

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

April 5, 2012

### SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall.

#### Resolution Referral

1204a, Directed Action to Renew the Mandate for Community Outreach Workgroup, referred to the Rules and the External Affairs Committees

#### Guest Announcements

Sydney Rock spoke, from the Labor Justice Project. The group tries to promote worker-student solidarity on campus and has a petition and a campaign for workers at the I-House, where long-term labor practices have been suddenly changed.

Akasemi Newsome spoke, from the UAW, the GSI Union. The UAW has a GSI workgroup survey that's online. They're also in the middle of a membership drive.

Lee Maranto spoke, the campus Independent Hearing Officer. Students were asked to attend a training to enable them to serve, when available, on a Conduct panel. There had to be a grad on the Conduct panel when a grad faced sanctions. The stakes were higher than for undergrads, with dismissal or certification involved. Training was coming up and will also occur in the fall.

#### GA Announcements

Mr. Klein said the Outreach Workgroup will sponsor, with the East Bay Parks District, a clean-up project at the East Short Park, the Emeryville crescent.

Mr. Welch, Coordinator, Grad Social Club, said the Bay Cruise will be on Saturday, and 50 tickets were left.

Ms. Suarez said GMORR will have a coffee hour for five hours on Wednesday, April 11, at the GA. Written pieces were requested for the GMORR Journal, to recruit diversity students.

Ms. Hsueh, Business Manager, said the results of the Business Office survey were online. Also, equipment was available for groups to reserve.

#### ASUC Elections

ASUC elections were next week. Two referenda are on the ballot, regarding a Daily Cal fee and the Class Pass. The GA heard short statements on behalf of the Daily Cal VOICE Initiative and from the following candidates: Mr. Douglass, DAAP, for the Senate; Mr. Goldstein, for president; Mr. Mosell, Ind., for

president and the Senate; Mr. Raby, speaking for Mr. Ickowitz, Squelch, for president; Conner Landgraf, SA, for president; Mr. Chung, SDU, for presiden; Mr. Albright, CS, for president.

Guest Speaker -- Graduate Division Dean Andrew Szeri, on Operational Excellence

Dean Szeri spoke on Operational Excellence. They're in the implementation stage of OE. Their goals are to keep one-time expenditures below \$75 million and to generate at least \$75 million in annual savings per year. CalPlanning was recently launched, and a second BearBuy beginning. They project \$28M in savings this academic year, and \$46M next year.

Student Advising Council needs grad reps, to work on making advising more consistent. A faculty/staff survey was being finalized to establish a baseline for the way things are now. And each of the 15-20 OE projects has feedback and accountability measures.

Mr. Goren, OE Communications Coordinator, could answer questions and help students get involved. There's also an open student position on the Implementation Team for the One-Stop Shop for student transactions.

Report from the Graduate Student Advocate

This is a new position for the GA, helping grads when they have a Conduct charge. The GA heard from Mr. St. Clair. He got a parent grant, but learned that it affects student loan eligibility. So he owed \$4K and was short \$4K for the semester. The Grad Advocate did a kick-ass job for him and the case was settled. But the question remains.

Report from the GA President

Pres. Yudof will put together an advisory board for replacing Chancellor Birgeneau. With no objection, Ms. Navab said she would represent the GA. Grads were needed to talk to the Selection Committee about priorities for the new chancellor. The GA will co-host with his office "An Evening with the Chancellor." The Faculty Mentor Awards ceremony will happen April 18. CACSSF has a one-time surplus of \$2M from things that have been phased out. They're putting together proposals. Cal Day is April 21, and the GA will host a cotton candy day.

Report from the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

The GA met in executive session to discuss legal issues regarding the BGSF.

Report from the Funding Committee

Mr. Sheen reported. There's \$8,500 left in the Contingency Fund for the school year. Six groups applied in March and the Committee was recommending a total of \$3,405. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Committee's recommendations.

Discussion on Proposed Changes to Funding Procedures

The proposal was being worked on and will be sent to committees. The idea was to make it easier for committees to deal with the inflow and processing of funding applications and reimbursements, and to communicate with groups. The proposal will also deal with equity concerns and distribution of money amongst student groups, particularly GMER.

There would be two funding periods, Fall and Spring Semesters, with the Contingency Fund for the summer. Groups would be able to make simple changes, to cut down on e-mails. Funding categories would also be changed, making it easier to track the funding process. The GMER cap would return to \$500. Grants would be changed to include everything at an event, including food and speakers. The GA also has a Facility Waiver more groups should know about. The GA also has Pepsi products that groups could get.

GMER would be revised. A proposal was to go from nine super groups to 90 academic units. There would be a funding floor for small department. Interdisciplinary events would be encouraged.

#### Report from the Budget Committee

Delegates will vote in May on the 2012-13 GA budget. Student group funding is proposed to increase by \$10,000. The budget will be online. The revenue projection was conservative. The total was roughly \$430,000. Funding will hopefully go back to \$135,000.

#### GA ELECTIONS

The GA elected the following for 2012-13:

President, Bahar Navab; Assembly Affairs Vice President, Gordon Hoople; Campus Affairs Vice President, Bianca Suarez; Rules Officer, Joanna Hernandez; Funding Officer, Patrick Baur; Environmental Sustainability Officer, Autumn Petros-Good; Grad Council reps, Mr. Sehgal, Mr. Niederhut, and Ms. Arata, with an alternate to be elected in May. There were no nominees for Grad Student Advocate. An election will occur in May.

#### Discussion on the GA Boat Cruise

The GA had to give the boat company a check for \$30K for the boat cruise, from commercial reserves. Ticket sales were \$25K, but wasn't accessible in time. The Grad Social Club also has \$8K in its account. Communication and accountability have been problems. Operating procedures were changed so this doesn't happen again. Tickets went from \$40-50 to \$65. It was noted that the GSC has done great things that year with smaller events. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA voted to write a check for \$25K to the boat company, with an additional \$5K to come from the GSC account.

A motion to adjourn failed by voice-vote.

#### Resolutions

By voice-vote, the GA tabled Resolutions 1203a, By-law Amendment Defining Sustainable Food and

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)  
Approval of the Agenda  
Approval of the Minutes

Scholarship Act; and 1202e, Directed Action In Support of Chancellor Birgeneau's "Knowledge Made In America: A Private-Public Funding Model."

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, 1203d, Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action Against the Proposed UC Berkeley Honor Code. It has the GA support the intention behind an honor code, but calls on changes and for a team of grads, undergrads, and faculty to develop a plan for this, including an educational component.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, 1203e, On Directed Action In Opposition to Criminal Charges Stemming from Non-violent Campus Protests. It has the President send a letter to the UCPD and the DA opposing criminal charges being filed against non-violent campus protesters, and singling out individuals for political purposes. It asks the Chancellor to also express his opposition and also calls for the end of stay-away orders against defendants.

The meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

## **End Summary of the meeting**

-----

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Philippe Marchand at 5:32 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall. Mr. Marchand said that even though the food wasn't there and the Officers were running late, most of the Delegates were present, so they'd start with some of the presentations. Delegates should have picked up an agenda packet containing all the Resolutions should have signed in, and should have a name tag and a voting card.

### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Marchand called for a motion to approve the agenda. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Marchand said the minutes for the March meeting were posted. He called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 1, 2012 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

### RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Marchand referred the following bill to committee:

1204a, Directed Action to Renew the Mandate for Community Outreach Workgroup, to the Rules and the External Affairs Committees

Seeing no objection or amendment, Mr. Marchand said the bill was referred.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### Guest Announcements

Mr. Marchand said the first Guest Announcement was from Sydney Rock, from the Labor Justice Project. Ms. Rock introduced herself and said she was a first-year undergraduate there. She's with the Labor Justice Project. The group tries to promote worker-student solidarity on campus. They have a campaign with workers at the International House. On Wednesday a delegation of students and workers drafted a set of demands for the I-House CFO. They have a petition they're circulating to show support and solidarity with the workers.

The University has been subcontracting food service workers at the I-House for a number of years and they recently said they will stop doing that. But they've said that in the past as well. However, there have been some strange labor practices. Workers were asked to clock in and out, which they were never asked to do. They're also doing background checks on workers who have been there for 30 years. They've also started a rotating schedule, not on the basis of seniority. People who have been working there for a long time are being asked to work on the weekends so they can't see their families or lead the life they were leading before this.

Ms. Rock said the Labor Justice Project will circulate a petition to gather student support. Next week a delegation of student and workers will go to the I-House to present it to the management and get them to solve these unfair labor practices. Ms. Rock said she wanted to thank the GA.

Mr. Marchand said the next announcement was from Akasemi Newsome, from the UAW, the GSI Union. Ms. Newsome introduced herself and said she's a grad student in Political Science, and a Union steward, a departmental representative. She wanted to let everyone know about the GSI workgroup survey the UAW has rolled out. Grad students didn't have to be a GSI right now to fill it out, and just needed to have a GSI want in their graduate career. She would ask grads to please fill out the survey. It was very important for the Union to figure out just how systemic and basic the problem was of working, e.g., more than 20 hours a week, and if there are any other thoughts of problems or concerns that GSI have. She'd pass out a flier with information about where people could access the survey online.

Ms. Newsome said they're also in the middle of a membership drive. If any of them were interested in becoming members of the UAW, so she would ask them to please feel free to fill out another card that she'd pass out. If people aren't a GSI there's no additional cost. But if they are a GSI, it costs \$5 a month.

Mr. Marchand said the next announcement was from Lee Maranto, the campus Independent Hearing Officer. Mr. Maranto introduced himself and said he spoke to the GA a little earlier in the semester. He asked how many of them read "The Week." He had a column, "Boring, But Important." He was there to ask for a little of their time and their service to the Student Conduct process. The Conduct process at Berkeley requires student involvement, specifically for grads who find themselves in the Conduct process. In those cases, the process requires a grad student to sit on the panel to determine whether or not that student violated the campus Code of Conduct. He would distribute some fliers.

Mr. Maranto said he was asking students to come to a training, one session, for four hours, after which they are forever more able to serve on a Conduct panel. If a panel is needed, he basically determines, based on their availability, if grad students can serve. If grads couldn't serve, and were unavailable, that was fine. They'd serve on these panels with undergraduates as well, with a graduate perspective on Student Conduct issues. A training was coming up on Monday, with another one on the 24th. Food will be provided as an incentive. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked how long the hearings are. Mr. Maranto said they vary, but they're not more than about two hours. The Delegate asked if that includes deliberations and decisions. Mr. Maranto said that was correct. There is a presentation from the University, from the student involved, and from witnesses. The hearings vary, depending on the nature of the alleged violation. His goal was to keep hearings reasonable. There might be war stories out there of hearings that have gone on for six or eight hours, which have occurred. But that wouldn't happen on his watch. The whole point of the new Conduct process and the creation of his position, Independent Hearing Officer, was to create some efficiency and to ensure due process for students. Grad students in particular have incredible time constraints, so he'd honor that when he schedules hearings.

Mr. Sehgal asked what the range was of Conduct violations. Mr. Maranto said he would refer the question to the Code of Conduct specifically, so people could get a sense of what the Code violations are. All of them are parallel to what might be seen in a criminal context, with an added layer of academic violations. The DA doesn't arrest people for plagiarism, e.g. There are academic cases that come before a panel and go through the Conduct process. For graduate students, the stakes seem to be much higher, since they can face dismissal, in academic cases, have certification involved. For those particular cases, they're required to have graduate students on the panel.

