

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

December 1, 2011

### SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting concluded the Fall Semester. It was called to order at 5:36 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall.

#### Approval of the Agenda

The Chancellor was to have attended the meeting, but asked to reschedule.

#### Presentation by the Operational Excellence Shared Services Team

The Shared Services project has approved an implementation planning team. OE is an effort to improve campus operations and save money. The GA heard from Thera Kalmijn, Executive Director for Shared Services Implementation. The functions they're looking at are HR, IT, finance, and research administration. They want to take a more strategic approach to delivering these administrative services that is more effective and efficient. The organizational culture on the campus is decentralized. They're currently in the design validation phase, trying to gather the data they need. Design will be finished in the first three months of next year, and they'll have a phased implementation. Shared services is different from central campus services. In the spring they'll likely do a current state of satisfaction survey, pre-implementation. There's typically difficulty in the first couple of years, as people adjust, after which service satisfaction climbs.

#### ASUC Announcement

Mr. Albright, ASUC Senator, reported. A dance event will be held on Memorial Glade. Registration for the Dance Marathon is open a fundraiser for pediatric AIDS. Student government owns the Cal Lodge, on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe, with reduced prices for ASUC and GA members and groups.

#### GA Announcements

Ms. Jui said the Student Mental Health Advisory Committee is looking for feedback for its Committee's Advocacy Agenda.

Ms. Hsueh, Business Office Manager, announced winter hours for Anthony Hall.

Mr. Marchand said the GA in February will elect a new rep to the Graduate Council.

#### Guest Announcements

Chris Ackman, Executive Director of ECO Media (Environmental Clubs & Organizations), would like grad student involvement

### Funding Contingency Report

Mr. Sheen reported, Funding Officer, reported. Discussion was focused on Students for Zero Waste at GSPP and the American Indian Graduate Student's group. A motion to fund the latter group the full amount failed unanimously by voice-vote, as part of the request was for a printer, which the GA has made available.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA adopted the Funding Committee's recommendations, awarding \$1,212.64 in Contingency.

### REPORTS

Ms. Navab, GA President, reported. Applications for the Faculty Mentor Award are out. The System-wide SHIP Committee will look at next year's health insurance contract, and feedback was requested. The Regents approved expenditures Lower Sproul work, \$193 million. The additional \$30 million from savings will be discussed by the Lower Sproul Workgroup. The GA hopes to turn Anthony Hall into more of a grad lounge. An investigation will be conducted by the UCLA Assistant Police Chief on what happened with the Berkeley campus protests on November 9. Ms. Navab said she was asked to identify six students who were witnesses or victims to meet with the Assistant Chief. Also, grads were encouraged to use the ASUC Bookstore for Christmas gifts, since money spent there comes back to the students. The Health Fee Advisory Board recommended an increase in the Health Fee to \$57.50, increasing it a little bit to meet demand. The Academic Senate met on Monday and had a vote of no confidence in how the campus Administration handled the events of November 9.

Mr. Marchand, Assembly Affairs VP, reported. He's been working on attendance records and has contacted perhaps a dozen Delegates. Committee membership changes were proposed and approved with no objection. Seven of the GA's nine laptop computers were stolen during the Thanksgiving break. The GA has changed the keys and they'll add additional security upgrades to Anthony Hall. The GA, the E-Board, and especially Ms. Navab, took an active role with the protests and communicating with the Administration and protesters, and the GA and Ms. Navab received a lot of praise.

Ms. De la Torre, Campus Affairs VP, reported. She was appointing Eve Weissman, Law, to the Police Review Board. Appointees don't usually require GA approval, but a vote was needed due to PRB policy. After discussion Ms. Weissman's appointment was approved by voice-vote. The new Berkeley Graduate Project Coordinator was introduced, Fiona Tang, Law. A new Women of Color Conference Project Coordinator, Tala Khanmalek, Ethnic Studies, was being hired. A request was made to work on a graduate mental health survey.

Mr. Ortega, External Affairs VP, was working on the SAGE Conference that will be held on Friday.

Ms. Epstein, GA Treasurer, reported. The GA has funds for groups to rent Pauley Ballroom.

### RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 1111a was approved under the Consent Calendar, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for Three Student Regents.

Resolution 1110a was approved by hand-vote 39-4, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of SB 259, which would allow GSRs at UC to decide whether to unionize.

Resolution 1111e was approved unanimously by voice-vote, To Create a Student Financial Oversight Workgroup. The group will review UC financial documents and issue a report. Jonathan Stein, Student Regent, requested the bill. There was a pilot test, with an analysis done by Sanaz Mobasseri, Public Policy. The bill establishes a Workgroup. With no objection, the GA approved adding one person to the Workgroup and naming Ms. Mobasseri as Chair.

The GA tabled discussion on Resolution 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County.

Resolution 1111c, as amended, passed by voice-vote, Budget Amendment to Invest \$30,000 in the Graduate Assembly's Funds Functioning as Endowments.

Resolution, 1111d, as amended, was approved by voice-vote, On a By-law Amendment and Budget Amendment to Create a Graduate Student Advocate Position. The ASUC Student Advocate Office would do the training. The position would take on grads' grievance cases dealing with academics, housing, etc.

Resolution 1111b was taken from the table and considered, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County. A motion to indefinitely postpone the bill failed by hand-vote 17-23. A motion to amend by adding the ban to restaurants and retail establishments, besides grocery stores, passed by hand-vote 19-16. A motion to table the bill until the February GA meeting passed by voice-vote.

Resolution 1112a, as amended, was approved by voice-vote, On Standing Policy and Directed Action Regarding Non-Violent Protests on the University of California Campuses.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

**End Summary of the meeting**



This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Fall Semester, was called to order by Philippe Marchand at 5:36 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall.

Mr. Marchand said that as he mentioned in his e-mail, they have some pre-printed material and asked if anybody needed printed material.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Marchand said the Chancellor will not be at the meeting that evening. Ms. Navab said he asked to reschedule because he wanted to prepare for the SAGE Conference on Friday. Hopefully he'll attend in

Approval of the Agenda (cont'd)  
Resolution Referral

- 4 -

February. It was unfortunate he couldn't attend because she knew a lot of people were planning to talk to him that evening.

Ms. Pickering asked if the Chancellor or his staff addressed any questions the GA sent in advance. Ms. Navab said the questions haven't been sent yet since the Chancellor wasn't going to attend. She'll give the questions to him on Friday at their standing meeting. She'll let people know if he addresses any of them.

Mr. Klein asked if the Chancellor apologized for not attending. Ms. Navab said she'd have to check the e-mail.

Mr. Marchand called for a motion to approve the agenda, as amended. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Marchand noted that there were three microphones available for people to use.

#### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Marchand called for a motion to approve the minutes from the November 3 GA meeting. It was so moved and seconded. Mr. Marchand said the minutes were posted online with all the meeting material. There was some delay because of the problems with CalMail. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2011 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

#### RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Marchand said there was only one Resolution to refer to committee, 1112a, Standing Policy and Directed Action Regarding Non-violent Protests on University of California Campuses.

Ms. Navab said she would encourage the Assembly to fast track the bill as this was a time sensitive issue. She thought they should consider it now rather than in February, when these issues will be less pressing. It was so moved and seconded.

Mr. Marchand said that fast tracking a bill meant it's not sent to committee, and a three-quarters vote was required for approval. **THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK 1112a PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Navab said that Shared Services wanted to talk about Operational Excellence initiatives, an area that would impact grads. Andrew Szeri was present, the head of the Program office for OE, and she asked if could address any questions in general about OE.

Mr. Szeri said he didn't know he was going to speak, but he'd try and give an update. The campus so far has about \$40 million worth of investments approved for OE projects. Together, they should net approximately \$71 million worth of savings, as he recalled. So far the Shared Services project has only approved an implementation planning team, to do detailed design on how to implement shared services on the campus. This will be a short-term, relatively low-cost planning effort. It will generate a full proposal that will go through the process, to the various committees of OE, including bodies with student input. That should probably happen early in the Spring Semester.

Mr. Szeri said that evening the GA will hear from two key members of the team doing the detailed design for Shared Services. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked for a short description of OE. Mr. Szeri said that Operational Excellence is an effort to improve campus operations and save money. The idea is to invest up to \$75 million of one-time money in order to create improvements and efficiencies in operations that save \$75 million a year, year after year. The focus is on administrative processes, many of which are hidden from students, but of importance to the way the University runs. People can understand it most easily as a way to make sure that students' tuition dollars are going further in the sense of supporting a highly functional University administration.

Ms. Navab said some things don't relate directly to students, and some do. They voted in committee that day on something that will affect students, the creation of a one-stop shop for students' financial transactions. Students now have to go Sproul for some transactions and to University Hall for some. Housing financial aid, loans, etc., in one location was more student-centered. A lot of others OE initiatives don't necessarily impact students directly, like e-procurement and timekeeping. Shared Services is an area mostly focused on by staff, although it has implications for grad students. That's why the GA asked staff to come in that evening.

Ms. Delgado said she heard an e-mail went around that some of the problems in CalMail were due to a decrease in technical services people doing that job. All students were affected, but especially grads who teach and have students, and had to prepare grades.

Mr. Szeri said there have been problems with CalMail, and everybody was suffering. Those problems occurred because the system that has been in place for some years is now at the end of its life. An OE project has as one of its goals replacing the way mail is done on campus. But OE didn't cause the CalMail outage and OE isn't responsible for CalMail being at the end of its life. In fact, it represents the pathway by which the campus can migrate to a better, more effective e-mail solution. That will most likely be provided by a third-party provider, like Google, or somebody like that. But that was still in the process of negotiation. To answer the question about Ms. Navab had about the one-stop shop, Mr. Szeri said it was approved by the Executive Committee that afternoon. But it was approved with a proviso, to do more thinking and detail about the budget and about space renovations needed in Sproul Hall, or

wherever the one-stop office is housed. So it's approved in principle with budgetary details to be worked out later.

Presentation by the Operational Excellence Shared Services Team (cont'd)

- 6 -

Ms. Pickering asked if he could give another two-sentence summary of Shared Services. Mr. Szeri said that will be explained.

Mr. Szeri said it was his pleasure to introduce the Executive Director for Shared Services Implementation, Thera Kalmijn.

Ms. Kalmijn said she couldn't explain Shared Services in two sentences. She introduced herself. She's a Cal grad, and was there as an undergrad, studying Slavic Languages and Literature. She came back and did her MBA in the Haas School evening program. She was really glad to be back, as it felt like home. Go Bears!

Ms. Kalmijn said she was really excited to be doing this work. She'll talk about where they are in terms of the campus Administration and why they're doing the Shared Services project to begin with, the direction they're headed the challenges they face, and the timeline.

This probably wasn't new to any of them who have interactions with staff and departments. The functions they're looking at, HR, IT, finance, and research administration, are stretched to the limits, especially in departments that aren't as well resourced as some professional schools might be.

They also have some challenges with centrally delivered services and systems. There's a tension between centrally delivered services and department staff and academic units, who feel the needed quality or responsiveness wasn't there. So there's an effort to stem tension on campus; and that doesn't make it any easier to get people's administrative work done. They have a very decentralized, fragmented way of doing work at Berkeley. She's trying to get an accurate count of how many departments there actually are on campus. If there are over 200, she'd guess that for many processes, things are actually done in 200 different ways. As might be imagined, that's not very efficient. It also creates problems with risk and compliance.

As a result, Ms. Kalmijn said a lot of people have been trying, in the absence of effective, campus-wide systems, to create work-arounds. People create something in the absence of centrally led efforts to support work being done. That's led to a lot of short-term, reactive solutions. People had something that needed to be done and had no tool to do it. So, e.g., they created a form to fill out. People use forms in departments that were designed in 1986. A lot of things have not changed in a lot of years.

Ms. Kalmijn said that as to where they are headed, first, they want to take a more strategic approach to delivering these administrative services, and do things more effectively and efficiently. They want higher professional standards for the work they do. There's sometimes a feeling that if you start an administrative transaction and it gets sent along, it can disappear into a box. Staff are unsure what was happening with it and sometimes had to struggle to get things done in a timely manner. So they need to focus on services that can be done in a way that is responsive and proactive and that anticipates the needs academic units and serves the campus.

To get to that point they first need to evaluate what model of shared services best fits the campus. Shared services can be implemented in a lot of different ways. Ms. Kalmijn said they've looked at how their peer universities do this, and have looked outside higher education, and there are different options.

Presentation by the Operational Excellence Shared Services Team (cont'd)

- 7 -

They know that implementing this is a very large task, and they'll take a phased approach. They won't implement every department at the same time and cause the entire campus too much change at the same time.

Ms. Kalmijn said that one reason they were at the GA was because they're committed to constant engagement, communication, and iteration. Shared Services has a Web site, under the OE Web site, and they go to many venues to hear people's concerns and questions, among staff, students, and faculty.

Ms. Kalmijn said she's been back on campus since April, and the first thing she did was to look at where they stood and how ready they were to implement a shared services organization. She learned they're further back from the starting point than she thought when she first accepted the role. They also thought they could have more quickly had a detailed implementation plan. They could have delivered a "blue-print" for shared services in the fall, but it would have been a best guess. The target for savings for shared services, which is another issue, is currently \$18 million. Making an \$18 million guess was probably not the way they want to do things. So they're doing some more work.

They've found there is significant complexity in the way things are done there. People want to know what shared services will look like and when they'll be impacted, and want to ask questions and be included in the conversations and decisions. So there's a tension between actions and collaboration. Both are equally important. Obviously, they need to move forward.

Ms. Kalmijn said the other thing she noticed when she came on campus was that people would ask what shared services is. So she developed a framework of ten building blocks to explain it. They start at the foundation and need to have all ten building blocks in order to have a shared services organization.

On the slide being shown, the dots are report dots. Orange means they have a lot of work to do; yellow means they have some work to do; and green means they're totally ready. The letter "B" on the chart shows where Bain has done some work, analysis, on shared services functions. As they'll notice, there aren't a lot of "B's." Bain's task was not to deliver the implementation plan. They'll also notice there aren't a lot of green dots.

The organizational culture on the campus is decentralized. People creating their own solutions doesn't lend itself very well to shared services. Shared services is about being able to do work in a common way. So there's some work to do there.

Additionally, Ms. Kalmijn said they don't have a shared services organization structure or governance model. They have the implementation team budget. So they need to create the organizational structure and the governing body or bodies, to create accountability for the campus. They also need to figure out how they'll pay for it. That's the funding model. They don't know how much it costs to deliver services across campus, such as for paycheck or IT services. A lot of that is embedded across departments.

They also have to determine what the physical infrastructure will be and where people will sit, whether people will sit together in some cases, or if they'll still have people sitting in departments.

The next layer talks about how the work is done. A mapping of what steps happen has not been done and there's certainly no standard across campus. People don't use the same tools and systems. Timekeeping is another OE initiative. Ms. Kalmijn said she's heard there are ten systems on campus. That's not something one usually sees in this day and age.

Presentation by the Operational Excellence Shared Services Team (cont'd)

- 8 -

As to who does the work, staffpeople do a little bit of this and that, which is how things have sort of organically built up over time. With all the constraints and budget cuts, it's actually gotten more so, with people taking on more tasks.

Ms. Kalmijn said the next level up is standard processes, standard tools and systems: the client service model. If people do this and that, they end up not being good at any one thing. Integration of new faculty members happens once a year, so people might not be that proficient at doing that. If people did that more often, it would likely go more smoothly and likely not have errors and rework. So part of shared services is having people who are subject-matter experts in their area, and do the work that way. And then they had to make sure those people are supported with a learning and development culture and are constantly able to keep their skills up to date.

Ms. Kalmijn said that if they have all these building blocks, they can form a shared services organization, where people share work across departments in the administrative area, using standard tools and processes to get work done.

The other important thing about shared services is that it gives a service to the organization. If it doesn't serve its clients, the campus, it's not doing its job. So there's a high emphasis on performance and operating metrics, to make sure the campus is satisfied with the service.

Ms. Kalmijn said they're currently in the design validation phase, trying to get all the data they need to build the building blocks. They're doing a lot of data gathering. Staff will be filling out some surveys. They're mapping processes and figuring out what tools people use. When they're done with that, they'll come back with a blueprint. Once they know where they're going, they'll put the funding model in place. If people need to move to different locations, they'll identify the space. They hope to have early adopters ready to roll into shared services in the summer of next year.

Ms. Kalmijn said she wanted to give an example of process mapping, a cornerstone of this work. They don't know exactly how work is being done on the campus and they need to find out. The slide being shown was a process map of a hiring. It problem works differently in every department. But people had to make sure there was money to recruit the position; had to create or modify a job description; send it to HR for classification; post the job; collect candidates; screen them; interview them; make a selection; and send a letter. It's estimated that to take, in the current environment, , was 59 work days.

In shared services they look for things that can be done by subject-matter experts. So someone would write job descriptions. Things would be faster if they had recruiters to source and collect information, and screen them quicker. They could have a standard offer letter. The time it takes can be reduced to 35 days.

Ms. Kalmijn said they'll do this mapping exercise for dozens and dozens of processes on campus and will base all of their work on what actually happens. They'll find there are 10 to 20 different ways things happen on campus, and they'll migrate to closer to one.

As to why grad students should care about this, one reason was because they care about people they see every day in their departments, the staff and the people who support them in the research and in the work they do. They will be impacted. Ms. Kalmijn said OE cares about that a lot, and they think about that a lot. They think about staff transition. Many staff roles will change, not just because of shared services, but also because other OE initiatives are changing the way work on campus is done.

Presentation by the Operational Excellence Shared Services Team (cont'd)

- 9 -

There will be new administrative procedures. Hopefully this will result in better and less frustrating experiences for students. What they're striving for is a high level of quality service across the campus. That's really their goal.

Ms. Kalmijn said that as for their timeline, they're in the design validation phase. Design will be finished in the first three months of next year, and they'll have a rolling implementation. They're basing the order of implementation by unit, also based on their readiness. She called for any questions.

Mr. Rabkin said he's a Delegate from Computer Science. Their admin does a little bit of this and that, and IT people do a little of this or that; but mostly their job was to meet the Department's needs. What people are nervous about is that once jobs are outsourced, there will be people at e-mail addresses who aren't good at things the Department actually needed to happen because they're not compatible with the Department's particular requirements. Units are different. A centralized IT operation is good for 90% of the campus. Engineering, science, and other areas of campus have very specialized HR needs, and post-docs are treated in special ways. He asked how OE was making sure they won't inflict grievous harm on departments with special needs.

Ms. Kalmijn said shared services is different from central campus services. Central services has, in the past, really not been shared services in the way they're going to do it. Not all the building blocks were present. Shared services will make sure they understand how departments' needs are currently being met and make sure they don't screw that up.

Mr. Rabkin asked about a department's needs being different from anyone else's. Ms. Kalmijn said the process mapping was intended to get at that. They now have over 150 people signed up in different departments to participate in the process mapping. They'll break them into groups that were like-minded. So heavy research units will be together, and student affairs people will be put together for this. There might be a process where they find 80% similarity and 20% difference. Staffpeople will be asked to fill out an "activity detail survey" on how they spend their time. She couldn't answer specifically how people's jobs will be affected, or how the support that's needed will still be there. But the point is that they're trying to make sure that they consider all that in the process of developing the design so they don't create any gaps. They're very mindful of that.

Mr. Niederhut said that most tasks in his Department are actually done by faculty members and not staff. He asked if that's something she saw a lot. Ms. Kalmijn said faculty matters involve academic personnel, and faculty would be heavily involved. She hasn't heard of a lot of faculty being involved in the hiring of staff. The first round of process mapping will occur next week and the following week. They're focusing on hiring, so she was sure she'd have more information on that.

Mr. Hoople asked how they're getting input from grad students, and asked how grads could get involved if they wanted to do so. Ms. Kalmijn said that one way they're getting input is by being at the GA meeting. They're still working to figure out the best way to tap in to all the different stakeholders on campus. If people were interested in getting involved in some way with Shared Services, she'd ask them to contact [shared\\_services@berkeley.edu](mailto:shared_services@berkeley.edu). They're trying to find a meaningful way to bring students into the work they're doing. Ms. Kalmijn said she would ask students to please contact them. Their messages are read regularly when they get them. Ms. Navab said she was the GA's representative on the liaison team, so they could talk to her.

Presentation by the Operational Excellence Shared Services Team (cont'd)

- 10 -

Ms. Kalmijn said she would like to introduce Sybil Wartenberg, their communication and change person, who helps with all these presentations. She has a committee focused on communication and change, which was another place students could get plugged in, focusing on student and faculty engagement.

Ms. Jui said there was a recent survey in her Department that showed the quality of service has gone down since a lot of changes have been implemented. She asked how Shared Services was incorporating grad student and client feedback on changes. Ms. Kalmijn said that one thing they'll likely do in the spring is a current state of satisfaction survey, pre-implementation, to understand how happy people are currently happy with services. The survey will go to faculty, grad students, staff, and others.

Mr. Szeri said they just completed a current-state survey about procurement and purchasing. The idea is that it establishes the baseline to see if changes improve matters, or don't improve them enough, or improve them selectively. The survey Ms. Kalmijn was talking about was along those lines.

Ms. Delgado asked if she could talk about the role that Bain played, and the creation of this model. It looked kind of like a corporate structure. She asked about the difference between the corporate model and centralization, and said a lot of departments have really seen service go down since OE cuts were made last year. This was still a public university, and she asked how those differences were being addressed.

Ms. Kalmijn said the work that Bain did, which was done before she got there, was intended to be a diagnostic to see if the campus would benefit from a shared services organization, and if so, in what areas, and where the low-hanging fruit was located. In terms the model being a corporate structure, Ms. Kalmijn said she talked about how they're working to design a best-fit for this campus. That's why they've talked to many other peer institutions to see how they've implemented this. Every organization, whether in higher education or in industry, has business processes. By standardizing those processes, to a degree, in a way that still supports the campus and is more efficient, they could save money while delivering better service. It certainly is different for this campus, but she thought it would apply pretty much anywhere this work was done.

Mr. Williams said he would like to thank Ms. Kalmijn for the presentation. She mentioned a savings target of \$18 million by increasing efficiency. He asked how much of that would be a result of staff layoffs. Ms. Kalmijn she would like to thank him for reminding her to speak about the \$18 million. That was a rough estimate that came out of the work Bain did before she got there. OE was trying to validate that number from the ground up. If that number isn't correct, they'll let the Chancellor know what the correct figure. Most savings from shared services will come from reductions in FTE and positions. However, there's also quite a retirement bubble. A lot of people on the staff side have been sort of waiting to retire,

waiting out the economy. OE hoped to get a lot of what it needs through attrition and not through layoffs. That's also been the model they've seen at a lot of higher education institutions. That's not to say there will be no layoffs, but fewer of them.

Ms. Pickering asked about why it would be good to have staffmembers specifically located in one place. She thought one great thing about departments having their own administrative staff was the ease by which they could be accessed and asked for help in the course of grads' every day academic lives. She asked to what extent people will be physically centralized, and what the benefits were in doing that, as opposed to just increasing efficiency.

Presentation by the Operational Excellence Shared Services Team (cont'd)  
ASUC Announcement

- 11 -

Ms. Kalmijn said that first of all, they recognize that this is something that's important to people. In terms of the benefits of co-locating people, if a number of people doing the same kind of work all sit together, it's easier to make sure they're all doing the work in the same way, and much better. They also generate a continuous improvement loop, where they keep on thinking about better ways to solve problems they have. There's also the opportunity to back each other up. So if someone happens to be sick, someone else could answer questions. Also, not all people will be moved out of departments to a central location. Shared Services was looking carefully at what needed to stay embedded in departments and remain.

Mr. Williams asked if Shared Services had data showing that people were happier with the services they're receiving. Ms. Kalmijn said they have gone through a slew of satisfaction surveys. They see difficulty in the first couple of years, as people adjust, after which service satisfaction climbs. In her previous experience, which wasn't in higher education, satisfaction started at a low point and went up. Typically people see an improvement in service satisfaction.

Mr. Terhorst asked what other universities Shared Services was looking at. Ms. Kalmijn said they include Johns Hopkins, Oregon State, UCSF, Illinois, University of New Hampshire, UC Davis, Santa Cruz, and OSU. Those were some of the ones that jump to mind.

Mr. Jackson asked if there are any best practices for the UC System and if Shared Services has looked at other efficiency models, such as Kaiser, in health delivery, since it's a big organization. Ms. Kalmijn said she has some colleagues who work at Kaiser, and Ms. Wartenberg worked at Kaiser. Ms. Wartenberg said she's worked doing shared services for Kaiser over the past seven or eight years. Kaiser was very much like Berkeley in 2000. Ms. Kalmijn said that as for best practices in the UC System, Shared Services was kind of in lockstep with San Francisco. The two campuses were very different, so it was a bit of a difficult comparison. UC Davis is also starting shared services in their administrative unit. Other campuses were not doing an implementation the size of Berkeley's. The building blocks she talked about would be common to any shared services implementation and are considered best practices for doing something like this.

Seeing no other questions, Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank Ms. Kalmijn. Ms. Kalmijn said she would like to thank them, and would ask them to please let Shared Services know their thoughts, feedback, hopes, and fears. She wanted to thank them for their time. (Applause)

Mr. Marchand said this would be a good time to remind people that a feedback form was part of the meeting materials. It's where people could give feedback on things at the meeting, such as the Shared Services presentation. One question was included about that. If people have more questions they could indicate them on the feedback form. Also, if they haven't done so, Delegates and Alternates should sign in before they leave the meeting. There's a list at the back, where the name tags were.

### ASUC Announcement

Mr. Albright introduced himself and said he's an ASUC Senator and is the GA's representative to the ASUC. First, the ASUC Office of the President is holding a dance event on Memorial Glade from 6:00 to

ASUC Announcement (cont'd)  
GA Announcements

- 12 -

11:00 p.m. There will be a number of artists there, including "LA Riots." They're giving away 1,000 free shirts and other free items, and it's open to everyone. Also, that day is World AIDS Day. Along with that, registration for the Dance Marathon is open. It happens every year in Pauley Ballroom in the Spring Semester. It's a 24-hour dance, or 12-hour dance that goes on all night, and it raises money for pediatric AIDS. Even if people don't want to attend, the registration fee, \$19, is the cost to prevent the transfer of AIDS from a mother to her child. So even just registering is a great service. People could also make a team, such as the GA.

Regarding the Cal Lodge, Mr. Albright said this is something owned by the students, who get reduced prices for staying there. The Lodge is on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe. Prices for ASUC and GA student groups have been reduced. The Lodge is actually owned by the student governments, the ASUC and the GA. They own it and operate it. It's open for students and student groups, such as for a weekend. There's a link to the Cal Lodge at [asuc.org](http://asuc.org). Mr. Albright said he went there a couple of weekends ago, and it's a nice property. People pay an amount per person and the Lodge does all of the meals. It has a huge fireplace and a living room area. It's a great place.

Ms. Navab said the Cal Lodge was very close to the Sugar Bowl.

Mr. Marchand said the Web site is at [callodge.org](http://callodge.org).

Mr. Albright called for any questions. Seeing none, Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank him.

### GA Announcements

Ms. Jui said she's a GA Delegate from Integrative Biology and sits on the Student Mental Health Advisory Committee. They met on Tuesday and would love feedback on priorities for the Committee's Advocacy Agenda. They came up with six things they thought they might work on. But if Delegates had anything to add, she would ask them to please do so on the half-sheets that were available. She would ask Delegates to please fill it out and either return them to her or leave them on the table by the entrance.

Susan Hsueh introduced herself and said she's the Business Office Manager. The GA will be closed from December 21 through January 6. They will open on January 9, but with limited hours, 10:00 to 3:00, until

the following week, until January 17, when the semester begins. Also, Round 2 of funding is coming up, on January 19. But people don't have to wait until the 19th to submit their applications. They can submit an application early. For those who are filing for reimbursement, students at the front desk will be working limited hours in the upcoming weeks. So if people file to be reimbursed, a check won't be ready for them to pick up, and they'll probably have to pick it up after Winter Break.

Mr. Marchand said that Sam Saxena is a Grad Council representative and will be leaving at the end of the semester. The GA has an Alternate who can be the Grad Council rep in the meantime. But at the February GA meeting the GA will elect a new representative. There's a short question about that on the feedback form. If people might be interested in running for this position and wanted to know more, they could talk to him or Ms. Navab at the end of the meeting.

## Guest Announcements Funding Contingency Report

- 13 -

### Guest Announcements

Chris Ackman introduced himself and said he's the Executive Director of ECO Media (Environmental Clubs & Organizations). ECO was founded at the beginning of the last school year and invited all environmental clubs and organizations on campus to join. Shortly thereafter, the group started a media project to keep groups united and to make them more efficient. Since they founded this resource, they've gone to conferences and have built up a network for greater implementation of this group at other schools. It will provide resources and foster discussion and actions versus private networks and existing medias. Resources include signing a petition, joining a boycott, looking at a calendar, and other things. They have lots of partners, Google Docs, images, and film. And the Eco Showcase will summarize all of what's gone on with the project.

Mr. Ackman said they have not had any graduate students involved and would love to have some participate. More than 14 undergrads are working on it this semester. They're really amped on this project and have huge ambitions. If he could get people's e-mails who are interested, that would be great. He'll leave a sheet for people to write their e-mails, and the group will send them more information. Next Tuesday, December 6, 7:00 to 8 p.m., in 110 Barrows. Mr. Marchand said that if Mr. Ackman could send the GA an e-mail, they could forward it to all Delegates on Friday.

### Funding Contingency Report

Mr. Marchand said the Funding Contingency Report was sent in advance, but they have paper copies available that people could share.

Mr. Sheen, Funding Officer, said this was the Funding Committee Report for December, for the Contingency Fund. It was pretty straightforward. As a general note, in the summer workgroup, when they decided Round 1, there was some miscommunication about exactly how reimbursements would happen. As it turns, because they have two rounds this year instead of four, they have a limited ability to predict how much money will be coming back in anticipation for Round 2. They'll figure this out. The Business Office has been helping them to close accounts where the reimbursement window has closed, in order to

help the Funding Committee make better projections. But as a sort of general warning, they may need to ask the Assembly for help in February.

For a second point, Mr. Sheen said they generally expect discretionary money next month to be a little tighter than it was this month. In that vein, the Funding Committee that month tried to negotiate and tighten up as many Contingency Fund requests as possible. That's why on the report there are disparities between the amounts that were requested and the recommendation the Funding Committee was making. The recommended allocations were voted on by a majority of the Funding Committee.

Mr. Sheen said there was one issue with respect to Students for Zero Waste at GSPP. They submitted a beautiful four-page proposal. In the process of negotiating with them to see if it was possible to find cheaper alternatives for anything, while the Committee couldn't find them, it was suggested by some members that the GA fund them the group \$500 maximum instead of the \$886 the group requested,

Funding Contingency Report (cont'd)

- 14 -

without identifying an individual component to the project the Committee wanted to slash. With that said, a majority voted to continue. On the merits, they felt the project was a good one and one that the Funding Committee wanted to support. He called for any questions.

Mr. Klein asked if he could describe what the group was asking for. Mr. Sheen said the representative from the group, could talk about that. Ms. Ridel said the Compost Alliance is starting to organize composting, but they had to finance their own compost bags and collection until a critical mass for the campus was been achieved. For six months the cost was \$868 for bags, collection, and cleaning. The bags were the biggest item. They thought they could get the bags cheaper, and bought the bags themselves, in bulk. But because they had to work with UC Berkeley Physical Facilities, they have to pay for and use Facilities' bags, so custodial staff could use them. The group is integrating them.

Mr. Klein asked if the requested amount was for the cost of the bags. Ms. Ridel said it was.

Ms. Pymer asked what other events were being funded by the Contingency Fund.

Mr. Sheen a new group, the American Indian Graduate Student Association, is holding one event at Big Bear. They have a Ph.D. panel coming up and they requested money for security. It's a campus building that requires security after-hours. The Funding Committee funded that. The group also requested honoraria, which the Committee didn't vote to fund. The group maintains a space for American Indian students on campus. They asked for a printer and the Funding Committee's general policy is not to fund equipment. But the GA has a printer that was offered to the group.

Mr. Froehle said these are items that would normally under the GMER category. He asked if this group was formed more recently or if it applied for funding earlier. Ms. Ridel said that Big Bear has applied in the past, but just for GMER, not Grants. Mr. Froehle asked how much GMER funding the group applied for. Ms. Ridel said it was \$350. Mr. Sheen said the idea for this came after the grant deadline.

Mr. Sheen said the next event being funded by the Contingency Fund was the Chemical Engineering Graduate Student Community Outreach, a new group.

Mr. Marchand said that seeing no other comments, he would ask for a motion.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the Funding Committee report to fund the American Indian Graduate Student's request for the full amount.

Mr. Niederhut said a member of his Department submitted the application. The logic for requesting a printer was to maintain a space where American Indian students on campus can congregate, and come there not just for printing, but for other computer resources, and for other things. Having all these people going to the same spot for different purposes helped to create a sense of community.

Mr. Sheen said the GA had a new printer they offered the group, and the group actually took it that week, and he believed the group suggested it wouldn't need money to buy a printer. Mr. Niederhut said he'd withdraw his motion if that was the case. Mr. Sheen said that if this comes up again, the group can reapply. Mr. Marchand said the GA bought a computer that came with a printer they didn't need, and they gave that to the group.

Funding Contingency Report (cont'd)  
Reports

- 15 -

Mr. Marchand said the motion can't be withdrawn and people could vote against it. The motion to amend failed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Rabkin asked why the GA was giving away things, and said he thought they were supposed to be careful about that. Ms. Navab said there are no real By-laws that specify how they give away resources. When there's no By-law about policy, it becomes a Business Office or E-Board decision. This was a Business Office decision.

Ms. Ridel said funding was tight and the group didn't want to fund the purchase of a printer.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to approve the amendment failed unanimously by voice-vote.

A motion to call the question on the Funding Committee's report was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS, AWARDED \$1,212.64 IN CONTINGENCY FUNDING, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank Mr. Sheen.

## REPORTS

Ms. Navab, GA President, reported. She said that applications for the Faculty Mentor Award are out. She would ask Delegates to please encourage people to apply. The deadline is February 3. Fliers were available at the front.

Ms. Navab said she is a representative to the Systemwide SHIP Committee, the Student Health Insurance Plan. They have an upcoming meeting to look at next year's contract. The feedback form has a question about this and asks if there are things they'd like coverage for, or increased coverage on something. She

would ask them to please let her know. They've gotten other feedback, and it would be great to get feedback from Delegates as well.

Regarding the Regents meeting held on Monday, there was an hour and a half of public comment. People shared comments about having the Regents more involved in public education funding. There were also comments encouraging the Regents to sign on to actions to end corporate loopholes. The Regents responded by deciding to set up a campus-wide tour for the Student Regents.

An Occupy General Assembly meeting happened in the middle of the Regents meeting, so the Regents left the meeting, except for Gavin Newsom and UCOP. As a result, the rest of the meeting was kind of rushed. But the Regents approved expenditures for next year and approved Lower Sproul within a minute, with no discussion. So at least the Lower Sproul \$193 million portion she's been talking about was approved. As for the \$30 million in savings they've talked about, next month the Lower Sproul Workgroup will discuss how they want to see that spent in additional items. Some of those include renovations to Anthony Hall, which the GA hopes to turn into more of a grad lounge.

Reports (cont'd)

- 16 -

Ms. Navab said the UCPD Captain contacted her and an investigation will be conducted on what happened with the protests on November 9. The investigation will be headed up by UCLA's Assistant Police Chief. Ms. Navab said she was asked to identify six students to meet with the Assistant Chief, people who were either witnesses or victims of police activities on the 9th. If people would like to submit their name or someone else's, she would ask them to please let her know and she'll try to come up with a representative six people.

Ms. Navab said she wanted to encourage grads to use the ASUC Bookstore to buy Christmas gifts that year. Every time people shop there, money comes back to the students. Jeff Deutsch was present that evening, the Manager of the Bookstore, and could answer any questions people have.

Ms. Navab said a Health Fee was one of the fees that students pay. The Board met and recommended an increase in the Health Fee to \$57.50 in order to maintain the current level of services. The Board boosted it a little bit to meet the sustained level of demand, but didn't increase it greatly given the financial climate they're in.

The Academic Senate met on Monday and had a vote of no confidence in how the campus Administration handled the events of November 9. The Senate amended the language of the Resolutions so it was no longer a vote of no confidence, but more of a condemnation of how the Administration handled the situation. They wanted to see a policy change about police force used against non-violent protests. There were a couple of other amendments as well. The vote passed by an overwhelming majority, about 90% of the 400 faculty or so who were present. Ms. Navab said she spoke at the meeting, as did the Chancellor and the Provost, and if people had questions, she could go into greater detail.

A Delegate asked why there was a change in the Resolution. Ms. Navab said there was a divide among the faculty. Some people felt more there should be a vote of no confidence; some felt that was too strong; some felt it was confusing as to what a faculty vote of no confidence actually meant. The Academic Senate came up with a compromise they thought would pass.

A Delegate asked if they made any policy recommendations. Mr. Marchand said the Academic Senate approved four Resolutions. The Resolution from Brian Barsky and Jonathan Simon had ten points. Mr.

Marchand said he couldn't go into detail and the wording is on the Academic Senate Web site. Ms. Navab said the Berkeley Media Center has excerpts of the comments that speakers made as well as the Resolutions. Mr. Marchand said the wording was also in the Daily Cal.

Ms. Delgado asked if faculty who didn't vote for it said why they voted that way. Ms. Navab said there were no speakers against the Resolutions.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said the Barsky Resolution had more specific language about implementing rules by which specific weapons like batons and pepper spray could be used, and the types of situations the police had to be involved with. There was a report that came out in 2009 about similar attacks against protesters. It was suggested that the report be implemented immediately. It's been available for many, many months.

Ms. Navab said that her message to the faculty on behalf of grads was that they'd like to see the Administration collaborate with students more in their efforts to fight for higher education, and for faculty to actually come to Sacramento with the students every now and then, rather than just telling the students

Reports (cont'd)

- 17 -

to do it. If administrators want students to host forums, they shouldn't be pre-scripted and should be debates on alternatives. Davis students are proposing to look at how Australia funds education, which gives students a free education that is repaid with no interest, in the form of a tax based on how much they make. She wasn't proposing the Australian model, but to talk about other options. At the meeting she also asked faculty to stand up and define what free speech should look like on this campus.

Mr. Rabkin said he didn't have any sense of how representative the faculty Senate meeting was. The Academic Senate has a few thousand members, and 400 met, perhaps 20%. Ms. Navab said the Academic Senate has 1,500 members. Everybody was invited to attend and had a two-week heads up about the meeting. At the meeting they discussed sending a vote out to the broader faculty, but they voted against that.

Mr. Rabkin asked if she knew why they voted against that. Ms. Navab said it was felt that people wouldn't have heard the discussion and the different points that were made. Mr. Marchand said there was also some procedural confusion in that they had already voted on the Resolutions before voting to send it out to everyone for a vote. It was strange to send a vote out by e-mail after the question had already been approved.

Ms. Navab said that if people have further questions they could contact Bob Jacobsen, Chair of the Academic Senate. He's great about student involvement and has attended all the OccupyCal meetings, because he wanted to see what the conversation was about.

Mr. Marchand, Assembly Affairs Vice President, reported. He said he's been working on attendance for Delegates, and most people haven't missed too many meetings. He's contacted perhaps a dozen Delegates to see what was happening. In most cases, people had a class but wanted to continue in the spring.

With Ms. Navab chairing the meeting, Mr. Marchand said he wanted to propose committee membership changes. Two people signed up to be on a committee at the first GA meeting but never registered as a

Delegate. And because three people haven't attended committee meetings, he'll remove Dilpreet Singh and Sujit Thapa from the Campus Affairs Committee and remove Preeti Khanna from the External Affairs Committee. In addition, he was also suggesting moving a Delegate, Supun Perera, Civil Engineering, from External to Campus Affairs. In addition, a new Delegate, Liz Long, from Law, joined the Sustainability Committee and Ginger Jui left Sustainability to sit on a campus committee.

Mr. Marchand called for a motion to ratify the changes to committee membership. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE CHANGES IN COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Marchand said the Executive Board was also working on some operational policies to discuss how people work together at the GA office, which he thought will address some things about their policies for equipment, accessing Facebook accounts, requesting money for events, and going over the budget.

Unfortunately, someone stole seven of the GA's nine laptop computers during the Thanksgiving break. In response to that, the GA changed the keys so old campus master keys can't open Anthony Hall. They haven't bought new computers yet and will wait until after Winter Break. The GA has money to replace

Reports (cont'd)

- 18 -

some computers, and some of them will come out of the ASUC Auxiliary budget, since some computers were for the Business Office. If the GA doesn't have enough money in its budget to buy replacements, they'll come back to the Delegates.

Mr. Marchand said they'll add additional security upgrades to Anthony Hall. Improvements for security are included in Lower Sproul renovation, but they might not be able to wait until then.

Ms. Navab said they also requested campus police to come and install card key access to the building and to put security cameras in. But that takes a really long time.

Mr. Klein asked if this happened previously that year. Ms. Navab said it also happened about a month ago. Mr. Klein asked if measures were taken to prevent it from happening again. Mr. Marchand said they changed the locks and reduced the number of keys. They had cable locks securing the computers, but those were cut. Ms. Navab said it was strange because the thief had access to the front door without breaking in, but they didn't know where the key was to Ms. Hsueh's office and had to climb over a half wall to also steal her computer. Mr. Marchand said there were some old campus master keys that could have opened the front door, so it could have been a former staff on campus. They have no idea who did this. Ms. Navab said the theft occurred on Thursday, so somebody did their Black Friday shopping at the GA. The windows and doors were locked, so someone had a key to get in.

Mr. Klein asked if they have tracking software on the computers. Ms. Navab said they don't, but they're working on putting that on the new ones. The security cameras recommended by the police cost thousands of dollars, and the GA was looking into getting something cheaper.

Mr. Marchand said the GA did a lot of work in the last month because of all the protests. The GA, the E-Board, and especially Ms. Navab, took an active role. The GA played an important role in terms of being the only people speaking to the Administration and to the OccupyCal people. The GA and Ms. Navab received a lot of praise from varied people, from the OccupyCal, protesters, to the Academic Senate, to even Mark Yudof. The GA did a lot of lobbying behind the scenes.

With Mr. Marchand chairing the meeting, Ms. De la Torre, Campus Affairs Vice President, reported. She said she had to appoint somebody to the Police Review Board, an important appointment given recent events, which the PRB will review. Her appointment is Eve Weissman, a Law student.

Eve Weissman introduced herself and said she's a second-year Law student and also the Chair of the National Lawyers Guild Chapter at the Law School. She has been very involved over the last several months with the Occupy Movement across the Bay Area, in Oakland, San Francisco, and Cal, sort of coordinating the efforts of law students who have done legal observing, collected evidence, documented what's happened, and have provided legal support to people involved in the movement. So she wanted to be part of the Police Review Board to look at what happened on campus, particularly on November 9, and understand what actions were taken, why, what chains of authority were used, and to look at things through the lens of a legal perspective, deciding whether or not, objectively, what was done was appropriate by the law and by the standards of the institution.

Mr. Rabkin asked to what extent she'd view her role as advocating for victims of police brutality versus being an impartial arbiter, and what challenges she saw for maintaining an appropriate balance. Ms.

Reports (cont'd)

- 19 -

Weissman said she thought the purpose of the Review Board was to look objectively at what happened. There's a tremendous amount of evidence, including video footage, photos, witnesses, participants, and of course, people on both sides, including the police, protesters, and members of the Administration. Taking all of information and evidence and understanding what happened in an objective way is what she would seek to achieve.

A Delegate asked if she thought her involvement with the Occupy Movement in the past few months, even as a witness or legal observer, would cause other members of the PRB to question her and her ability to maintain objectivity, and if so, how she would overcome that.

Ms. Weissman said it was her understanding that the Board is composed of a number of different representatives, including reps from law enforcement and from the Administration. She saw her role from the lens of a student. In terms of overcoming what could be perceived as some sort of bias, that's overcome by coming to the table with a truly objective stance and looking at the information as it's presented. A review was already done in 2009, so this is not a new process for the University. It's important to have somebody on the Board who had a slight stake, or advocacy role, to make sure that the process was truly transparent and objective and represents the views of students, protesters, and people who feel their rights have been severely violated. It's important to have somebody on the Board who will be a voice for students and for people involved, and to make sure those views are adequately represented.

A motion to approve the appointment was made and seconded.

Mr. Marchand said generally, Ms. De la Torre has the power to appoint representatives on behalf of the GA. The Police Review Board asked to have the Board rep approved by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. Rabkin said that as a good procedure, he thought they should discuss the appointment with the candidate not in the room. Mr. Marchand said that was correct, and he would ask Ms. Weissman to leave the room.

Mr. Niederhut asked if the position was advertised. Ms. De la Torre said it wasn't. She asked people in different departments for recommendations. Mr. Rabkin asked which departments were included. Ms. De la Torre said they were Law, GSSP, and Education. Mr. Marchand said the representative the GA appointed last year told him she hadn't actually left the Board, and the GA hadn't been notified. So there was very little time for an appointment to be made. He asked Ms. De la Torre to prioritize somebody from the Law School, since he thought that would be a good fit for the position. Ms. Navab said the current GA rep on the PRB is leaving because she has filed a claim against the UCPD. So it would be inappropriate for her to serve on the Board.

Mr. Goren asked if the GA wouldn't be able to put anybody else on the Board until February if they didn't approve this appointment. Ms. Navab said that was correct. The GA was voting on this appointment because of a rule of the PRB, and otherwise, Ms. De la Torre could make the appointment.

A Delegate asked if the GA could consider someone else. Ms. Navab said they could. One suggestion was to write the names of other people on the board and then vote on them individually, with the appointment going to whoever got the majority of votes, rather than voting each person up or down individually.

Reports (cont'd)

- 20 -

A discussion was held off the record. A motion to extend discussion off the record by ten minutes was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Marchand said that the PRB only does two things. They receive appeals from people who complained to the police and were appealing to the Board the results of the UCPD investigation. Secondly, the Chancellor can give the Board a special mandate, such as to investigate the November 9 protests. The Board generally works on special cases and doesn't set policy for the police. Most of the time the PRB works on confidential information, so there's a limit to what can be reported.

Ms. Navab noted that the GA could always remove any of its appointments and can also request that reps report to the GA, to either the Delegate Assembly or the E-Board. Mr. Marchand said the PRB is comprised of a faculty who is Chair and is a Law professor, another faculty, a grad and undergrad student, a community member, a retired police officer, and one public liaison with the UCPD who doesn't have a vote.

Mr. Klein he was disappointed in the way the opening was noticed to people and said it should have been e-mailed out to at least Delegates, asking for different candidates. He knew it was within Ms. De la Torre's power to do this, and independent of Ms. Weissman, he was unhappy with the way this was handled. Ms. Navab noted that there were also problems with CalMail.

Ms. Pickering asked if there were interviews. Ms. De la Torre said she talked to each of the candidates who wanted to do this. She tried to make sure it would be someone who was diplomatic and would advocate for the students. She got notice to look for somebody on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. She should have sent a general e-mail to Delegates.

Mr. Marchand said that he thought that in the future they could say they'll always advertise committees and have job postings.

Ms. De la Torre asked if people wanted to make any other nominations.

Ms. Pymer asked about the time commitment that is involved. Ms. De la Torre said it's variable, but especially during the spring it will be a big time commitment.

After discussion off the record, the question was called and debate closed. THE MOTION TO APPROVE MS. WEISSMAN AS THE GA REPRESENTATIVE TO THE POLICE REVIEW BOARD PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Marchand asked to have Ms. Weissman brought back in and said he would like to congratulate her.

Continuing her report, Ms. De la Torre said she wanted to introduce the Delegates to new Berkeley Graduate Project Coordinator, Fiona Tang. Ms. De la Torre said she wanted to thank Chris Klein and Joanna Hernandez, who weren't present, who were on the Hiring Committee.

Fiona Tang introduced herself and said she's a second-year Law student, recently appointed as Project Coordinator for the Berkeley Graduate, the online blog for the GA. She wanted to introduce herself and offer her services in terms of a sounding board for the graduate student community. Matt Hoberg was in the position for several months, so the blog did have some work done. What she would like from

Reports (cont'd)

- 21 -

Delegates was feedback on what they thought has been done so far and input on where they thought the blog should go moving forward. She's also discussing this with the E-Board.

Mr. Marchand said there was no specific question about The Berkeley Graduate on the feedback form, but people could add something. Ms. Tang said that people could also go to the Web site, click on the link, and send her an e-mail. She wanted to thank them.

Ms. De la Torre said she was in the process of hiring a new Women of Color Conference Project Coordinator, who wasn't present that evening. A hiring committee worked on this, and the appointee will be Tala Khanmalek. Ms. De la Torre said she's already sent an offer e-mail. Ms. Navab said Ms. Khanmalek is a Ph.D. student in Ethnic Studies.

In addition, Ms. De la Torre said she was working on a graduate mental health survey and was still looking forward someone to do the survey. She sent out notices about this. Ms. Navab said the person who ends up working on the survey from the GA will be accompanied by two other people, from the ASUC and from the Committee on Student Fees. The survey will cover more than just mental health.

Mr. Klein said that in looking at the written Officers' Reports, under Projects, he understood that Fiona Tang was there, and also that they're hiring a new Women of Color Project Coordinator. But none of the other Projects submitted reports. He found that a little disheartening. He wanted to know what was going on with them and to have feedback on what they're doing. This involves stipended staff that the GA pays a lot of money to.

Ms. Navab said that part of that was with the e-mail problems the campus has been having.

Ms. Suarez, GMORR Project Coordinator, said she was on furlough and just came back, and that's why there was no report. People could also visit Graduate Minority Outreach R&R site and read the pretty lengthy reviews that she does.

Ms. De la Torre said that objection was duly noted and she'll have Project Coordinators submit reports for the next meeting.

Regarding the report from the External Affairs VP, Ms. Navab said that Mr. Ortega left to work on the SAGE Conference. SAGE is a coalition of graduate student governments from public schools across the US. The GA is hosting a summit on public higher education. Some really great speakers will be on the panels, including the Chancellor, a Regent, two State Assembly members, and people from other campuses. The Conference will be on Friday from 2:00 to 5:00 in Dai Hall, Engineering. It's open to anyone, with an invite-only reception afterwards, at the Chancellor's house. If a Delegate really wanted to go, that could be possible.

Ms. Epstein, GA Treasurer, reported. She said that as a reminder, the GA has funds for student groups which want to rent Pauley Ballroom, which is expensive, or other rooms. If groups in Delegates' departments put on events, she would ask them to please let them know about this. Ms. Navab said that people could also apply for waivers at the ASUC. If student groups want to rent Pauley Ballroom and apply through the Funding Committee, the Funding Advisor will tell Ms. Epstein, and the Treasurer and

Reports (cont'd)

- 22 -

Consent Calendar -- Res. 1111a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for three Student Regents

President will decide if they want to use some of the fund for Pauley Ballroom. Ms. Epstein said that groups can apply for room waivers from the ASUC, but that only takes about \$900 off the price for Pauley, and there are still facilities and other fees to pay; and the GA can fund some of that.

## RESOLUTIONS

### Consent Calendar

Mr. Marchand said that if a bill had no amendments and nobody objected to its passage, it could be approved under the Consent Calendar. If people wanted to discuss or amend a bill, they should pull it from the Consent Calendar. All bills that remain under the Consent Calendar are passed by consensus.

Mr. Marchand said the only bill remaining under the Consent Calendar was Resolution 1111a.

The following Resolution, 1111a, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Bahar Navab and Alberto Ortega:

### RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION FOR THREE STUDENT REGENTS

WHEREAS, the University of California is a is one of the three systems of public higher education of the State of California, designated as the State’s primary research institution; and

WHEREAS, the University of California “is governed by The Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution, has ‘full powers of organization and governance’ subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that ‘the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs’”<sup>i</sup>; and

WHEREAS, The Regents board membership “consists of 26 members:

- 18 regents are appointed by the governor for 12-year terms
- One is a student appointed by The Regents to a one-year term
- Seven are ex officio members -- the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, Superintendent of Public Instruction, president and vice president of the Alumni Associations of UC and the UC president.
- In addition, two faculty members -- the chair and vice chair of the Academic Council -- sit on the board as non-voting members”<sup>ii</sup>; and

WHEREAS, “the student Regent is a voting member of The Regents of the University of California, attending all meetings of the Board and its Committees and serving a one-year term commencing July 1”<sup>iii</sup>; and

CC -- Res. 1111a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for three Student Regents (cont'd) - 23 -

#### RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION FOR THREE STUDENT REGENTS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Student Regent Designate is a non-voting member of The Regents of the University of California, attending all meetings of the Board and its Committees and serving a one-year term commencing July 1, one year prior to becoming the voting Student Regent; and

WHEREAS, the Board makes policy and budgetary decisions directly affecting students at the University of California; and

WHEREAS, students are contributing 40% of the UC General funds, more than the State of California, but only have 4% of the vote on the Board; and

WHEREAS, as major shareholders of the UC, UC Students believe that they have the right to more student representation on the Board; and

WHEREAS, UC students believe that they should have representation on the Board based on all segments of the student population, including undergraduates, graduate academic students and graduate professional students; and

WHEREAS, UC students only have one Student Regent and one Student Regent-designate in any given year on the Board of Regents, who are vastly outnumbered by the appointed and ex-officio regents; and

WHEREAS, the composition of the board or regents has been historically non-representative of the student body and disconnected from the needs and experience of present day students; and

WHEREAS, many of The Regents have not attended a UC institution; and

WHEREAS, asking a single student to represent the full population of UC students is difficult, and The Regents' Board as a whole would benefit from having the variety of viewpoints that comes from undergraduate, graduate academic, and graduate professional students; and

WHEREAS, having multiple Student Regents will assist in reaching out to the full student population in having a connection between The Regents and the students; and

WHEREAS, the University of California Student Association (UCSA) "is a coalition of UC students and student governments aimed at increasing the accessibility, affordability and quality of the UC system through advocacy and direct action organizing"<sup>iv</sup>; and

WHEREAS, UCSA is the recognized student voice for all 230,000 undergraduate, graduate and professional students in the University of California; and

WHEREAS, every year, UCSA hosts a system-wide student conference, UCSA Congress, where students from across all campuses chose the priorities UCSA will lead on behalf of the UC student body; and

CC -- Res. 1111a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for three Student Regents (cont'd) - 24 -  
Res. 1110a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of SB 259

#### RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION FOR THREE STUDENT REGENTS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, during the summer 2011 UCSA Congress for academic year 2011-2012 the graduate and professional students chose as their campaign the modification of The Regents board structure to have three voting student regents and three corresponding student regent designates such that every year there would be one student regent selected from and representative of each of the undergraduate, academic, and graduate professional student bodies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of California Berkeley (UCB) Graduate Assembly (GA) takes a stance in full support of the UCSA Graduate and Professional Student Campaign.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA directs the GA President and External Affairs Vice President to advocate for three student regents with the Chancellor and other UCB administrators.

<sup>i</sup> <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/about.html>

<sup>ii</sup> *ibid*

<sup>iii</sup> <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/studentreg.html>

<sup>iv</sup> <http://ucsa.org/section/view/about>

The following Resolution, 1110a, was authored by Joshua Williams:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF SB 259

WHEREAS, thousands of PhD and professional students at the University of California (UC) will, at some point in their graduate careers, work as Graduate Student Researchers (GSRs) for members of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, GSRs are currently prohibited from joining a union under the California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA); and

WHEREAS, Academic Student Employees (ASEs) such as Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs), teaching assistants (TAs), readers and tutors are currently unionized across the UC System; and

WHEREAS, collective bargaining has provided graduate students who work as GSIs additional benefits (such as childcare subsidies) and protections (such as independent binding arbitration of grievances) compared to those who work as GSRs; and

WHEREAS, California State Senator Loni Hancock (D-Oakland) has introduced a bill, SB 259, that would amend HEERA to make it legal for any category of student employees, including GSRs, to unionize; and

Res. 1110a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of SB 259 (cont'd) - 25 -

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF SB 259  
(cont'd)

WHEREAS, passage of SB 259 would allow GSRs at the UC to discuss the costs and benefits of unionization and make a collective, democratic decision that best serves their interests;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly stands in support of SB 259.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly Executive Officers are directed to join the ASE Union (UAW 2865) and other interested parties in calling for Chancellor Birgeneau, President Yudof, and the UC Regents to withdraw their objections to SB 259 and allow for its swift passage.

Mr. Williams introduced himself and said he's a Delegate from Performance Studies. The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) makes a distinction between graduate students who are employed as teaching staff, such as GSIs and TAs, readers, and grads who are employed by the University as Graduate Student Researchers. GSRs are not eligible for unionization. There is currently a bill in the California State Legislature, written by Sen. Hancock, that would change the language so that all graduate student employees of the University would be eligible to unionize if they so choose. The Resolution would have the GA stand with the UAW, the grad student union representing GSIs and others, in calling for the passage of the bill. This was not a vote in favor of unionizing GSRs necessarily, but a vote in favor of removing language that was, in his opinion, condescending and patronizing in not

allowing some grad students to do certain things and because it makes artificial distinctions among grads in their various capacities as University workers. He thought there should be a subsequent conversation about unionization in the future.

Mr. Hoople asked if he had a sense of how the bill was being received in the Legislature. Mr. Williams said it was in some trouble. It's in suspension, which means they won't vote on it in the spring or the summer. There's a question about whether or not it will pass. Mr. Marchand said it was in suspension because the Appropriations Committee had to look at it, as the bill would cost the State money.

Mr. Baur asked if he could clarify why a distinction was made between the two sets of grad employers. Mr. Williams said he understood that when GSIs first organized to create their union, that caused the creation of the distinction. GSRs weren't a part of that initial movement because the State and the University as a whole wanted to keep as many academic student employees non-unionized as possible. Mr. Marchand said HEERA only includes student employees if the services they provide are unrelated to their educational objectives, or if those objectives are subordinate to the service they perform under their job. Research was supposed to be more related to students' educational objectives than teaching. That was the legal precedent, and wasn't in the Act itself.

Mr. Rabkin said his Department was polled, and the biggest problem their constituents named was that the GSI pay scale was about 30% below the competition. They can't recruit on the GSI pay scale. They voted against the union because it's collective bargaining. A GSR union would lock the Department into something they couldn't actually work with, or lock them into something that would be really painful for them. The only way they could do it would be by cheating. The Department has a policy that says every GSI must also get a GSR. So they'd have to fudge the human resources rules a lot. They'd get a lot of pushback and it wouldn't work very well. He was nervous that a union, which the Department might not

Res. 1110a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of SB 259 (cont'd) - 26 -  
Res. 1111e, To Create a Student Financial Oversight Workgroup

vote for, would force them into the same working conditions and pay rates as other departments. The premise of the union is that there's one negotiating team, which the Department might not vote for or have anything to do with. Students in the Department don't want people to negotiate on their behalf and want to negotiate for themselves. The bill would take that power away.

Ms. Pickering said that most science students she knew are instructors, and presumably they're GSRs. She asked if none of their pay was covered by a union. Ms. Pymer said students in Chemistry are either a GSR or a GSI. They're required to be a GSR three semesters unless the principle investigator can't support them, and then they're forced into being a GSI. Sometimes people can be a GSI and GSR at the same time, but that was very hard to do. Ms. Pymer said that one way that Berkeley competes is with pay that factors in the cost of living; and Berkeley is the most expensive school. So they accept a pay cut to work with great professors and go to Berkeley instead of to other places.

Ms. Pymer said that for GSRs in Chemistry, the time they spend in a GSR position is proportional to how fast they graduate. She was afraid that GSRs would have to be paid hourly if unionized, and in Chemistry they work 60-80 hours a week, although sometimes as low as 50. Unionizing would put them in the same boat with other GSRs, when GSRs across campus were very different. She knew it was hard for people making less, but that was part of supply and demand.

Mr. Williams said the statute was discriminatory against some student employees and a conversation about this should happen, rather than saying some students automatically cannot unionize. Many benefits have come to the graduate student population by unionizing, including various provisions in SHIP. If people are so concerned about how much they're paid or how much they work, unions have in place many procedures for dealing with employees being overworked and the ways people are paid. If more grads were behind the union, they could get a far better contract.

Ms. Navab said that all GSRs are actually hourly employees. The reason they don't think they're hourly is because many times they don't turn in timesheets. That means that students can work a lot more hours. The policy on campus is ignored sometime.

Mr. Marchand said that regarding the point Ms. Pymer brought up regarding workload, he did some research and had some background information. He tried to compare contracts. Postdoc contracts are very different, with a minimum salary and not a maximum. Salaries can't be changed for people on grants whose salaries are set at a fixed amount. Postdocs also have a very flexible workload requirement. Also, if a student wanted to work on research for as many hours as they wanted, and they were unionized, they simply had to not say they were being overworked. It was self-enforced, like it is with GSIs.

A motion to call the question, end debate, and come to a vote, was made and seconded and passed by hand-vote 44-3.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION, 1110a, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 39-4, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF SB 259.

The following Resolution, 1111e, was authored by Jonathan Stein and Bahar Navab:

Res. 1111e, To Create a Student Financial Oversight Workgroup (cont'd)

- 27 -

#### RESOLUTION TO CREATE A STUDENT FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT WORKGROUP

WHEREAS, the financial documents of the University of California are available to the public; and

WHEREAS, no member of the press or public appears to be investigating those documents thoroughly;  
and

WHEREAS, effective oversight of the University's finances has the potential to identify savings, promote more efficient operations, and educate students about the operations of the University;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly establish a Student Financial Oversight Workgroup of three (3) members, as of December 1, 2011, with a sunset date of no earlier than June 30, 2012, with the purposes of: reviewing the University of California's past and present financial documents; creating a report in the Spring Semester summarizing important elements of those documents, including trends over time; and reporting to the Graduate Assembly once before the end of the Spring Semester on the content of that report.

Mr. Stein said that as Student Regent, he has access to University financial documents that he was sure would be fascinating, if he had the capacity to understand them. Luckily, there are great graduate stu

dents at Cal who do have the experience necessary to look at complex financial documents and report what they have into intelligent questions he could asks decision makers. They basically want to institutionalize this sort of process. The workgroup would help him do his work as well as he could.

Ms. Navab said they had a pilot test of this. Mr. Stein gave some data to Sanaz Mobasseri, a Public Policy student who worked in banking and with documents. She did an analysis that was really helpful. Ms. Mobasseri can't do this by herself, so the idea was to create a workgroup with Delegates that she might possibly chair, and lead that effort.

Mr. Klein asked why they chose three members for the workgroup as opposed to a range or a minimum. Mr. Stein said he didn't want it to become too big and unwieldy. Ms. Navab said committees can have a hard time getting quorum when they have nine members; and for three members, quorum was easier.

Ms. Pymer said the Rules Committee didn't know if a workgroup needed to have quorum. Also, it seemed like the task would involve a ton of paperwork, and asked another one or two people would be helpful. Mr. Stein said that would be. Ms. Navab said they could have an amendment to make membership from three to five grads.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn asked what kind of financial documents he was talking about. Mr. Stein said that documents are public, but aren't easy to read. They're available on the Web site and it's a matter of sifting through them. Some portions are Systemwide and some are broken down by campus. Ms. Mobasseri said the documents deal with revenue streams and cost centers.

Mr. Rabkin said a workgroup didn't need a quorum and just needed to get stuff done.

Mr. Stein said that other than Delegates, there were some other people he would like to reach out for their help with this. So he would ask to approve this without limiting the workgroup to a membership number.

Res. 1111e, To Create a Student Financial Oversight Workgroup (cont'd)

- 28 -

Mr. Marchand asked for a show of hands of people interested in being on the workgroup, and said two people were interested.

Mr. Goren said Operational Excellence was also looking at numbers and trying to find ways to save money, and having this workgroup doing some of the legwork would be a great way to have direct student involvement in the OE process.

Ms. Pickering asked what kind of experience was needed for the workgroup. Ms. Mobasseri said her background is in investment banking and doing financial statement analysis, for big corporations and small start-ups. People need to have a sense of financial statements.

A Delegate asked if the workgroup, to institutionalize this, would also draft a guidance document, written material to help guide people. Mr. Stein said that would be fine. Mr. Marchand noted that workgroups were supposed to report every month.

Mr. Cohen asked if this will be coordinated with OE. Ms. Navab said it wouldn't be, since OE is Berkeley-specific. They could offer to collaborate with OE. Mr. Marchand said the financial data was Systemwide that the workgroup would consider.

Mr. Cohen asked about having regular reports. Ms. Navab noted that workgroups expire at the end of the academic year, at the end of June.

Seeing no other speakers, Mr. Marchand said they would go to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1111e PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO CREATE A STUDENT FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT WORKGROUP.**

Mr. Marchand said they would now form the workgroup the bill created. He called for nominations, from Delegates and non-Delegates. Ms. Mobasseri and Rosa Bravo nominated themselves.

Mr. Stein asked if they had the ability to seek a third member from, e.g., Economics. Ms. Navab said that Delegates could allow Mr. Stein to appoint people to the workgroup. It was so moved and seconded.

Mr. Marchand suggested giving the workgroup or the President the option of appointing people. Ms. Navab said she would serve on the workgroup. Mr. Marchand suggested a motion to allow one more person to be added to the workgroup. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ALLOW THE WORKGROUP TO ADD ONE MORE PERSON PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Marchand said the workgroup will be comprised of Ms. Mobasseri, Ms. Bravo, and Ms. Navab, with the possibility of a fourth member, or third voting member, to be appointed by the workgroup.

Ms. Navab said she would request a motion to make Ms. Mobasseri Chair of the workgroup. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO MAKE MS. MOBASSERI CHAIR OF THE WORKGROUP TO ANALYZE UC FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Res. 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County-29-  
Res. 1111c, On a Budget Amendment to Invest \$30,000 in the Graduate Assembly's Funds  
Functioning as Endowments

Ms. Navab said a speaker was present for 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County, who had to leave. A motion to amend the agenda to consider the bill next was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said they got the Resolution, 1111b, from the ASUC. It's an Alameda County Resolution that would ban the plastic bags. It wouldn't ban all such bags, but the ones given at check-out lines, for the most part. Also, paper bags would be taxed. The idea was to encourage people to use reusable bags. The Committee thought it was generally good. They looked at the details and it was pretty well written. They went over the successes and failures of other ordinances. They support the ASUC's goal to amend it to also include restaurants as well.

Ms. Pymer moved to adopt the Rules Committee amendments. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RULES COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Rabkin said the phrase, “single-use plastic bag” was a vague misnomer. He uses plastic bags as trash bags or to waterproof something, and he found them very useful. He would like to be able to buy them, as grocery stores charge for them. He liked plastic bags and would rather not have the State Legislature and Alameda County administration take the right to use them away from him.

Mr. Sehgal moved to adopt the External Affairs Committee recommendation to re-refer the bill to the Sustainability Committee and work with members of the External Affairs Committee to strengthen the Resolution. A Committee member is an expert in materials science and posed the observation that depending on the analysis and what factors one is interested in, plastic bags may actually be less environmentally harmful than paper bags. They use less material, there's less transport cost, and manufacturing costs are lower. Mr. Marchand said the motion was basically to table the bill until February.

Mr. Kehoe asked when the resolution in question was coming up. Ms. Pickering said it wasn't clear what resolution was being referred to or what actual proposal was on the table. That was one problem with 1111b.

Ms. Navab said that if people wanted to table this, she could get more information.

Mr. Klein moved to table the bill until later in the meeting. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO TABLE 1111b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A PLASTIC BAG BAN IN ALAMEDA COUNTY.**

Mr. Marchand said the next bill to consider was 1111c. He said there was a substitute version of the bill that Ms. Epstein will present.

A motion to adopt the substitute Resolution was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Res. 1111c, On a Budget Amendment to Invest \$30,000 in the Graduate Assembly's Funds - 30 -  
Functioning as Endowments (cont'd)

The following Resolution, 1111c, as amended by substitution, was authored by Mollie Epstein, GA Treasurer, with the assistance of Philippe Marchand and the Budget Committee:

**RESOLUTION ON A BUDGET AMENDMENT TO INVEST \$30,000 IN THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S FUNDS FUNCTIONING AS ENDOWMENTS**

WHEREAS, in 2009-2010, the GA created two new Funds Functioning as Endowments (FFE) with the UC Berkeley Foundation: the Graduate Assembly Operational Support Fund (W4015); and the Graduate Assembly Restricted Operational Support Fund (W4016); and

WHEREAS, gift agreements were written for each of these funds that direct their annual payouts to be directed, in full, to the GA's annual operating budget; and

WHEREAS, the GA authorized the investment of up to \$280,000 from GA reserve funds with Resolution 0903g; subsequently investing only \$50,000 in the unrestricted FFE and \$70,000 in the restricted FFE; and

WHEREAS, as of October 1, 2011, approximately \$109,000 in student fee reserves (all previous years' carryforward) was left in the GA's bank account, generating virtually no interest revenue; and

WHEREAS, these reserves are accumulated only from the annual revenue that the GA receives from student fees, and are independent of a) the GA's operating budget, and b) the commercial revenues (e.g., from the Coca-Cola or Pepsi contract, which include \$70,000 still in the GA's bank account, and \$300,000 gifted to the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation to invest to the benefit of the Berkeley graduate students); and

WHEREAS, the GA would likely increase its long-term revenue by investing some of its liquid reserves, as the return rate for the FFEs was 10% in 2010 and 17% in 2011 (payout rate 4.75%);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA's budget for 2011-12 be amended to include a \$30,000 transfer from the GA's carryforward to the GA's Funds Functioning as Endowments, allocating \$15,000 to each of the GA's FFEs.

Mr. Klein asked if the new version was in the meeting materials. Mr. Marchand said it wasn't.

Ms. Epstein said that lines 17 through 20 were clarified. They're investing in the Berkeley Foundation, which was not the same as the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation, and that wasn't entirely clear in lines 17-20. So that was clarified. She also made it clear that the GA had other sources of funds, and those weren't being used. She also wanted to clarify that there are two specific accounts that were created in 2009-10. The earlier Resolution didn't specify which one the money would be allocated towards. One of them is an unrestricted account and the other was restricted, making it more difficult for the GA to touch the principle later on. Also, the other change was to clarify that the return for 2009 was 10%, and for 2010 was 17%. But the GA only gets back as a return 4.75%, and the rest of the return is automatically invested.

Res. 1111c, On a Budget Amendment to Invest \$30,000 in the Graduate Assembly's Funds - 31 -  
Functioning as Endowments (cont'd)

Res. 1111d, On a By-law Amendment and Budget Amendment to Create a Graduate  
Student Advocate Position

Mr. Klein asked if the amount they were moving was still \$30,000. Ms. Epstein said it was. Mr. Klein asked they chose that specific amount. Ms. Hsueh said the GA currently has two endowments totaling \$120,000. She thought it would be nice to have a round figure, and make that \$150,000. These are student fee monies they're putting away as an endowment. Ms. Epstein said it was pretty arbitrary. Ms. Hsueh said they have another half-year to go for their budget, and things might come up that cause them to need money from their Bank of America account, even though it's earning .12% interest. They can always come back in the spring and invest more. Mr. Klein asked how much they had in the BofA. Ms. Hsueh said it's about \$190,000. Mr. Marchand said their liquid reserve is about 25% of their budget.

Ms. Pymer said she wanted to amend the fourth Whereas Clause, to replace "around" with "approximately," to read, "... as of October 1, 2011, approximately \$109,000 in student fee reserves... was left in

the GA's bank account...." THE MOTION WAS SECONDED. THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Froehle moved to re-refer the bill to the Budget and Rules Committees for further analysis so the GA didn't have to spend this time nit-picking. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Hoople asked why they have money in a BofA account when it's earning no interest. Ms. Hsueh said the financial services for the ASUC Auxiliary puts its money in the BofA. Every week they generate checks, so the money for their operating budget had to be liquid. Money in the endowment, for instance, couldn't be touched. Also, they might face an emergency. Mr. Hoople said they could get liquid bank accounts that have a slightly higher interest rate. For this amount of money, that might be worth it. Mr. Marchand asked if Ms. Hsueh and Ms. Epstein would be willing to look at that and come back to Delegates next time. Ms. Navab said this wasn't up to the GA because their money is tied to an account with the ASUC. With commercial money, they had the autonomy to move those funds to a different account.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1111c, AS AMENDED BY SUBSTITUTION AND ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON A BUDGET AMENDMENT TO INVEST \$30,000 IN THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S FUNDS FUNCTIONING AS ENDOWMENTS.

The following Resolution, 1111d, as amended on the floor and approved by the Assembly, was authored by Elizabeth De la Torre, Bahar Navab and Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND BUDGET AMENDMENT TO CREATE A GRADUATE STUDENT ADVOCATE POSITION

WHEREAS, the Student Advocate Office, a non-partisan executive office of the ASUC, offers representation, help, and advice to any student or student group involved in a dispute with

Res. 1111d, On a By-law Amendment and Budget Amendment to Create a Graduate Student Advocate Position (cont'd)

- 32 -

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND BUDGET AMENDMENT TO CREATE A GRADUATE STUDENT ADVOCATE POSITION (cont'd)

the University (e.g. defense against student conduct and cheating accusations, financial aid appeals, sexual assault and hate crime reporting); and

WHEREAS, in addition to campus policies applicable to all students, graduate students have their own appeals procedure for academic decisions that impede advancement towards their degree; and

WHEREAS, graduate student-initiated appeals and complaints may differ widely from those typically filed by undergraduates (e.g. student-advisor disputes, appeals of committee decisions): and

WHEREAS, the ASUC Student Advocate Office, being staffed by undergraduate students, is ill-equipped to handle graduate student cases; and

WHEREAS, advocating for the rights of individual graduate students falls under the GA's mission and purpose; and

WHEREAS, the GA could provide this service through the creation of a Graduate Student Advocate position, which could work closely with the ASUC Student Advocate Office;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that section 2.3.1 of the By-laws be amended as follows:

2.3.1. Positions. The Officers of the Graduate Assembly shall be the President, the Assembly Affairs Vice President, the Campus Affairs Vice President, the External Affairs Vice President, the Treasurer, the Rules Officer, the Funding Officer, ~~and~~ the Environmental Sustainability Officer, *and the Graduate Student Advocate*. Officers may not be Delegates or Alternates.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a new section 2.3.10.9 be added to the By-laws:

*2.3.10.9. Graduate Student Advocate. The Graduate Student Advocate shall assist individual graduate students or graduate student groups involved in a dispute with the University including, but not limited to, student conduct, University grievances, and graduate appeals procedures. The Graduate Student Advocate shall work with the ASUC Student Advocate Office to establish common standards and procedures for both advocacy services. The Graduate Student Advocate shall submit a semesterly report with summary data on graduate student advocacy cases, as well as policy recommendations pertaining to graduate student rights on campus. The Graduate Student Advocate shall be supervised by the President and may provide more frequent reports to the Executive Board or Delegate Assembly, as directed by these bodies.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that at its February 2012 meeting, the Delegate Assembly elect a graduate student to fill the role of Graduate Student Advocate for the remainder of the 2011-2012 academic year.

Res. 1111d, On a By-law Amendment and Budget Amendment to Create a Graduate Student Advocate Position (cont'd)

- 33 -

#### RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND BUDGET AMENDMENT TO CREATE A GRADUATE STUDENT ADVOCATE POSITION (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 2011-2012 GA Budget be amended by transferring \$2,500 from the General Contingency line to a new Graduate Student Advocate Stipend line, in order to offer the Graduate Student Advocate a \$500 monthly stipend from February to June 2012.

Ms. Navab said the reason they wrote the Resolution was because the undergraduate government, the ASUC, has an advocacy arm, the Student Advocate Office, that takes on grievance cases dealing with academics, housing, etc. They've had an increase in grad student cases, and the SAO has heard a lot of complaints. The SAO doesn't feel prepared to handle graduate student cases. As undergrads talking to

faculty about grads, they don't feel they're taken seriously. And they don't have an understanding, e.g., of how graduate programs work, such as grad housing. So they're unable to advocate appropriately. As a result, the ASUC Student Advocate Office came to the GA and asked about creating a graduate student advocate that the SAO could train to be housed in the GA. The SAO could train them, such as with procedures. This function involves confidentiality, so the idea was to create a new stipended position that would report to the President, so she could be aware of what was happening and advocate for any new policy issues.

Mr. Klein said the Budget Committee recommended having the position be a non-voting member of the E-Board. Ms. Navab said they went back and forth on whether the position should be on the E-Board. People were amenable to an amendment.

Mr. Marchand said the current status would have the GA SAO be an Officer who is not a member of the E-Board, with the same status as Rules, Funding, and Sustainability. Ms. Navab said the person was always welcome to attend E-Board meetings, but wasn't required to do so.

Mr. Klein said he did a close reading of the By-laws and couldn't find where E-Board members were defined.

Ms. Pymer said that grads pay fees to the ASUC and asked why the ASUC didn't have a grad student position, instead of the GA creating a position it would pay for. Ms. Navab the ASUC Student Advocate is an at-large elected position. Grads could run, but she didn't think a grad ever has. The undergrads don't get paid.

Mr. Marchand said that 4.15.1.6 of the By-laws, membership of the E-Board, states that the president chairs the E-Board, which includes the AAVP, CAVP, EAVP, and the Treasurer, who is non-voting.

Ms. Pymer said the Rules Committee wanted a more frequent report other than just annually, which seemed sporadic and didn't provide for accountability. They wondered about amending the second Resolved Clause to have semesterly reports. Ms. Navab said that if the person is on the E-Board, the GA would get a report on a weekly basis. Mr. Marchand said GA Officers are required to report to the Assembly.

Ms. Pymer said that since confidentiality was required and this person's task was more specific than the broader work of, e.g., the EAVP, she would rather have the position separate from the E-Board. The

Res. 1111d, On a By-law Amendment and Budget Amendment to Create a Graduate Student Advocate Position (cont'd)

- 34 -

motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE SECOND RESOLVED CLAUSE, REPLACING "ANNUAL" WITH "SEMESTERLY," TO HAVE THE GRAD STUDENT ADVOCATE REPORT SEMESTERLY, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Davidson asked if this would be an elected position. Mr. Marchand said it would be.

Mr. Klein said it seemed that this position was substantially different than other Officer positions. Current wording prevents this position from being a Delegate, and he didn't think that was necessary. He didn't think the position should be an Officer and thought it should be appointed. Ms. Navab said they

modeled this after the ASUC, and the SAO doesn't serve in other capacities so they're not biased by how other bodies vote, and just do their job rather than serving under another hat.

Mr. Marchand said appointments are made either by election or hired by people elected by the Assembly.

Ms. Navab said they could make this a project coordinator or Officer or have it staffed to the President.

Mr. Hoople asked how the position works in the ASUC. Ms. Navab said people in other positions run from a student political party, but not the Student Advocate, who is usually endorsed by all the parties. The position is very themed.

Mr. Albright said that the Student Advocate has usually worked in the SAO for the previous three years before the SAO elects them. It's not a party position.

Ms. Pickering asked how important it was that the person not be a Senator. Mr. Albright said the position couldn't be from a party and the person had to be unbiased.

Mr. Kehoe said it made sense to have the position be an independent Officer, especially in dealing with different departments. It would give the position more weight.

Ms. Harris said for oversight, reporting to somebody if they're not a Delegate should be included. Ms. Navab said the position could report to the E-Board. An amendment could be made to the last sentence of the second Resolved Clause, to insert "shall be supervised by the President and", to have the sentence read: "The Graduate Student Advocate is supervised by the President and may provide more frequent reports to the Executive Board or Delegate Assembly...." It was so moved and seconded.

With Ms. Navab chairing the meeting, Mr. Marchand said their Officers are appointed by the Assembly and report to the Assembly. The only people who are supervised are staff. He thought the Advocate should work with the E-Board, but not be part of it, and with an equal footing with the Officers. He wouldn't want direct supervision because that's not how the GA was structured. If people want the position to be supervised, the position should be a staffperson.

Mr. Niederhut asked why this wouldn't be under the Graduate Student Support Project. Ms. De la Torre said the GSSP was based more on programming. She thought an Officer would have more weight.

Mr. Kehoe said the position would be accountable to the Delegate Assembly, which could replace the person if it was unhappy.

Res. 1111d, On a By-law Amendment and Budget Amendment to Create a Graduate  
Student Advocate Position (cont'd)

- 35 -

Res. 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda  
County

Ms. Harris said the idea to have the position supervised was to have a greater connection with the GA.

Ms. Navab said having the position report to the President would allow wording in the employment contract about confidentiality and being able to talk to the President about confidential matters, rather than talking to the Executive Board. But she didn't feel that strongly about this.

With Mr. Marchand chairing the meeting, a motion to call the question, end debate, and come to a vote, was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE SECOND RESOLVED CLAUSE, HAVING THE GRAD STUDENT ADVOCATE SUPERVISED BY THE PRESIDENT, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 27-4.

A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and failed by hand-vote 12-18.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1111d, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND BUDGET AMENDMENT TO CREATE A GRADUATE STUDENT ADVOCATE POSITION.

Mr. Marchand said the Chair would entertain a motion to bring back from the table Resolution 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Marchand said he would propose having five minutes to discuss this Resolution. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Albright said he hasn't taken an active role in this movement other than writing a bill and helping CALPIRG with its campaign on this. He could answer questions to the best of his knowledge.

Mr. Kehoe asked when the vote will take place on the proposal to ban plastic bags. Mr. Albright said that as he understood it, the first vote by the County Board of Supervisors is December 14, and with another vote a month later. As it was described to him, the second vote was to reaffirm the first. Mr. Huet-Vaughn said the body was the Alameda County Waste Management Authority.

Mr. Cohen said the Resolution doesn't have citations of any studies. He asked if Mr. Albright would be willing to look at the European model and discuss further options. Mr. Albright said he hasn't done much research on this, and this was presented to him by a student group working on this across the State.

Mr. Goren said it was his understanding the GA was to meet for issues of importance to grad students. The bill didn't seem within their scope and moved to table the bill indefinitely. The motion was seconded. Mr. Marchand said the motion was debatable. He noted that the Resolution was within the scope of all the things the GA has discussed.

Res. 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County (cont'd) - 36 -

Mr. Kehoe said that in the interest of the democratic process, he would ask people to not shout when they vote in order to allow voice-votes to be accurately judged.

Mr. Rendall said he didn't think this was out of scope with what the GA has done in the past. Clearly, there's a constituency that this was very important to, and they should let it come to a vote.

Mr. Sehgal said he agreed with the sentiment of the Resolution, but thought they would be setting a bad precedent if they carbon copy resolutions that are drafted by other groups without vetting them. What they bring to this process as graduate students was very informed perspectives, and to view things through their lens.

A motion to extend speaking time by 15 minutes was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote.

The motion to indefinitely postpone Resolution 1111b failed by hand-vote 17-23.

A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Cohen moved to accept the External Affairs Committee analysis that says that groups sponsoring the bill will work with people in External Affairs to work on different approaches. He moved to add a Resolved Clause saying the GA supports extending the language of the ban to restaurants and banning the use of plastic bags. Mr. Marchand said they would wait for exact language and return to the amendment when language was submitted.

Mr. Riffe moved to amend the second Resolved Clause to add “and retail establishments,” and to have the second Resolved Clause read as follows:

"Resolved, that the GA supports expanding the language of the proposed ban to include restaurants and retail establishments."

Mr. Kehoe asked what the ban currently includes. Mr. Albright said it only includes food stores, like grocery stores, 1,700 of them in Alameda County. It doesn't include retail stores. Including retail stores would total about 7,000 establishments in Alameda County. The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Rabkin said he liked plastic bags for things that are oddly shaped, or for keeping things waterproofed. If he buys a book and it's raining, and there were no plastic bags, he'd be out of luck. He would rather not have the ban.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 19-16.

Mr. Sehgal said that what they're doing is rewriting the bill. While that's valid, it was also telling of the fact that perhaps the bill was not as well informed as it might be. He moved to table this until the February GA meeting. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Marchand said they were out of time. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote.

Res. 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County (cont'd) - 37 -

Res. 1112a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action Regarding Non-Violent Protests on the University of California Campuses

THE MOTION TO TABLE RESOLUTION 1111b, AS AMENDED, UNTIL THE FEBRUARY GA MEETING, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A PLASTIC BAG BAN IN ALAMEDA COUNTY.

Mr. Marchand said the last Resolution was 1112a, which he authored.

The following Resolution, 1112a, was authored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION REGARDING NON-VIOLENT PROTESTS ON THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUSES

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly expressed support for peaceful demonstrations during the November 9th Day of Action to ReFund Public Education (Resolution 1110c); and

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

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, among the 38 protesters arrested on November 9th, 32 were UC Berkeley students, and one was a faculty member; and

WHEREAS, the GA Executive Board released a statement on November 12th condemning the unprovoked use of police force on November 9th; and

WHEREAS, the November 9th events at Berkeley, as well as the use of pepper spray by UCPD against peaceful protesters at UC Davis, generated national attention and led both UC President Mark Yudof and California State Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez to launch investigations in the use of force against campus protests; and

WHEREAS, on November 28th, the Academic Senate will be considering a motion expressing loss of confidence in the UC Berkeley's senior administration's ability to respond to non-violent demonstrations on campus; and

WHEREAS, while the campus Police Review Board made several recommendations on addressing acts of civil disobedience following a building occupation in November 2009 ([http://administration.berkeley.edu/prb/6-14-10\\_prb-report.pdf](http://administration.berkeley.edu/prb/6-14-10_prb-report.pdf)), it is unclear how many of these recommendations have actually been implemented by campus officials; and

Res. 1112a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action Regarding Non-Violent Protests on the University of California Campuses (cont'd) - 38 -

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION REGARDING NON-VIOLENT PROTESTS ON THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUSES (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly should promote policies that protect the basic civil rights, as well as the health and safety of all students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly condemns the initiation of force by UCPD against non-violent protesters at UC Berkeley and UC Davis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly supports policies that would restrict the use of police force on campus (including batons and pepper spray) to that which is necessary to defend against immediate and substantial threats to the safety of campus community members.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA President communicates the content of this Resolution to Chancellor Birgeneau and UC President Yudof, as well as all bodies investigating the police response to recent protests on UC campuses.

With Ms. Navab chairing the meeting, Mr. Marchand said the Executive Board had an extraordinary meeting after the events of November 9 on campus, the protests and the police reaction. A couple of Delegates attended the meeting, and he wanted to thank them. The Resolution would basically make the GA take a position to condemn the use of police force against peaceful demonstrators at Berkeley on November 9, and at Davis on November 18. It's also resolved that the GA supports policies that would restrict the use of police force on campus as necessary to defend against immediate and substantive threats to the safety of campus and community members. That was actually the wording that was taken from a public statement by the Chancellor of UC Merced, who made the comments after that incidents at Davis. The bill also resolves that the GA communicate this stance to Chancellor Birgeneau and Pres. Yudof. The Resolution gives the GA's opinion on the incidents at Davis and Berkeley and what they want going forward in terms of general policing and non-violent protests.

Mr. Kehoe said the bill talks about safety, and asked if tree sitters would constitute "an immediate and substantial threat," or if police action against them would be prevented; or, e.g., against homeless people living on campus. The Resolution, in the second Resolved Clause, just mentions "police force."

Mr. Froehle said that "force" is a technical term. Mr. Klein asked if it meant physical interaction. Mr. Marchand said they could have it read the "initiation of force," which was really the most important.

Mr. Rabkin said they occasionally have wacky religious people on campus, and if somebody was sitting in front of his business making calm, unthreatening homophobic or racist remarks, he would like the police to be able to remove them. If they didn't leave when asked, he would like the police to drag them away. And if they get rowdy, he would like to make sure the police lead them away. He didn't want to tie the hands of the police unnecessarily. Things don't have to be violent to be extremely disruptive or harmful. There are non-violent speech acts that make the campus less friendly and hostile. He didn't think the GA wanted to say "never," which would rule out a lot of cases.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn moved to amend "force" to "violence" in the first Resolved Clause, to read as follows:

Res. 1112a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action Regarding Non-Violent Protests on the University of California Campuses (cont'd) - 39 -

"Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly condemns the initiation of violence by UCPD against non-violent protesters...."

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said the point raised was good. “Force” was vaguer, and “violence” was clearer in terms of what was being referred to. There are ways to address the concerns of protesters and they could be removed without beating them with batons or spraying them with pepper spray. People weren't incensed about removing people for breaking the law, but were against removing them in a violent way that causes physical and lasting harm.

Mr. Sehgal said the definition of “violence” is “behavior involving physical force, intended to hurt or damage.” There's a high degree of subjectivity in the word “physical.”

Ms. Pickering said “force” was a better term, because the way police interpret “violence” could be a lot more extreme.

Mr. Williams said “police force” is actually a technical term used in police terminology. To describe a response to protest action, retaining the word “force” keeps things much clearer.

Mr. Froehle moved amend the amendment and, in the first Resolved Clause, strike the word “violence” from the amendment and replace it with the “excessive force,” to read:

"Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly condemns the initiation of excessive force by UCPD against non-violent protesters...."

Mr. Froehle said his motion would also amend the second Resolved Clause, to add the word “excessive,” to read:

"Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly supports policies that would restrict the use of excessive police force on campus...."

A Delegate said that excessive force is already restricted.

The motion to amend was seconded. A motion to call the question was made and passed with no objection.

The motion to approve Mr. Froehle’s amendments failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Navab said they were back in consideration of Mr. Huet-Vaughn’s amendment. The motion to approve the amendment failed unanimously by voice-vote.

Ms. Navab said they were back to the original Resolution, as submitted.

Mr. Terhorst said there are many other means of violence, such as tasers, that are not included. Mr. Marchand said they're referring to things that were used on campus. As far as he knew, the UCPD doesn't

Res. 1112a, On Standing Policy and Directed Action Regarding Non-Violent Protests on the University of California Campuses (cont'd) - 40 -

have tasers, which is why that wasn't included. He didn't want to focus on exact wording too much. The premise is that if there's a case of non-violent civil disobedience, people wouldn't simply be dragged away by their hair. The gradation of force was far too fast in this case.

A motion to extend speaking time by ten minutes was made and seconded failed by hand-vote 13-11, requiring a two-thirds vote.

Ms. Navab said they would vote on the Resolution as it was submitted.

**THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1112a PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION REGARDING NON-VIOLENT PROTESTS ON THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUSES.**

With Mr. Marchand chairing the meeting, he said they would adjourn at that time. He would like to invite people to the Bear's Lair and would ask people to please help in putting the tables and chairs away, and to please turn in their feedback form.

This meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary