum of understanding can be worked out with Deans Greenwell & Doyle based on the Office’s response.

Ultimately, the committee recommends tabling this resolution until such meetings and memoranda can be worked through. Alternatively, the committee would recommend changing the starting date for the project and position to the Fall so that these issues can be addressed in creating the job description for the Director so as to provide a clear direction for the project. The time could also be used to create additional buy in from the Campus community. A simple directed action to investigate and report, or to hire a temporary stipend-staff position to investigate and recommend a project and job card could be alternative compromise to show that the GA is seriously working on the issue but alleviate some of the problems with creating a project without the necessary direction.

As written, the amendment to the bylaws creating the project requires a ⅔ vote.

1512C: Resolution in Support of Including the Chancellor as Part of the Berkeley Student Health Insurance Procurement Process

While symbols matter, involving the chancellor in the process - which will likely involve the CFO reporting on a proposed decision for signoff will have little effect. Good management requires delegation and trusting appointed designatees, which in this case would likely be the CFO anyway.

As written, the standing policy requires a ¾ vote. The committee recommends striking references to standing policy and adopting a directed action to alert the Chancellor and ask him to pay special attention to the decision’s impact on students, as the CFO is already the designate for the Chancellor for decisions such as this.
Annual Bylaw Review
Feedback from the Execboard has indicated that formation of search and selection committees (Section 5.5.1) has been difficult to meet the requirements posed in the bylaws, namely that selection committees contain at least one officer, one project director, and at least fifty percent non-stipend staff (ie delegates or alternates) despite three being enumerated as the minimum total number. We request feedback on potential solutions from the delegates, to be submitted in the Feedback Form. One possible change would be to require that the same groups be required to be invited/solicited to join, but pending a (e.g. five business day) waiting period if a required party has not volunteered, allow the search committee to proceed without full participation of groups that fail to choose to participate.