Mr. Maranto said there will be training in the fall to be on these panels. If people were interested in that, or had any other questions, they could contact him by e-mail. Mr. Marchand said that people could also contact Ms. Navab or the Graduate Student Advocate if they wanted to know more about this.

Mr. Klein said that on Saturday, April 14, the Outreach Workgroup will sponsor, in cooperation with the East Bay Parks District, a plastic, litter, and debris removal clean-up project, from 9 a.m. until noon. It will be at the East Short Park, the Emeryville crescent. It's easily accessible by AC Transit and there's a map on the flier that was available on the table in the front. He would encourage grads to come out if they were interested in helping the environment, or if they wanted to get their friends or people in their department, he would ask them to take a flier and post it. The more people they could get to do this, the larger the impact they could make to improve the Bay Area and keep their environment clean. Mr. Marchand said the flier was also on the GA Web site, along with other material for the meeting that evening.

Mr. Welch, Coordinator, Grad Social Club, said the Bay Cruise will be on Saturday. They still have about 50 tickets left. They might do something like give Delegates a discount. The GA will discuss that later on in the meeting. They'll stop selling tickets that evening.

Mr. Marchand said the food was arriving, and at some point the GA would take a recess for people to get something to eat.

Ms. Suarez said she's a Delegate in Education and the GMORR Coordinator. They'll have a coffee hour for five hours on Wednesday, April 11, at the GA. She would encourage grads to stop by, drop by, and get some coffee, tea, or orange juice. They'll also have pastries and some door prizes. This is something the Project likes to do in the fall and the spring to make different kinds of space on campus open to the graduate community. Fliers about the event were at the front.

Also, as was sent out on the listserv that day, the GMORR Project Caucus, is putting together a Student of Color Diversity Handbook. Some Delegates were present who are on the Committee. Round 1 of the Caucus submission went out that day. The GMORR Journal will be geared towards helping recruit more diversity students to Berkeley, easing the transition process for incoming students, and helping to support the organizational capacities and intellectual efforts of the colored community on campus. They're looking for diverse editorials, opinions, articles, and feedback on what's happening at the department level. This is in response to feedback from organizations over the past year, that it's really difficult to figure out what was going at parts of the campus. This was GMORR's attempt to bring different faces together and to provide a mechanism for developing new intellectual and research collaboration across campus.

Ms. Hsueh, Business Manager, said she wanted to thank everybody who participated in the Business Office survey. The results were in and are on the GA Web site. Delegates gave them a lot of good ideas. Most of them don't know that the GA actually has equipment that groups can rent for free. One suggestion was to make a list of all the equipment available to student groups on the Web site and then have a form that people could fill out online. They could see which equipment was available when a group wanted to reserve it. Ms. Hsueh said they'll try to do this in the next couple of weeks. People could submit reservations to the Business Office online. There were many other suggestions. She would ask Delegates to please take a look at the survey, and she wanted to thank them for filling it out. For those who did not participate in this survey, that didn't mean they couldn't give suggestions. If people had anything to suggest to the Business Office, Ms. Hsueh said they could call her, or could drop by. And if they come to Anthony Hall, they'll have candy for them.

Ms. Hsueh said they're working on online funding applications and are waiting for a grant to come in. If it's approved, they'll be able to do an online funding application. She wanted to thank them.

Mr. Marchand said the food was ready. He would suggest a recess at that time. He called for a motion to recess for ten minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank them for being efficient with the food chain.

### ASUC Elections

Ms. Navab introduced herself and said she is the GA President. She'd give a quick spiel about why grads should care about the ASUC elections, after which they'd hear the presidential candidates or members of their parties speak briefly and give some information about themselves and about the referendums on the ballot.

Ms. Navab said people there know what the ASUC is. One of the main reasons for grads to care about ASUC elections next week are the two referenda on the ballot. Elections are next week, Tuesday through Thursday, and people could vote online. Delegates will receive an e-mail from her with all this information. The GA would hear somebody speak on The Daily Cal Referendum, titled "The VOICE Referendum." There was also a Class Pass Referendum that was up for renewal, the sticker that lets students rid on AC Transit and which funds night shuttle and perimeter buses. If people care about those things, grads should vote. Grad students typically don't vote very much, and grads usually have a very low turnout. The other reason grads should vote is that the GA was part of the ASUC, a branch. So when the ASUC takes a position, unless the GA actively takes a position itself, the ASUC's position was also the GA's position. The ASUC speaks for grad students as well. So all grad students should care about who is in the ASUC. And last but not least, a lot of GA money was tied to the ASUC. So if people cared about the GA's money, or commercial monies, they should care about the ASUC.

Ms. Navab said that each candidate and any representatives from the referenda will get two minutes to tell the GA about themselves, followed by Q&A. Questions could be asked to a particular candidate or asked broadly to all the candidates.

Lynn Yu introduced herself and said she was with the Daily Californian. She's the Campaign Manager for the VOICE Initiative, a student fee referendum on the ballot in the ASUC election. It would put \$2.00 on every student's CARS bill, with 33% to go to financial aid, basically eliminating the fee for low-income students. The rest of the money would go to the Daily Californian.

As to why the Daily Californian needs the money, Ms. Yu the paper was currently in a terrible financial situation and faces a \$200,000 budget deficit. That wasn't due to poor management or poor sales, but

simply due to structural shifts in the journalism industry. As businesses start to advertise more online, they completely leave print advertisements behind. Every single newspaper in the United States is facing

ASUC Elections (cont'd)

- 9 -

the same situation. In 2007, all of the Daily Cal's revenue was either ad sales or donations, and the paper made about \$1 million in ad sales. In 2010 they made \$654,000. So from 2007 to 2010, the paper's revenues plummeted. That wasn't because of one bad salesperson, but due to the fact that businesses no longer want to advertise in print; and that really hurts newspapers. And the Daily Cal was facing the same situation every other newspaper was.

Ms. Yu said she wasn't exaggerating when she said that if the VOICE Initiative isn't passed, it was extremely realistic that the Daily Californian would have to cut more days of print. So they'd really appreciate it if everyone would vote yes on VOICE, and to tell everyone they know to vote yes on VOICE. She wanted to thank them.

David Douglass introduced himself and said he was running for ASUC Senator with the Defend Affirmative Action Party, DAAP. They're against fee hikes and demand that the Administration and the Chancellor push for taxing corporations. Google, e.g., made \$30 billion in revenue last year. There was no way that California should say that there's no money for public education. DAAP also wants to double underrepresented student minority enrollment at UC Berkeley. They'd like to project a picture of diversity and to integrate the campus. In 2011, 149 black students were admitted out of an incoming freshman class of 4,000. That was wrong. DAAP wants integration and wants UC Berkeley to reflect the community of California and serve the community of California. DAAP will take direct action on Friday at noon, with a rally. They'll submit the thousands of signatures they've gathered to overturn Prop. 209, the anti affirmative action proposition, and have a sit-in. They won't just talk the talk, they'll walk the walk. They want to endorse privatization of UC Berkeley. They also want British Petroleum out of UC. They don't want BP controlling the research that's done and to perpetuate global warming, and want autonomous research, and to support and sustain the creation of business and of an environment where students can set up their own companies and flourish in this economy. The rally will also demand that the Administration drop all charges against Occupy Cal student protesters. He wanted to thank them.

Elliot Goldstein introduced himself and said he was running for ASUC President, to call for shared governance for students at UC. Shared governance for students was a viable and, he'd dare say, a right that students should assert at that time. In 2010 the Regents voted to change terminology, and "student fees" were changed to "tuition"; and now students contribute 40% of the general budget of UC, and pay more than the State for the cost of their education. Students are therefore the major stakeholders of the University.

Mr. Goldstein said he realized he was speaking about undergrads, but grad students' professional development fees will increase. And grads were also paying more than the State. So students had to start demanding that they have more seats at the table, on the Regental level and on the University level.

Mr. Goldstein said he viewed what the ASUC was doing with the BEARS Initiative as a model for the partnership and the changing relationship between students and the Administration that the campus was now witnessing. The Student Regent is calling for more seats at the Regental level, including graduate and professional student seats. So this idea was happening. But they'll need to amend the State Constitu-

tional. UC students should demand what the Wisconsin State Charter has for its University, shared governance for students.

ASUC Elections (cont'd)

- 10 -

Mr. Goldstein said he was calling for the formation of a Systemwide committee, and maybe to also form on the Berkeley campus as well, to think about actual ways that students can have more say in the way the University is run. He was trying to start a dialogue with students on the campus about how they can start asserting that. He wanted to thank the GA.

Brad Mosell introduced himself and said he was an independent candidate running for president and for the Senate. He was running because he was pretty tired of ASUC elections. If people walk through Sproul, they've probably seen all the signs that have three words on them, like "sustainability", "public education," or "accountability," and then no substance behind it. He thought this was indicative of the general political discussion that's currently occurring. They have broad concepts with no substance, and no one to hold officially accountable. Even in the presidential race, there will be one forum that allows for rebuttals among candidates. That will occur in Friday, with the Daily Cal. Apart from that, all the issues people hear are generally non-competitive. He asked why they shouldn't just compromise. There's no clash. Instead, they need people to hear why there was only one Senator who voted against the Class Pass on the upcoming ballot. And they need to hear why only two Senators abstained from voting regarding a stance on affirmative action. Senators said that the Senate should trust the students in making important decisions with regard to the Class Pass, and then voted against using AirBears for the upcoming election because of cheating. Mr. Mosell said these were the sorts of questions and substantive thoughts they needed to have regarding both student elections and to bring to upper Administration. That's what he was running for, and trying to raise awareness about. He wanted to thank them.

Eric Raby introduced himself and said he was there as a representative of Squelch, a political party in student government that uses humor to address the partisanship and intensity of the elections process and governance. He was there on behalf of ASUC Senator Noah Ickowitz, who is running for President. Mr. Raby said that in the time he's gotten to know him, Mr. Ickowitz was a loyal, caring, inquisitive, and yes, sometimes argumentative person. But he was a friend Mr. Raby said he was proud to be campaigning for. Mr. Ickowitz apologizes for not being able to be at the GA meeting. He was currently in class, likely being facilitated by a graduate student.

Mr. Raby said they're running on a four-pronged platform. The first was negotiations. They're interested in having a leader who fights for students when it comes to negotiate, such as with AC Transit. That's something grads pay for. Mr. Raby said they were disappointed to learn that the ASUC was trying to lock students into a seven-year, multi-million dollar contract, but failed to have any negotiations back and forth before agreeing to that deal.

Mr. Raby said they're also looking for transparency. They know that sometimes when one party or another is in charge of student government, it feels like only half the campus was receiving information and receiving the services of student government. Mr. Raby said they'd like to make sure that changes. Squelch is a party that doesn't have a core constituency. They pride themselves in being able to fight for all students and they'd like to extend that to student government, especially as it relates to graduate students. They're also interested in campus climate. They're looking for more spaces for dialogue, and having more opinions reflected, the more diverse the campus gets as a whole. They're also interested in restructuring retreats, like that occur at the Cal Lodge, in order to create a space that was a similar size

but would give students more money and serve as well as the Cal Lodge. He wanted to thank them very much.

ASUC Elections (cont'd)

- 11 -

Conner Landgraf introduced himself and said he was the presidential candidate for Student Action. There were two specific things he wanted to accomplish as the ASUC President that he thought were directed at grads. First, he wanted to advocate for additional students on the UC Board of Regents and work with the UC Student Association to make sure that really gets traction. He wanted to make that a priority because it's a tangible thing they could do to help improve the situation financially, with the UC budget situation. The Board of Regents is the body that makes decisions on what tuition is, and on professional degree fees, and other things that affect all students.

In addition, Mr. Landgraf said he thought technology on campus was pretty disastrous. If they look at BearFACTS, bSpace, Tele-BEARS, all these Web sites were pretty decrepit for this campus. It was funny that they have one of the best Computer Science departments in the country, yet their Web sites were bad. Mr. Landgraf said he really wanted to get students involved in that process. He thought they could get grad students involved as well in improving these systems. He thought they could get students working with systems like Tele-BEARS and BearFACTS, where students would be able to see progress and improvement. The University will take at least two or three years to come out with new versions. Mr. Landgraf said he thought that with student input, they could have it done much quicker. He wanted to thank the GA so much for its time, and he would encourage them to vote.

Honest Chung introduced himself and said he was running for President with Students for a Democratic University. The party arose organically from campus activism. As a result, they're a group of activists. They're organized around public education and some of them have been involved in Occupy Cal. Their philosophy for the ASUC is that it should be a base that students could go to actually fight issues like privatization. He wasn't going to make the claim that SDU represents grads, and SDU wants people to represent themselves in the ASUC, and open up the ASUC so it's participative democracy. Democracy is not solely elections, but about participation. Things had to change, through mass mobilization of student power. They need independent student power to fight the Administration, not build connections with the Administration, which has been actively pushing privatization policies. As for their connection to grads, Mr. Chung said students for a Democratic University were pretty deeply rooted to grad students. They had an official endorsement of the UAW, which represents GSIs and others. SDU also has two graduates on its slate. Ultimately, given their name, they want democratize the University and the ASUC.

Andy Albright introduced himself said he was running to be their next ASUC President with Cal-SERVE, Cal Students for Equal Rights and a Valid Education, the progressive party on campus. That past year he served as the GA's representative from the ASUC Senate, so he's been at GA meetings every month. Some of the things he'd like to work on next year tie into what he's worked on this year. This year he's worked to send students to Sacramento to lobby legislators for education. Next year he thought they could go further. The ASUC has the potential to work Statewide events. He'd like to partner with other student governments in the UC, CSU, and community college educational systems across the State, and he'd like to work with the Graduate Assembly to partner with other graduate assembly's across the State as well. If they start to work across the State on behalf of the 3 million students in the State of California, they could really start a movement, whether it's lobbying or protesting, whatever people decide, to have Sacramento reinvest in their higher education.

Mr. Albright said that something else he'd really like to work on is student safety on campus. Crimes are rising both on the campus as well as on the Southside, and the ASUC currently, and for the past few years, has done nothing about it. He'd like to work with the UCPD as well as the Berkeley Police Department to form a partnership to ensure student safety on and off campus. However, at the same time

ASUC Elections (cont'd)

- 12 -

Guest Speaker -- Graduate Division Dean Andrew Szeri, on Operational Excellence

they talk about this, they had to be cognizant of the fact that there are huge problems with police violence on the campus. The students on this campus should never fear those who were meant to protect them. Next year he'll work with the campus Administration to install stricter guidelines for police actions at protests.

Mr. Albright said these are things he's worked on that year, and next year he'd really like to create an ASUC that was in tune with student needs. For the past three years he's been a student there, he hasn't seen an ASUC that really focused on things that students care about on this campus. He's out talking to students and hears that they're struggling with affordability, with safety, etc. And he would like to make an ASUC where undergrads as well as graduate students can be involved. He would love grads' support. He wanted to thank them very much.

Ms. Navab said the ASUC elections work by rank voting. So people rank the candidates in the order they prefer them. They can also select portions of the ballot and didn't have to vote for everything.

Mr. Marchand said they didn't really have time for questions at that point. He would like to thank all the ASUC candidates and reps who came to speak to the GA that evening. (Applause)

Ms. Navab said that some candidates who were there, and also some who weren't there, sent some paragraphs to the GA about what they're doing around grad students. The ASUC puts out a Voter's Guide, and there will probably be a link to it on the GA Web site, with some platform issues that deal with grad students.

Mr. Marchand said that Dean Szeri was present at that time, and Mr. Marchand suggested hearing from him at that time, even though he was scheduled to speak later on in the agenda. Mr. Marchand said that as he mentioned in an e-mail he sent that week, a two-page summary of the current status of Operational Excellence, Dean Szeri would make a short presentation, followed by questions on the subject of OE. A motion to amend the agenda to go to Dean Szeri's presentation was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

GUEST SPEAKER -- Graduate Division Dean Andrew Szeri, on Operational Excellence

Dean Szeri said he had information about Operational Excellence, paper copies to distribute. On the front page there's a timeline that shows where they are. They're firmly in the implementation stage of OE. The bottom of the page has bar graphs that show where they are on the twin goals of keeping their expenditures up to \$75 million in one-time funds and generating at least \$75 million per year on annual savings. The graphs will be replaced next week at the OE Coordinating Committee meeting, which includes graduate student representation. The new graphs will show longer-term time horizons, because some of the

savings they expect to generate will happen beyond the timeframe of the graphs on the page that was distributed that evening.

Guest Speaker -- Graduate Division Dean Andrew Szeri, on Operational Excellence (cont'd)

- 13 -

Mr. Szeri said the next page has some thumbnail sketches and places where more information could be found for a few of the OE projects that were most likely of relevance or interest to graduate students. For some recent highlights, a couple of days ago they had the launch of CalPlanning, a financial analysis and budgeting tool. And a couple of days ago, they also had the second BearBuy beginning. The first cohort before that ran successfully. The back page shows a list of all of the current OE projects, with a sentence or two describing each one.

An event sponsored by the California Alumni Association will be held on Sunday, April 15, "I Learn for Cal." Mr. Szeri said he e-mailed Ms. Navab information about this and how people can register and raise money for graduate students.

Also, Mr. Szeri said he did a town hall some weeks ago and had 50-odd questions e-mailed in. He answered all the questions, and they're posted online on the Graduate Division Web site. If somebody thought a question wasn't answered, they should let them know. He called for any questions about Operational Excellence, graduate education, or whatever.

Mr. Hasan asked what savings were projected for fiscal year 12-13. Mr. Szeri said that in this academic year, he believed the figure was \$28 million of savings booked before the end of the year. And then next academic year, he believed it was \$46 million, as he recalled. So they're building steadily towards their \$75 million target.

Mr. Davidson said that under the Shared Services Initiative, he asked what will happen to current departmental staff. Mr. Szeri said that largely, current departmental staff will stay in departments, doing stuff relevant to the department. But there will be a certain amount of transactional processing kinds of work that will be more efficiently done in Shared Services. Right now they're working on the plan for moving the work and moving the people in order to make that a reality. The methodology for the planning for how to move the work and how to move the people was being worked out at that time. It should be finalized in the next few weeks. There will be a presentation before the OE Coordinating Committee next Thursday, where the GA is represented. They'll discuss the Workforce Transition Plan, as they call it.

Mr. Niederhut asked about the enterprise data warehouse. Mr. Szeri said it's a giant computer database that centralizes data from different parts of the campus. For example, data about space has always been kept separately, such as for classroom space, office space, etc. That's always been kept separate from data about students and registration, and the number of students in majors, and so forth. If that data could be centralized into a data warehouse, where analysis could be done that spans the different parts of that data set, then they could answer powerful questions such as whether they're utilizing their classrooms to capacity, whether or not they really need to build another building, whether they could adjust scheduling in some way, whether they could add another section, etc. Those kinds of questions could be more easily answered.

Mr. Baur said it didn't seem that any aspects of OE dealt with campus security. Mr. Szeri said that in an information technology sense, yes, that was the case. That's because there are lots of ways in which they

are working to limit the likelihood of things like security breaches for computers and so forth. But he believed the question probably meant physical security, and the answer was, there wasn't.

Mr. Onak asked about the Student Advising Council. Mr. Szeri said it was just being formulated. They just hired the person who will be running it. There is representation from graduate students, from the

Guest Speaker -- Graduate Division Dean Andrew Szeri, on Operational Excellence (cont'd) - 14 -

Graduate Division, and from the Graduate Council. Mr. Szeri said he'll be one of the sponsors of the Advising Council. But there are also lots of people on the undergraduate side as well. The goal of the Advising Council is to work to develop a common approach to advising, common methods for relying on the same tools, so that people get more constant advising. That wasn't such a problem for graduate students, but it was a big problem for undergraduates. They might have an advisor in their department, a staff advisor in their college, a staff advisor by virtue of the fact that they live in an RSSP-run facility, and they might have another advisor because they're an intercollegiate student athlete. So it was possible to have multiple advisors as an undergraduate and get discordant advice, because the advisors in those positions don't have the tools they need to be able to do a consistent job.

Mr. Marchand said they encourage Delegates to fill out a Delegate feedback form. One question seeks candidates or volunteers to be the graduate student representative on that Council.

A Delegate asked how many positions will be added or subtracted campus-wide due to Shared Services. Mr. Szeri said they don't know yet because the methodology for the Workforce Transition Plan hasn't been worked out, which is to say that the details haven't been worked out for all of the academic programs. The Shared Services Center is comprised of teams that consist of about 70 staff each. They'll probably have something in the order of eight or possibly ten teams. So it was something in the order of 600 staff still participate, out of something in the order of 12,000 staff that they have currently. So that gives an idea of the scale that they're talking about.

A Delegate asked how much the campus fleet will be reduced. Mr. Szeri said there will be a one-for-one exchange between fleet cars and car share cars. He thought the number was something in the order of 40 that they'll try. But then they're going to see if they could go much further. Several OE projects have gone much further than they anticipated. For example, there's a dining hall project which has really run away with savings generation in a way that was very impressive. So it may go further.

Mr. Hoople asked about the implementation process, with stuff implemented over the next two, three, or four years, and with the centralized unit, and asked what they'd do if it doesn't work the way it's been planned. Mr. Szeri said the question was about how they will evaluate the implementation and ensure they have quality services they're setting up. They're finalizing a giant survey they'll run that asks about the quality of service that faculty and staff receive, in a large number of areas, from processing of research grants to hiring of people, the kinds of things that faculty and staff do. The intention of the survey is to establish a baseline, basically, for the way things are now and then, periodically, to reapply the same survey, possibly with more detail, as it seemed wise to introduce it. And then they'll measure, hopefully, improvements around the campus. Mr. Szeri said he's made it a personal issue to make things absolutely as transparent as possible. So his wish would be that the results of the survey are put on a Web site somewhere, so people could see, unit by unit, the satisfaction people have with different kinds of services. That was one very high-level way of accomplishing that. But also, every single one of the 15 or 20 OE projects has its own feedback loops and accountability measures in place, in order to ensure that things are improving. They really have two goals. They're not just about saving money, but they're also about improving occupations

A Delegate asked if the student health center was under the same program of cutting costs. Mr. Szeri it wasn't, and no program singled out the student health service. But it will be the beneficiary of many programs or projects in OE. For example, with the Procurement Project, they'll buy things through BearBuy, as will other units.

Guest Speaker -- Graduate Division Dean Andrew Szeri, on Operational Excellence (cont'd) - 15 -  
Report from the Graduate Student Advocate

Mr. Goren said he would like to thank Dean Szeri for coming in and sharing this. He very much appreciated the Dean's attempts to be very transparent. Just to remind the GA, Mr. Goren said he's the OE Communications Coordinator and works between the Dean's office and the student body. If people have questions, they could talk to him or send him an e-mail, at [oecc@ga.berkeley.edu](mailto:oecc@ga.berkeley.edu). He'd be happy to answer their questions. They were also running a DE-Cal and some student projects. There were a few people in the room who were involved. If people wanted to get involved in OE, more positions were being added weekly. Mr. Goren said that if people were interested, they should get in touch with him and he could put them in touch with the right people to actually join these efforts.

Mr. Marchand said he also wanted to mention that in addition to the Grad Council, they also have a student position in the Implementation Team for the One-Stop Shop. Basically, it's a one-stop shop for student transactions. It would allow people who go through Financial Aid, or register, or go through Billing, to do that at one location. That's another project they're looking for grad students to get involved with. There was a question about that in the feedback form as well.

Ms. Navab said that if anybody had questions about the advising Council or the One-Stop Shop, or serving on them, they could send her an e-mail, as she makes those appointments.

Mr. Szeri said he would like to thank them. (Applause)

## REPORTS

### Report from the Graduate Student Advocate

Mr. Cohen introduced himself and said he was the Graduate Student Advocate, approved by the GA a month or two ago. This is a new position for the GA and they're trying it out. He's been studying a lot with the ASUC Student Advocate, a division the ASUC developed to serve the same function for undergrads. Mr. Cohen said he'll help graduate students with their contacts with the University when they are charged with a Conduct charge. He advocates on their behalf and makes contact with the University, which is more agreeable. They had their first case. Michael St. Clair had a particular case that they thought would be of interest to a particular group, student parents, who weren't a highly visible group on campus and one they'd like to make more visible. Mr. St. Clair would say a few words about his particular case, and its resolution.

Ms. Navab said they don't usually disclose personal information when grads go to the Student Advocate. But Mr. St. Clair asked to come to speak to the GA. So this situation was a little bit different, and in these cases, there was usually confidentiality. This wasn't the usual way they do things.

Michael St. Clair introduced himself said he was there completely voluntarily. This will be his last year at Berkeley. He's a grad student in the Department of German. He became a parent a year ago. Last August he got a parent grant, \$8,000 and resources. He thought everything was fine and thought it was great to have the grant for his son, who is very expensive.

Report from the Graduate Student Advocate (cont'd)  
Report from the GA President

- 16 -

On January 31 he found out from the Billing Office that he had a \$4,000 overpayment for the student loans he got last semester, and they rescinded his \$4,000 loan for this year. Mr. St. Clair said he found out that the parent grant affects student loan eligibility; and he found out from the Billing Office, not from Financial Aid. This was in the second semester, if he had known that, he wouldn't have taken the loan fellowship, but would have continued to work as a TA.

Mr. St. Clair said this was a big-time crisis. He owed \$4,000 to the Billing Office and was short \$4,000 for the semester. For the entire semester he's been fighting this. He didn't believe the parent loan should affect student loan eligibility. The position that financial aid has taken is that he actually used the parent loan to reduce student debt. But he was given the money to support his son. That was the whole stipulation. Mr. St. Clair said he has sent over 100 e-mails, and had an attorney who wrote letters as well. Finally, on March 16, Mr. St. Clair said he filed a student grievance. On March 20 he got a hold of the Graduate Advocate, who did a kick-ass job. So not only did they get a settlement out of this, but the Financial Aid Office settle this through some sort of obscure appeal, or whatever they're doing. But they still have this issue. And the campus has not answered this issue. The question was why a parent loan should affect student loan eligibility. The campus won't answer that question. So Mr. St. Clair was asking the GA to put people's feet to the fire and get an answer. He wanted them to site the regulation, policy, or whatever it is, the methodology or reason for this. This was his last semester, and he was supposed to be filing a dissertation and publishing and doing research, and he spent the whole semester with this stupid appeal. He was sorry to get so angry, but this was ridiculous. He wanted to thank them. (Applause) Ms. Navab said they would bring this up at the next meeting of the Graduate Division.

#### Report from the GA President

Ms. Navab said she thought everybody saw the e-mail from the Chancellor about retiring from being Chancellor and going back to being faculty. Per Regental policy, Pres. Yudof will put together an advisory board to the President on appointing the new Chancellor. There's a seat for one graduate and one undergraduate student. Ms. Loomba, ASUC President, is representing the ASUC, and Ms. Navab said that unless there were any objections, she would represent the GA in those proceedings.

The Selection Committee will meet on May 4 with key stakeholders across campus. One of those sessions is with students. The GA needs to send three GA representatives to meet with the Selection Committee to talk about their priorities in the new Chancellor selection, or if there are names they'd like to forward. If anybody was interested in being one of the GA reps, she would ask them to please let her know.

Ms. Navab said that she and Ms. Loomba have also requested a town hall meeting that was open to all the campus communities, to meet with the Selection Committee and express their concerns, share priorities,

things like that. So that there's wider forum of students meetings rather than just the three students the GA would forward for the Selection Committee to meet.

If people were interested in being a representative, she would ask them to please indicate that at the bottom of the feedback form.

Report from the GA President (cont'd)

- 17 -

Ms. Navab said the GA will have an event with the Chancellor on April 13, from 6:00 to 8:00, "An Evening with the Chancellor." It's an informal gathering the GA will host. They realized that the Grad Division and the campus Administration keep hosting forums where they talk to grads; but grads don't really get to have a conversation and interact with administrators. So instead, they'll host an evening with the Chancellor, at Café Five, a restaurant at the Hotel Shattuck, hosted also by the Chancellor's office. There will be representatives present from other campus units, such as the Provost, the Grad Division Dean, and a couple of other Vice Chancellors. They'll take about 35 grad students. She sent an e-mail about this over the break, but only got responses from ten people. It's free of charge and there will be a light dinner served, and drinks, including non- and alcoholic beverages. If people were interested, there was a question on the feedback form. She'd also send a sign-up sheet around because she had to RSVP to the Chancellor's office ASAP.

Ms. Navab said the GA gives out Faculty Mentor Awards to faculty for their exceptional mentoring, and the awards ceremony will happen on April 18, from 4:00 to 6:00, in Tan Hall. There was a flier in the front of the room if people wanted to pick one up and post it. It's a great opportunity to thank faculty for their exceptional work. The GA had a great committee that she would like to thank. And she would also like to thank Shannon, for all the hard work on the fliers.

Ms. Navab said she was going to give an update about Lower Sproul and the new plans for the Career Center, but she didn't have time to do that. So if people would like to see them, they should shoot her an e-mail and she'd shoot them one back.

Ms. Navab said the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services and Fees (CACSSF) usually makes recommendations when there's additional student fee money, or when people think there should be a re-allocation of student fee money. This year they have a one-time surplus of \$2 million because of savings from things that were funded in the past, but were phased out. The Committee is putting together a list of one-time proposals, like system changes, or software upgrades, things like that, that they think will benefit students. The ASUC and the GA just started to compile a list. If Delegates have ideas, they should let her know, because they had to finish compiling this by Saturday. She could talk to people on the side about this.

Ms. Navab said that Cal Day is April 21, the day that admitted students come to visit the campus. The GA will host a cotton candy day and will give out sodas and things like that. There's also a dunk tank, for people to dunk ASUC elected officers. There will also be free events happening that day. Ms. Navab said the GA was looking for volunteers to help them out.

A Delegate asked if Ms. Navab will get dunked. Ms. Navab said she wouldn't, and it was the undergrads who'd get dunked. If people were interested in volunteering, she would ask them to please let her or Ms. Hsueh know. Also, she would request someone to amend the agenda to add one item before Resolutions, about the Boat Cruise, since there was a matter that needed a vote of the Assembly before the end of the meeting. If people had questions, she'd be happy to take them.

Mr. Marchand said they were out of time for the report. He said there was a proposal to amend the agenda, say, for ten minutes, to discuss the Boat Cruise. There might be a budget change. Ms. Navab said it was a money issue.

Report from the GA President (cont'd)  
Report from the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation  
Report from the Funding Committee

- 18 -

Mr. Helu moved to add ten minutes to the agenda before Resolutions for a discussion on the Boat Cruise. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Klein said that for the council that will advise the Chancellor's Selection Committee, he asked if Ms. Navab was taking that on as a student or as GA President. Ms. Navab said it was as President. Most of the work will happen in the next few months. Mr. Klein said that if the GA elected someone, they would help. He asked if she expected this to be wrapped up by next year. Ms. Navab said that from what she's heard informally, they hoped to have the candidates listed by October 1. She understood his question about transition and leadership, and the same thing was happening in the ASUC, obviously. She didn't know of the Selection Committee would be favorable to swapping candidates. If the GA wanted a different candidate to serve on this, such as if a different president is elected, they could talk about that after the elections that evening. But she didn't think the Selection Committee would be in favor of having her serve for two months and then having someone else come in. Mr. Marchand said they would move on to the next report.

#### Report from the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

Mr. Marchand said the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation was supposed to have a meeting and a decision, but first, they didn't have much time on the agenda, and secondly, they thought it might be good to hear what the Board of the BGSF, which is composed of all Delegates, has been talking about. Because there are some legal issues, Mr. Marchand said they would like to move into closed session. He called for a motion to go into closed session, to include GA staff, but no outside observers, to discuss this matter, for ten minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Marchand said this wasn't a meeting of the BGSF and was a closed session of the GA, due to legal issues. Mr. Marchand asked anyone present who was not a Delegate or staff to please leave the room. This meeting entered into closed session to discuss the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation.

#### Report from the Funding Committee

Back in open session, Mike Sheen said he'd go through Contingency funding for this month and preview some of the proposals that members of the Funding Committee have been talking about that they want to put before the Delegates next month.

For some quick updates regarding Contingency, Mr. Sheen said they have about \$8,500 left in the Contingency Fund for this school year, for the next two months. In March, six groups applied and requested \$7,372. The Funding Committee is recommending \$3,405. He'd elaborate on that. For an update from the Business Office, accounts are closed for Round 1, for GMER and Grants. So if groups ask why they can't reimbursement, it's because the deadline has past. That was good news for Round 2, because GMER Round 2 got an additional \$7,000 into the general pot. If student groups ask about that, they could go to CalLink, where they could find updated numbers. For some groups, it's a little bit of money. There are a

Report from the Funding Committee (cont'd)  
Discussion on Proposed Changes to Funding Procedures

- 19 -

few groups that have no money because of the way the adjustments were made. Any group that was lost in the shuffle could apply for GMER. They should check online. Lastly, for Travel Grants, the deadline to apply for the summer is May 17. The Business Office highly encourages people to submit proposals as early as possible.

Mr. Sheen said the slide showed an overview of the Contingency Fund items for this month. The far right column shows the Funding Committee's recommendations. If people want, he could go through each group. "Plus Pepsi" notations represent the fact that Ms. Navab was able to get a deal where the GA has \$5,000 worth of Pepsi that year, and every year for the next ten years. So they're going to try to offer that to student groups. This is the first month they're doing that.

Mr. Sheen said that one note he wanted to bring up was the Graduate Pakistani Students Association, which requested \$2,000 for an auditorium and other venue rental fees at the I-House. The price that students usually get was negotiated down because the I-House is co-sponsoring the event. The Funding Committee was initially very hesitant to give them the full \$2,000 because the group didn't provide details. The group did that after the Committee met and worked out a bare minimum, \$645. The Executive Board gave them \$600 towards the cost of the venue, but they also asked for them to possibly fund some food. The Funding Committee is suggesting giving them the remaining \$50 that they need for the venue and another \$350, \$7 X 50 performers. That total, \$400, keeps this round at a healthy \$3,800.

Mr. Sheen said he would entertain a motion to pass the Funding Committee recommendation, plus \$400 for the above group. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S CONTINGENCY FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, \$3,405.**

#### DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO FUNDING PROCEDURES

Mr. Marchand said he'd preview proposed changes to funding procedures on Saturday, April 14 very quickly and would ask people to hold off on questions until the end. Also, they wanted to preview it for people to talk to about this in the next month. They'll shop this through the different committees, so they wouldn't have to go through the detail on the floor.

Individual members on the Funding Committee, although not the Committee formally, have been discussing a series of revisions to the funding procedures. They are currently in the works of being drafted and they're working with the Business Office to come up with language that would satisfy the Business Office as well. This will be referred to committees, Rules, Funding, and Budget, through the Executive Board. Feedback from folks was requested.

Mr. Marchand said the kinds of changes being proposed are in two main categories. The first was administrative efficiency concerns, which dealt with streamlining the process and making it easier for committees to deal with the inflow of applications and easier for the Business Office to process the reimbursements and communicate with student groups. The second part had to do with equity concerns, which deals with the distribution of money amongst student groups, particularly GMER funding.

Discussion on Proposed Changes to Funding Procedures (cont'd)

- 20 -

Mr. Hoople said he's on the Funding Committee and has been working on this. The proposal was to change how funding rounds work. There's an overlap period that causes confusion, because the Funding Committee in that period doesn't know what the budget is. So there would be two funding periods, Fall Semester and Spring Semester. In the middle they'd use the Contingency Fund. If people wanted something over the Winter Break or over the summer, they'd apply directly to Contingency. At the end of the Fall Semester the Funding Committee will be able to wrap everything up and start the Spring Semester knowing how much money they have. That would help a lot.

Mr. Hoople said the dates will also be improved. Due dates that year made it hard for groups just coming to campus, and with the change, groups will be able to get their applications in before the deadline.

Also, a lot of e-mails get sent to a lot of different people, and that was a mess for Mr. Sheen and for the Business Office. Even the Executive Board gets e-mails about funding. So they want to establish a set of criteria that allows groups to make simple changes within their allocated funding that don't require e-mails. An example would be to change the date the event by a day or two. They'll figure out what those kinds of things are that groups could change. So if members of groups had ideas about things that they didn't want to e-mail about, they should let the Funding Committee know what those are.

Mr. Hoople said they also needed to revise the funding categories. The current category definitions are outdated and confusing. This has caused the Committee to have some difficulty tracking how money flows through the funding process. Also, there have been a lot of requests from publications, and the Committee would like to be able to track that better.

Mr. Hoople said the final problem was that GMER, per group cap, has been a little too high that year and was screwing up the per group distribution. So the solution was to return the GMER cap to \$500. Groups didn't get the full \$750 that year, so this change wouldn't really have an impact. But going forward, he thought the new cap would be a good policy to have.

They also want to change Grants to include everything that happens at an event, including food and speakers. Right now, people apply for GMER and Grants, which was very confusing, causing the Committee to have to figure out where the money was coming from and where it was going. Also, publications would be a new subcategory. People apply for publications specifically, and as a body, the GA could come up with rules for publications. Also, the Sustainability Committee has raised questions about publishing things.

Mr. Hoople said the last thing would be to use the Contingency Fund for everything else. Venues are really expensive and the Committee wants to figure out how to improve on that. Groups can get a Facility Waiver and the Executive Board can approve money from a special line item in the budget. Groups need to be aware of that and apply for that waiver.

As for the Pepsi funding option, Ms. Navab got them a lot of Pepsi, and the GA should find ways to use it. If people have big events and want Pepsi, they should let the GA know. Ms. Navab said the deal was with Cal Dining, which give the GA \$5,000 of Cal Dining's Pepsi products each year for the next five years. That was a lot of Pepsi.

Mr. Sheen said the super group stuff was the equity side. People have noticed there's been some tension with the super group system. Department talk about switching super groups based on the allocations

Discussion on Proposed Changes to Funding Procedures (cont'd)  
Report from the Budget Committee

- 21 -

they've seen after GMER is distributed. One problem is that certain departments tend to be more active in super groups and essentially take advantage of departments that are inactive. Active departments in super groups that also contain extremely active groups flee those super groups for those that are less active. Most Committee members don't think that was a good system, going forward. Some departments don't feel like they're getting a fair share of the pot. The Funding Committee was trying to strike a balance for per-student equity and award departments based on their general population, and encourage student group activity as a whole. They want to calculate a funding system that values that.

Mr. Sheen said the next slide showed a quick rundown of possible GMER revisions. They'll run some group requests that semester under the new calculation they're proposing and tweak it based on Delegate feedback. Instead of having super groups that are collaborative chunks of departments, they'd restructure it based on academic units as defined by the GA for the purpose of allocations. Instead of having nine super groups, there would be 90 academic units. Each group in an academic unit would be entitled to a first stab, the amount proportional to the population in that department.

Mr. Sheen said this wouldn't change things much for large departments, but for smaller ones, it could pose some problems. So one idea was to have a floor. A department with only ten students might have a proportional percentage amount that wasn't that much. So there would be a floor of \$1-200, to begin with. The Committee was also thinking about the possibility of allowing academic units to combine and be treated as a super group, which would require the consent of the Delegates from each of the departments.

Mr. Sheen above said that regarding interdisciplinary events, the other thing they've been talking about was to add value to groups that give a clear demonstration that they involve students from different departments. One group traditional in this category is the Queer Grads, which spans more than one academic department. So one idea was to set aside a pot of money for groups that demonstrate, by means the GA would develop, that they involve members from more than one department. He called for any questions. Mr. Marchand said they were 30" behind in the meeting and they'll discuss this next month.

Mr. Froehle said he suspected these changes were really about grants, which are open up for food. He asked what would change between GMER and Grants. Mr. Sheen said one reason they wanted to reduce GMER to \$500 was to have food for Grants. Grants are for one symposium or presentation, or a specific, defined project. Grants funding is more discretionary for the Funding Committee, so they could limit food. But they wanted to make it easier for student groups to apply for one event through one application. Mr. Froehle asked if Grants would be merit based, but not GMER. Mr. Sheen said that was correct.

Mr. Sheen said that people should feel free to send him an e-mail or ask questions of any member of the Funding Committee.

Mr. Helu asked if they could send the presentation out. Mr. Sheen said he would post it on the Web site.

### Report from the Budget Committee

Mr. Marchand said the GA's budget for next year will be discussed next month as well.

### Report from the Budget Committee (cont'd)

- 22 -

Haider Hasan introduced himself and said he's the new Treasurer the GA the elected last month. The budget was based on two meetings of the Budget Committee and feedback from the Executive Board. The Budget Committee will meet with Project Coordinators and will propose amendments at the next GA meeting, for Delegates to vote.

Mr. Hasan said a major change in the budget was to increase student group funding by \$10,000.

Ms. Navab said that last year there was a surplus in student fee money, and the deal she worked out with the Committee on Student Fees and the ASUC was to get \$15,000 a year to help offset the cost of the Funding Advisor, the portion of the salary the GA pays. So \$15,000 could be released to go to other things. She and Mr. Hasan decided the bulk of that should go to student groups, and as a result, student fee money was coming in.

Mr. Hasan said the budget will be put online for people to review.

Several cuts were made to the Executive Board, and some to stipends for the Projects. He didn't believe they cut any program funds for the Projects. He called for any questions.

Mr. Hoople asked if the GA had \$15,000 more this year for student group funding than last year. Ms. Navab said they did. Mr. Hoople asked if they lost any funding. Mr. Hasan said they didn't. Ms. Navab said the only thing they weren't sure about was whether the Grad Division would contribute to the New Grad Student Orientation this year. She'll make that request to Dean Szeri.

Mr. Hasan said the budget was conservative with respect to revenue because he didn't include money from the Pepsi contract, since it's 98% sure, not 100%. Ms. Navab said that money would go into commercial reserves.

Mr. Marchand asked if the budget included interest from funds in the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. Mr. Hasan said it didn't.

Mr. Niederhut asked about the budget total. Mr. Hasan said it's roughly \$430,000.

A Delegate asked about the projected surplus. Ms. Navab said there will be carryover, but they don't know the amount at that time. Ms. Hsueh said they don't know how much surplus or left over money they'll have until September 30. Every year for the past five years the Graduate Division has contributed \$10-12,000. It was up to the elected Officers to negotiate that. This money was always added to funding. With this, and \$15,000 from CSF, they'll try to bring funding back to \$135,000.

A Delegate asked how they contribute to the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. Mr. Marchand said that was mostly from the previous Coca-Cola contract, \$50,000 a year for ten years. Ms. Navab said the

Coke contract was up that year. The campus was now trying to sign a deal with Pepsi, which was almost confirmed. The GA would get \$50,000 a year, and if the revenues for the Auxiliary exceed a certain amount, \$230,000 or so, they'd get a portion of revenues above that. Seeing no other questions, Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank Mr. Hasan.

## GA ELECTIONS

Election of GA President  
Election of the Assembly Affairs Vice President

- 23 -

Mr. Marchand said they had an hour for elections. If there were no nominees for certain positions, he would suggest tabling them until next month. Nominations will be made and then each candidate will speak for one minute, followed by five minutes of Q&A. They'd then ask the nominees to leave the room for five minutes of debate and vote. If there's only one candidate and people wanted to skip statements and debate, they could call the question. For Officer positions, an absolute majority was needed. If there are more than two candidates and none reaches 50% of those Delegates present, they'd have two rounds of voting.

### Election of GA President

Mr. Marchand called for nominations for GA President. Mr. Goren nominated Bahar Navab. Ms. Navab said she wanted to be transparent and tell the Delegates that she has also applied for the Student Regent position, which was in the second round of the selection process. Unless she's cut in the early rounds, she won't know about that appointment until the end of May or June. But getting appointed was a really long shot because the Student Regent has been a grad student back to back and the incoming Student Regent is also from Berkeley. If she got that, she would obviously have to give up the current position.

A Delegate asked about the current rules for term limits. Mr. Marchand said people were limited to three years of any Executive position. This was Ms. Navab's first year as a GA Executive, which was unusual for a GA President. Ms. Mendoza said Ms. Navab was in her first of three years.

Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Marchand said nominations were closed. He asked if people wanted to hear a statement from Ms. Navab, and noted that they didn't. He asked Ms. Navab to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

A Delegate asked what would happen if Ms. Navab had to step down. Ms. Mendoza said the Rules Committee will propose a By-law for an interim position the GA would elect. Mr. Marchand asked about the position becoming vacant in the summer. Ms. Mendoza there would be a provision for a committee or the Executive Board to elect someone, subject to Delegate approval.

The GA had a discussion off the record and a vote. Mr. Marchand asked to have Ms. Navab brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate her for being elected as GA President. (Applause)

### Election of the Assembly Affairs Vice President

Mr. Marchand called for any nominations for Assembly Affairs Vice President. This position is in charge of Assembly training, running meetings, sending out communications, overseeing the Web site, and was in charge of the internal affairs of the GA office, such as physical resources. He'd say the position was between 10-15 hours a week, more on days the GA meets.

A Delegate nominated Gordon Hoople. Mr. Trager nominated Philippe Marchand, who said he was termed out. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Marchand said nominations were closed.

Election of the Assembly Affairs Vice President (cont'd)  
Election of the Campus Affairs Vice President

- 24 -

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Marchand asked Mr. Hoople to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, a motion to hear from Mr. Hoople for one minute on plans for next year was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. Mr. Marchand asked Mr. Hoople to be brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate him on being elected Assembly Affairs Vice President. He asked for a one-minute post-election speech.

Mr. Hoople said he's a first-year Mechanical Engineering Delegate. He's talked to Mr. Marchand a lot about the position. He attended an Executive Board meeting once, has talked to Ms. Navab, and has met a couple of other committees on campus. This seemed like a great way to get more involved and he was excited to help Delegates.

#### Election of Campus Affairs Vice President

Ms. De la Torre said the Campus Affairs VP is the people manager, including campus-wide committees, the projects, and was responsible for Advocacy Agenda items. She's also responsible for E-Board meetings and going to administrative meetings. Mr. Marchand said the position was about 15 hours a week.

Mr. Marchand called for any nominations. Mr. Ortega nominated Heather Arata, from City and Regional Planning. Mr. Trager nominated Daniel, who respectfully declined. Mr. Hoople nominated Autumn Petros-Good, Energy and Resources Group. Ms. Navab nominated Bianca Suarez, current GMORR Coordinator.

Mr. Marchand said that as a formality, they need a Delegate to nominate candidates, so he asked a Delegate to nominate all three candidates. It was so moved by Mr. Helu.

Mr. Marchand said they'd have a short, one-minute introduction to the three candidates.

Ms. Arata introduced herself and said she's a first year in the City and Regional Planning Department. She spent the first year getting to know the University and getting involved with the GA. In her Department she attends student group meetings, even those she doesn't belong to, so she could fully represent them and their interests in the GA, and know what was going on. She's also been involved with student advocacy stuff the GA has done, and went to Sacramento and just got back from the DC trip. She's the Vice Chair for SAGE, Student Advocates for Graduate Education. She thought the position will work really well with what SAGE is doing. The EAVP is usually a member of SAGE, but she thought the CAVP would really know what was going on across the campus.

Ms. Petros-Good introduced herself and said she's a third-year Ph.D. student in the Energy and Resources Group. It's a very interdisciplinary program, so she knew a lot of people from Engineering, Law, Public Policy, and Public Health. That would be an important resource she could bring to this position, with different people telling her the issues that graduate students have. One of the biggest things she wanted to do was to work on communicating resources that are available, in a more easily accessible fashion. It's taken her a year to figure out all the different resources available. Over the past year she was on the Environmental Sustainability Committee and was Chair of the Green Initiative Fund Committee, which spends

Election of the Campus Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 25 -

student fee money on sustainability projects across the campus. That's given her a lot of experience with different groups and people on campus.

Ms. Suarez introduced herself and said she's a fourth-year Ph.D. in the Department of Education. It's her second year as Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Coordinator. She wasn't really interested in running for office, but Ms. Navab and Ms. De la Torre convinced her that it seemed like the next step to continue the work she's done on campus for the past two years. She's spent a lot of time trying to figure out the issues happening at the department level and has amassed information on what was happening on campus climate issues, and also where there are opportunities to increase the student voice in campus committees and other administrative bodies. She's attended a lot of meetings that year with Ms. De la Torre and Ms. Navab. In her time as GMORR Coordinator, she's come to learn that issues of campus climate, diversity populations, and underrepresented students are issues that affect all students. As CAVP, she would like to enhance the models that she has pioneered in GMORR across campus.

Ms. Suarez said she saw that as three kinds of issues. In terms of bringing more diversity and opinion and expertise to serve on campus-wide committees, that involved getting into departments with grad students and organizing across issues. All of the work she'd like to do was one-on-one. The second issue was developing infrastructure for student organizations. She thought some of the issues related to the budget report. The undergraduate student community has much more support. In terms of cross-campus symposia, the question was how they could connect what was going on, e.g., in Ethnic Studies and Bio and Neural Sciences.

Mr. Marchand said they'd have five minutes of questions for the candidates.

Mr. Onak said this position appoints students to campus committees; and there are over 80 of them. But students don't know what they're doing and there aren't channels for them to send out what they're finding. He asked what steps they'd take to restore these committees.

Ms. Arata said she served on a committee, and it was difficult to understand how she could represent the entire graduate student body. She would help students figure out what they wanted to do on the committee. She felt she could relate to them.

Ms. Suarez said a lot of what she tried to do with GMORR was intersect its issue with committees. She meets with different committees, and she'd like to enhance that model across all committees and understand what organizations were active in issues that committee members engage in and to connect them.

Ms. Arata said she didn't know that was a problem before. She thought communication was lacking among the different levels of Administration, faculty, and student groups.

Mr. Hoople asked candidates to explain their other time commitments. Ms. Suarez said she works 16 to 20 hours a week as GMORR Coordinator, so this would be her new work. Ms. Arata said she has a fellowship next year, her second year. So she'd have time. Ms. Petros-Good said she didn't have any classes anymore and was a full-time researcher.

Seeing no more questions, Mr. Marchand asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Marchand asked to have the candidates brought

Election of the Campus Affairs Vice President (cont'd)  
Election of the External Affairs Vice President  
Election of the Graduate Student Advocate

- 26 -

back in and said he would like to congratulate Ms. Suarez for being electric Campus Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

#### Election of the External Affairs Vice President

Mr. Ortega said that External Affairs deals with everything outside of campus, from City, local, and County issues, to State issues, with the UCSA, and at the federal level. The level of engagement was pretty broad and subject to what the EAVP determines.

Mr. Marchand called for any nominations. Mr. Helu nominated Angelica Salceda. A Delegate nominated Heather Arata, who respectfully declined. Mr. Hoople nominated Dillon Niederhut, who respectfully declined. Mr. Niederhut nominated Neil Sehgal, who respectfully declined. Seeing no further nominations, Mr. Marchand said nominations were closed. He called for a short statement by the candidate.

Ms. Salceda said she's a second-year Law student and is the current City and Legislative Director under the EAVP. Throughout the year she worked with the UCSA and has gone to Board meetings and Regents meetings. She's provided public comment and helped to organize the March in Sacramento. She also worked in the State Legislature before going to Law School.

A Delegate asked about her connections with Washington, D.C. Ms. Salceda said she's never worked in DC, but understood the process and the advocacy that needed to happen for higher education at the federal level.

A motion to call the question and go straight to a vote was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Marchand asked Ms. Salceda to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Marchand asked to have Ms. Salceda brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate her for being elected Campus Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

#### Election of Graduate Student Advocate

Ms. Navab said the Grad Student Advocate is a new position the GA created at the request of the ASUC. The ASUC Student Advocate Office was getting graduate cases and asked the GA to create this position. If a student has a charge filed against them, whether it's Student Conduct, academic probation, or if they'd like to file a grievance, this position could help. This position doesn't sit on the Exec Board and reports to the GA President.

Election of the Graduate Student Advocate (cont'd)  
Election of the Rule Officer  
Election of the Funding Officer

- 27 -

Mr. Marchand said that Mr. Cohen talked about what the Graduate Advocate does, and called for any nominations. Mr. Marchand noted that that current Grad Advocate wasn't present and hasn't indicated he wanted to run again.

Seeing no nominations, Mr. Marchand called for a motion to table discussion. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO TABLE ELECTION OF THE GRAD STUDENT ADVOCATE UNTIL THE MAY GA MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUS BY VOICE-VOTE.

#### Election of the GA Rules Officer

Ms. Mendoza said the Rules Officer also serves as parliamentarian for the Assembly and Chairs the Rules Committee.

Mr. Marchand called for any nominations. A Delegate Joanna Hernandez, Law. Seeing no further nominations, Mr. Marchand said nominations were closed.

Ms. Mendoza said she saw the importance of looking over their rules and By-laws and the importance of making sure their processes are correct, and to clarify any confusion. She wanted to make that process smoother.

Mr. Niederhut asked her how strongly she felt a point of information should be a question and not an excuse for someone to talk. Ms. Hernandez said she didn't think a point of information should hinder the rest of the agenda items.

Mr. Marchand asked the candidate to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Marchand asked to have Ms. Hernandez brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate her for being elected Rules Officer. (Applause)

#### Election of Funding Officer

Mr. Sheen said the Funding Officer makes recommendations on over \$100,000 in funding, about a quarter of the GA's annual operating budget. But it gets dirty sometimes. The workload is based on the timeline over the year. At the beginning of the semester they have 150 applications, which takes a lot of

time, probably a whole weekend. Other than that it's on a monthly basis. They generally have one meeting per month, and the position coordinates that and does a presentation at GA meetings.

Mr. Marchand called for any nominations. He said the current stipend is \$2,000 for the year, although that was subject to change.

Mr. Hoople nominated Patrick Baur, ESPM. Ms. Navab requested a nomination of Jacob Schak, Policy. It was so moved. Mr. Davidson nominated Mike Sheen, who said he was graduating.

Election of the Funding Officer (cont'd)

- 28 -

Seeing no further nominations, Mr. Marchand said nominations were closed. Mr. Marchand asked each candidate to speak for a minute.

Mr. Baur said the Funding Committee had a very important but not very glamorous job. He enjoyed working with the Funding Committee that past year and was excited about the new policy changes they hope to implement. The Funding Committee, by supporting graduate student groups on campus, facilitates collaboration, recreation, community involvement, and cultural growth, and provides a really important service to graduate students in what could be a very difficult and, at times, isolating experience. He thought the policy changes they're making will streamline the service they provide. He was also very strongly supportive of the move to allocate a fixed pot for interdisciplinary groups.

Mr. Schak said he's a first-year student at the School of Public Policy. He currently serves on the Committee on Student Fees, which is under CACSSF. They're working on a \$2 million surplus and trying to allocate that. He looked forward to working with the Funding Committee. He thought Mr. Sheen did a great job and has clearly explained how they came up with their allocation recommendations. Mr. Schak said he'd be flexible with groups to accommodate their needs. He did work on a similar committee for the student government at his undergrad organization and did that for four years.

Mr. Marchand called for any questions for the candidates.

Mr. Tentori asked what the candidates saw as the role for Contingency funding and how much discretion there would be for that. Mr. Baur said that GMORR covers day-to-day operations of student groups to facilitate periodic and continuing meetings. Grants cover big, one-time events, like symposia or major community volunteer operations. Contingency exists to provide student groups to either category with the opportunity to get the funds they need if something exceptional came up. They might want to put on an event that goes beyond the Grants threshold, or a great opportunity came up for a group that they didn't know about at the beginning of the semester, and needed funds for more immediate costs. The Contingency Fund has a great deal of discretion and is merit based. But it was very important that Contingency funding exists to cover exceptional cases.

Mr. Schak said he thought Contingency funding was a very good idea. At his undergraduate institution they had a special fund called "Special Allocations," with a committee that met once a week to consider requests from groups. It funded a lot of great, creative ideas. It also lessened the workload of committees, because when they did the big, annual allocation, they didn't have to review every little thing.

Mr. Niederhut asked what the candidates would do to make sure that GMER funding remained equitable on a per-student basis.

Mr. Baur said he was involved in the Committee that proposed the new set of guidelines, which they saw as an equity issue, balancing the need of per-student equity with the equally valid goal of ensuring that every academic unit got a certain amount of funding to support its activities. He thought this was one of the fairest possible systems they could imagine. They're open to feedback, of course. He was devoted to making sure funds were distributed as fairly and objectively as possible.

Mr. Schak said he agreed with everything Mr. Baur said and thought the other thing to consider was whether groups that make a request for something really advertise to a broad array of students.

Election of the Funding Officer (cont'd)  
Election of the Environmental Sustainability Officer

- 29 -

A motion to call the question was made and seconded failed by voice-vote. A division was requested. The motion failed by hand-vote 16-14, requiring a two-thirds vote.

Mr. Klein asked the candidates to briefly describe the most important criteria they would take into account when judging grant applications.

Mr. Baur said the first thing to look at for Grants was the total pool of money and how much was being requested. Sometimes they have a tremendous amount of flexibility to accept everything, within certain standard guidelines. When they have to allocate less money than requested, the Funding Committee should take as objective a stance as possible. Groups that engage a broad array of students across campus should get a little more consideration. The only time he felt Grant applications should face serious skepticism was if the budget wasn't clearly explained and justified. And that happened quite often. The strongest criteria in his opinion were those that engage the broadest swath of the graduate community.

Mr. Schak said that they had to consider the precedent, look at outside sources of funding groups might have, and whether this would be a one-time allocation or something that was recurring.

Mr. Marchand asked the candidates to leave for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Marchand asked to have the candidates brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate Mr. Baur for being elected Funding Officer.

#### Election of the Environmental Sustainability Officer

Mr. Trager said the position runs the Sustainability Committee and appoints people to campus committees. A number of offices on campus deal with sustainability, and several departments. They receive lots of requests for help from undergraduates.

Mr. Marchand called for nominations for Sustainability Officer position.

A Delegate nominated Jason Trager. Mr. Davidson nominated Autumn Petros-Good. Mr. Marchand said that seeing no other nominations, nominations were closed.

Mr. Marchand asked the candidates for one-minute statements. Mr. Trager said that next year he would like to continue to work on the connections that he's built. He has his hand in a lot of sustainability efforts around campus. He's worked to connect people and to build a team, and working with the Green

Initiative Fund and the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. He was very familiar with sustainability groups.

Ms. Petros-Good said her Department was very focused on sustainability. Everyone in her class had to take classes about sustainability. She had a lot of resources she could capitalize on. She was really interested in this and it was her career.

Mr. Marchand called for questions for the candidates. Mr. Kline asked if they were coming out on April 14 to help him clean the Emeryville Crescent, and if they were interested in working more with the

Election of the Environmental Sustainability Officer (cont'd)  
Election of Graduate Council Representatives

- 30 -

Community Clean-up and Outreach workgroup on projects. Mr. Trager said that was the first he's hadn't heard of that, but he would be. Ms. Petros-Good said she'll be out of town, but has organized those events in the past. She'd be happy to work with Mr. Klein in the future.

Mr. Baur asked about their top three priorities for sustainability on the campus they'd focus on.

Mr. Trager said his pet project has been sustainability fellowships, getting 30 endowed fellowships for graduate students to study sustainability. His second priority was energy efficiency on the campus, and his third was composting on campus. It was a travesty they didn't have that.

Ms. Petros-Good said his first priority would be sustainability awareness and outreach. A lot of people don't understand sustainability. Her second priority would be waste management, which was very disorganized and needed more student involvement. She didn't have a third priority yet.

Mr. Tentori asked if they thought their role was to enforce sustainability or promote it. Ms. Petros-Good said she was definitely on the side of promoting it. She thought if they try to enforce sustainability and make rules about it, people feel very constrained and can act against sustainability initiatives. Promoting sustainability and being community oriented was a much better way to operate.

Mr. Trager said he thought both were needed. They have sustainability policies for a reason and there have been cases in which they're not followed. It's the Sustainability Officer's job to put their foot down and state what the right thing to do was. And promoting it was critical. If people come to Cal, they should know that this was what they do on campus.

A Delegate asked how long they've been on the Committee. Mr. Trager said he started on the Committee two years ago, and this year he was Chair. Ms. Petros-Good said this was her first year.

Mr. Marchand said the Rules Officer asked to verify that quorum was present. After a show of hands, Mr. Marchand said there were 29 Delegates present, and they had quorum.

Seeing no other questions, Mr. Marchand asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Marchand asked to have the candidates brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate Ms. Petros-Good for being elected Sustainability Officer.

Election of Graduate Council Representatives

Mr. Marchand said the Graduate Council meets once a month and is the Academic Senate Committee that makes policy on graduate studies and students. It is comprised of mostly faculty with three grad students and an alternate. Mr. Marchand called for nominations.

Mr. Hoople nominated Neil Sehgal, HSPA. Mr. Riffe nominated Dillon Niederhut, Anthropology. Mr. Helu nominated Heather Arata, CRP. Ms. Navab said that people could serve as a Grad Council rep as a Delegate, a Project Coordinator, or staff, but not as an Officer.

Election of Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)  
Discussion of the GA Boat Cruise

- 31 -

A quorum call was requested. Mr. Marchand asked Delegates to raise their voting cards, and said there were 30 Delegates present.

Seeing no further nominations, Mr. Marchand asked the candidates to speak for one minute. A motion to call the question and go straight to discussion was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Marchand asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Marchand asked to have the candidates brought back into the room and said Mr. Sehgal, Mr. Niederhut, and Ms. Arata were elected as Graduate Council representatives. He said the GA would vote on an alternate next month.

#### DISCUSSION ON THE GA BOAT CRUISE

Mr. Marchand said that in order to have the boat sail on Saturday, the GA had to give the company a check for \$30,000. Ticket sales have generated \$25,000, but the GA didn't have access to that money at that time. So they're requesting the Delegates to approve a check for \$30,000 from commercial reserves. Ms. Navab said it would be paid back by the Grad Social Club, which has \$25,000 in ticket sales, and an additional \$5,000 in its account, with and \$3,000 left in its GA account. But the GA can't compile these funds to issue a check by Friday, and so the GSC was asking the Delegates to front the money.

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Klein and was seconded by Mr. Davidson.

Mr. Helu said that in years past the GSC has come to the GA with these kinds of issues ahead of time. It seems that this has been completely disorganized that year, putting the GA between a rock and a hard space.

Ms. De la Torre said this has been disorganized and stressful. The GSC Coordinators said they could walk away from this.

Mr. Sehgal asked what would happen to the Boat Cruise if the GA doesn't approve this funding. Ms. Navab said the boat wouldn't sail and the GA could be sued. Mr. Sehgal asked if approving this money was the only option. Ms. Navab said the other option was to cancel it, lose the \$2,500 deposit, and have to reimburse everyone, including the \$4 each person had to pay as part of a ticket transaction fee. Ms. De la Torre said they've always lost money on the Boat Cruise.

Ms. Navab said communication and the lack of accountability have been huge problems. They underpay Coordinators. Mr. Hasan, GA Treasurer, has tried to get figures, but communication with the GSC was a problem. The Exec Board might need to think about whether this event was worth putting on in future years.

Mr. Helu asked what they could do in the future so this doesn't happen again. Ms. Navab they tried to put some checks in for future years, like operating procedures for the Exec Board and the GSC. Also, when any future contract is signed with a vendor, the Exec Board needed to approve the contract and the President needed to sign it, not the Grad Social Club.

Discussion of the GA Boat Cruise (cont'd)

- 32 -

Mr. Hasan said the GSC Coordinators said it wasn't humanly possible for two grads to organize these events, and thought four people could do it. So there was now funding for four Coordinators.

Ms. Navab said that in the past, tickets for the Boat Cruise were \$40-50 for three drinks, and now it's \$65 for unlimited drinks, or \$69 with the transaction fee. She didn't know if the GA wanted to subsidize heavy drinking. There's a cap people have, where they don't think it's worth paying \$70 for an event. It's turned out really well in the past, but at \$40.

A Delegate asked where the \$5,000 was from that the GSC already had. Ms. De la Torre said it was from profits the GSC generated from other events. The GA has asked them to cancel that account and transfer the money to the GA.

Mr. Onak said he's worked with the GSC Coordinators on GSC events and they have done great things that year with smaller events.

Mr. Davidson asked if it was possible to deal with another company. Mr. Hasan said the company has actually been very lenient. Last year the boat left from a different dock, at a different price, and he thought that impacted ticket sales.

Mr. Sehgal asked how many tickets have been sold out of the 500 they were committed for, and what amount they stood to lose if they breach the contract. Mr. Marchand said he understood they'd lose a \$5,000 deposit and \$2,000 in service fees.

Mr. Goren said the GA could talk about what to do in the future, but that wasn't the question at hand, which was whether to cancel the event or front the money.

Ms. Mendoza said that from a rules perspective, she was taking this as a budget amendment. It wasn't an allocation, but a loan, or an advance.

Mr. Hasan said the Boat Cruise wasn't in the budget, and it wasn't supposed to work out this way. When he'd ask very polite questions about how this was being organized, he got much more than resistance, and got very poor responses from the GSC.

A Delegate asked how much this will cost. Ms. Navab said the GSC will cover a portion of the cost. If they see that as GA money, it will cost them about \$7,000 at this point. But it would be covered through GSC current accounts.

Mr. Hasan said he felt the potential liability was greater

Ms. Pymer moved to write a check for \$25,000 under the condition that the other \$5,000 comes from the GSC bank account, and that they close the account and have everything go back to the GA. Ms. Navab said they wouldn't be able to process the \$5,000 check in time for them to pay the vendor.

Mr. Marchand said there's \$25,000 from ticket sales and \$5,000 would come from the GSC bank account.

Discussion of the GA Boat Cruise (cont'd)  
Resolutions

- 33 -

1203d, On Standing Policy and Directed Action Against the Proposed UC Berkeley Honor Code

A motion to call the question was made and seconded. Mr. Marchand said the motion was to advance \$25,000 to pay the Boat Cruise, assuming they'll get the money through ticket sales and the GSC account from previous social events. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Marchand said they were running late and had Resolutions to consider. People could adjourn the meeting or, perhaps, set a certain amount of time to consider the bills.

Mr. Davidson asked if any of the Resolutions were time sensitive. Ms. Navab said that unless the GA takes a stance on the honor code, the ASUC's stance would apply for the GA as well; and she knew that grads have felt differently than undergrads on this issue. There was also a Resolution on criminal charges stemming from a non-violent protest. Those students were being arraigned, and if the GA wanted to have influence on that, they should consider the bill that evening.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Mr. Marchand said that would mean all Resolutions would be tabled until the next meeting. The motion to adjourn failed by voice-vote.

## RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Davidson moved to table Resolutions 1202e, Directed Action In Support of Chancellor Birgeneau's "Knowledge Made In America: A Private-Public Funding Model"; 1203a, By-law Amendment Defining Sustainable Food and Beverage Criteria; and 1203c, Standing Policy and Directed Action In support of the Middle Class Scholarship Act. The motion was seconded. Mr. Marchand said the motion would postpone the Resolutions until the next GA meeting.

Mr. Klein said the GA was supposed to have food at its next meeting and 1203a might impact that.

Mr. Ortega said he'd like to get work done and out of the way, since the meeting next month will be long.

Mr. Marchand suggested postponing 1203a and 1203c and to separately discuss whether to postpone 1203b. The motion to divide was made and seconded and passed with no objection. **THE MOTION TO TABLE 1203a AND 1203c PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Twigg said they were already half an hour over the meeting and they should just deal with bills that were time sensitive. A motion to call the question and go to an immediate vote was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO TABLE 1202e PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution, 1203d, as amended on the floor, was authored by Gordon Hoople:

1203d, On Standing Policy & Directed Action Against the Proposed UCB Honor Code (cont'd) - 34 -

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION AGAINST THE PROPOSED UC BERKELEY HONOR CODE

WHEREAS, certain members of campus want to institute an Honor Code at UC Berkeley that would read to the effect of “As a member of the Berkeley community, I act with honesty, integrity, and respect for others”; and

WHEREAS, the Honor Code would be placed on exams, asking students to sign a statement such as “On my honor, I have neither given nor received assistance in the taking of this exam.”; and

WHEREAS, the aim of the proposed Honor Code is to strengthen the culture of honesty, integrity, and mutual respect among students, making it more a part of the social consciousness on campus; and

WHEREAS, the Honor Code would be voluntary for both instructors and students, would not be integrated into the Student Code of Conduct, and there would be no consequences for violation of the Honor Code; and

WHEREAS, there has been informal conversation about implementing an educational component to teach students about plagiarism, and other issues related to integrity. No concrete plans exist, however, for implementing this educational component; and

WHEREAS, the tenets of the proposed Honor Code are already present in the existing UCB “Principles of Community”; and

WHEREAS, the majority of GA delegates surveyed last December raised concerns or objections to the Honor Code;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly supports the intention behind the Honor Code and believes in creating a culture of integrity, mutual respect, and honesty on campus.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly believes that implementation of the honor code as it currently stands, without a clear program and plan for establishing the knowledge-base and values required to make an honor code successful, will serve to trivialize the proposed honor code.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly is in support of establishing a collaborative team of undergraduates (appointed by the ASUC), graduate students (appointed by the GA President), and faculty members (appointed by the Academic Senate), to develop a full educational plan and a more comprehensive honor code that can truly achieve the aims outlined above.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the ASUC Senate and to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

Mr. Hoople said the Resolution came from the fact that some faculty members are pushing the idea of an honor code. The way they'd implement it would be to put a piece of paper in front of tests with a

1203d, On Standing Policy & Directed Action Against the Proposed UCB Honor Code (cont'd) - 35 -

statement, determining that they now had an honor code. However, that is not the way to generate the culture of an honor code. Mr. Hoople said he went to a small, liberal arts college that had an awesome honor code. He loved honor codes and wished Berkeley could get one. But to achieve an honor code, they needed to foster that community before just declaring that they have an honor code. He thought that if they took the approach currently being proposed, it would do irreparable harm to ever having an honor code in the future.

Mr. Goren said that as a psychologist who has studied integrity on exams, the research he's familiar with is that an honor code like this prompts people to think about integrity. It becomes in the forefront of their minds. People who already have integrity and are honorable people don't say they'll cheat less. A person who sees themselves as someone who has cheated in the past and might cheat more in the future starts thinking about possibly cheating on the exam.

Mr. Niederhut said he's been teaching for a couple of years now, and every semester he has at least one student who cheats or plagiarizes. This might not be the way to foster community or to build an honor code movement from the students, that was actually grassroots. But it might be better than nothing.

Mr. Hoople said the Resolution says that the GA was in favor of creating an honor code on campus, but not in the way it was being constructed, and that they'd like to work with whoever was backing this movement to find a way to address the very questions being raised.

A Delegate said he thought the Resolution was great. His one concern was where it specifies the graduate and undergraduate members of the committee would do something, and he would like to have consideration of how faculty address the honor code.

Mr. Davidson asked if they could summarize the issues on both sides. Mr. Hoople said that last month what was raised, and the feedback they got a survey, was that generally, an honor code sounded great, but that they weren't sure this was the way to go about it. Ms. Navab said that 60% of Delegates said they shouldn't have an honor code, and 40% they should.

Ms. Navab said the Resolution should be amended to say that the three faculty participating on this would be appointed best Academic Senate.

Ms. Navab said that the concern wasn't with students who know what cheating is and choose to cheat. Her concern was with students who don't know that by collaborating on a homework assignment, they could be cheating, or don't realize they need to cite an idea and not just a direct quote. Those gray areas

need to be taught, and having students sign a statement without an educational component trivializes the statement. The ASUC was saying to approve an honor code as the first piece and then do the educational component. Ms. Navab said she thought that should be reversed.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said he thought the honor code was trivial as proposed. Potentially, every homework assignment could be turned in with an honor code statement. These kinds of statements have limited effect, and punishment worked better.

Mr. Marchand said he attended the ASUC Senate meeting and spoke against the honor code. It was strange to do an honor code that was independent of all enforcement mechanisms. An honor code would need enforcement, and most debates with honor code violations involve students denouncing each other.

1203d, On Standing Policy & Directed Action Against the Proposed UCB Honor Code (cont'd) - 36 -  
1203e, On Directed Action In Opposition to Criminal Charges Stemming from Non-violent  
Campus Protests

It invites people to denounce students. That was different from other campuses. The ASUC mentioned that this would be for more than just exams. Some undergrads thought exams should be emphasized. Somebody said a code might discourage students from glancing at another's paper. It might not affect premeditated cheating, but might affect spontaneous cheating.

Mr. Tentori said that as a GSI, he would not want such a statement on any of his tests. He didn't want students to not cheat because they signed something.

Mr. Sehgal said they should have the ability to do this in the right way, in a positive way, and encourage further refinement. Grad students would ultimately enforce this, and so they should perhaps take a more reasoned approach.

Ms. Bravo said they need more education before having an honor code. When she came in as an undergrad, she had no idea about citations and didn't know what plagiarism was. It was mentioned in class, but it wasn't always clear. People would be signing a statement without understanding what it meant to cheat.

A motion to call the question, end debate, and go directly to a vote was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Marchand said any amendment by committee would need to be brought up for debate.

Mr. Hoople moved to amend the second-to-last Resolved Clause, to add, "(appointed by the Academic Senate)." The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Seeing no further amendments or discussion, Mr. Marchand said they would come to a vote.

**THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1203d, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION AGAINST THE PROPOSED UC BERKELEY HONOR CODE.**

The following Resolution 1203e, as amended on the floor, was authored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN OPPOSITION TO CRIMINAL CHARGES STEMMING FROM NON-VIOLENT CAMPUS PROTESTS

WHEREAS, on November 9th, after thousands of members of the campus community participated in a rally and march organized for the Day of Action, nearly 500 of them voted as a General Assembly to set up tents under the banner of 'Occupy Cal'; and

1203e, On Directed Action In Opposition to Criminal Charges Stemming from Non-violent Campus Protests (cont'd) - 37 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN OPPOSITION TO CRIMINAL CHARGES STEMMING FROM NON-VIOLENT CAMPUS PROTESTS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, in the afternoon and evening of November 9th, campus police officers (UCPD), along with officers from the Oakland PD and Alameda County Sheriff Dept., used baton strikes against, and forcefully removed, protesters who were forming a human chain around the tents; and

WHEREAS, in response to these events, the Graduate Assembly passed Resolution 1112a, "Standing Policy and Directed Action regarding non-violent protests on the University of California campuses," which condemned the initiation of police force in response to non-violent campus protests; and

WHEREAS, on November 14th the Chancellor granted amnesty under the Student Code of Conduct for students who were arrested and cited solely for blocking police access to the tents on November 9th; and

WHEREAS, while UC Davis Chancellor Linda Katehi requested that criminal charges be dropped for students arrested during the November 18th police intervention against non-violent protesters, Chancellor Birgeneau has not done the same at UC Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, the Alameda County District Attorney has recently filed charges against several of the students and one faculty member engaged in the November 9th protest, including resisting arrest, remaining at the scene of a riot, obstruction of a throughway, obstructing an officer, and battery; and

WHEREAS, some of the graduate students who received charges were not arrested on November 9th, and instead appear to have been singled out by UCPD as lead organizers for the GSI union and the Public Education Coalition; and

WHEREAS, students who engaged in non-violent protest on November 9th have since been issued stay-away notices from UC Berkeley while they face criminal prosecution, barring them from setting foot on campus at most times and from participating in normal student life;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA President send a letter to the UCPD and the District Attorney's Office in opposition to criminal charges being filed against non-violent campus

protesters, and in opposition to charges being used to single out individuals for political purposes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA President sends a letter to Chancellor Birgeneau, asking him to express his opposition to the filing of criminal charges against non-violent campus protesters.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly calls for an immediate end to the draconian stay-away orders and objects to the filing of charges against protesters involved in the November 9th Day of Action.

1203e, On Directed Action In Opposition to Criminal Charges Stemming from Non-violent Campus Protests (cont'd) - 38 -

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said several people who participated in the November protests, students and a professor, were charged with various charges, such as resisting arrest, trespassing, and others. They're faced with stay-away orders and cannot come to campus except for class. The Resolution says the GA thinks that's an egregious action for people who did nothing but stand by their rights.

Mr. Marchand said there were amendments out of committee, to add a Whereas Clause at the end, and to add a final Resolved Clause. A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, ADDING THE LAST WHEREAS CLAUSE AND THE LAST RESOLVED CLAUSE.

Mr. Marchand called for discussion on the Resolution as amended.

Mr. Sehgal asked about concerns of the Rules Committee. Ms. Pymer said the Resolution states that people were singled out, and they wanted to make sure they understood where that came from being making that claim. They also talked about people, in a non-violent protest, kind of expecting to get arrested, and to make a statement in the course of being arrested, showing their belief that something was unjust.

Mr. Marchand said that after watching videos, people who weren't initially charged ended up being charged because campus police recognized them from the videos. He wasn't sure what "obstructing a thoroughfare" is, but with 2,000 people marching in a street, they also were an obstruction. So people were being singled out, from thousands of people. For the stay-away orders, people can go to class or work, but can't do things like go to the library and couldn't use student services. Exceptions were also made for University housing. A number of stay-away orders have been dropped, but not all of them.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said other charges were battery on a police officer, which was false, from his understanding; failure to disburse, which he would cop to; and inciting a riot, which was bogus. Key organizers were beaten extensively, but not arrested. The belief is that they were singled out.

Ms. Navab said she thought the stay-away order was the most objectionable part. Students pay fees to go here and with this order, couldn't use most of the services on the campus, such as the health center and the library. She read the police reports and saw the evidence the DA has. There are accounts by police officers that disagree with what she saw that day. It was the GA's role to stand up for students and for free speech.

Mr. Trager said the point of non-violent protest was not to be arrested, but to follow through with actions and accept the consequences in the hope that greater society sees the wrong with what happened and supports the protesters in their pursuit of righteousness.

Mr. Baur said his building, the College of Natural Resources, has had a rash of break-ins. He thought the priorities were reversed when the police focus on non-violent protesters and not on actual crimes.

Mr. Sehgal said it was hard for him to denounce charges without specifying what those charges are. The GA would be ultimately making a blanket statement that everything the Alameda County Sheriff was saying was wrong.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

1203e, On Directed Action In Opposition to Criminal Charges Stemming from Non-violent Campus Protests (cont'd) - 39 -

**THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1203E, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN OPPOSITION TO CRIMINAL CHARGES STEMMING FROM NON-VIOLENT CAMPUS PROTESTS.**

Mr. Marchand said that concluded their agenda. He wanted to thank everybody for attending. He wanted to congratulate people who were elected.

This meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary