

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

September 8, 2011

### SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting commenced the Fall Semester. It was called to order at 5:38 p.m.

#### Announcements

The GA over the summer sent a budget memo to administrators for them to consider when the campus made budgets for the coming year. The GA prioritized mental health, which received an extra \$400,000, and childcare services, which received \$200,000.

Big issues for the coming year include Lower Sproul, which will be redeveloped, and Operational Excellence, which hopes to implement changes that result in \$75 million in savings per year. One issue of concern to grads was benefits decentralization for GSIs. Another issue ASUC Auxiliary transition from Business and Administrative Services to Student Affairs, which has been controversial.

#### Introduction of Andrew Szeri, Dean of the Graduate Division

Dean Szeri has been Dean for four-plus years. The Grad Division has about 50 people and reports to the Provost. It's charged with overseeing the care and well being of graduate students on campus.

#### Representatives from the ASUC

Andy Albright, ASUC Senator, introduced himself. The ASUC Senate voted unanimously to support the second half of the California DREAM Act.

#### Upcoming GA Events

The Grad Social Club will have a welcome back party on September 16 and an Oktoberfest party on October 21, as well as speed dating on September 30. The coordinators want to have a lot of events and need Delegates' help to do that.

#### Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Council member

The City has about 40 commissions that students can join. The City was also working on redistricting, given the new census figures.

#### Presentation by Student Regent Mireles and Student Regent Designate Stein

Alfredo Mireles and Jonathan Stein introduced themselves.

#### Resolution Referral

The following Resolutions were referred to committee:

1109a, Budget Amendment to Partly Allocate Contingency Funds, to the Budget and Rules Committees

1109b, Updating the GA Charter, to the Rules Committee

1109c, Standing Policy and Directed Action in support of the UCSA Graduate Student Bill of Rights, to the External Affairs and Rules Committees

1109d, Budget Amendment to Restore Funding for External Affairs Legislative Directors, to the External Affairs, Budget, and Rules Committees

1109e, A By-law Amendment to Refer Time Sensitive Resolutions to Committees, to the Rules Committee

1109f, To Establish Funding for the Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator, to the Campus Affairs, Budget, and Rules Committees

1109g, In Support of the California SB185, to the External Affairs and Rules Committee s

#### Committee, Workgroup, and Project Introductions

Introductions were held to help Delegates choose which groups to participate in:

The External Affairs Committee advocates on behalf of grads on local, State, and national issues.

The Campus Affairs Committee takes issues to administrators and works with campus committees.

The Budget Committee works on the GA budget and on ASUC businesses.

The Rules Committee monitors GA actions and Resolutions.

The Funding Committee recommends awards for Grants, travel money, student group money, GMER, and Contingency Funding.

The Sustainability Committee will raise money for Sustainability Scholarships and was also largely responsible for the increase in bike racks on campus and new recycling bins.

The Communications Committee writes and edits copy to make information accessible.

The GA's Systems Administrator could use help in creating an online funding application system.

Community Outreach is attempting to create a campus-wide outreach program for people to participate in, possibly local educational outreach and mentoring as well as a non-local, possibly environmental activity.

The Faculty Mentoring Award looks at faculty mentorship.

The Graduate Minority Outreach, Recruitment and Retention Project focuses on issues of equity and inclusion at the graduate level.

The Grad Social Club puts on fun events.

The Graduate Support Services Project puts on workshops.

The Graduate Women's Project provides space for graduate women and allies.

The “Berkeley Graduate” is an online publication. It needs writers and pays bloggers.

The Women of Color Initiative puts on the Empowering Women of Color Conference, in its 27th year.

The Graduate Minority Students Project advocates for equity and inclusion on campus.

Campus committees involve grads in general campus Administration, and there was an extensive list.

#### Report on Lower Sproul Redevelopment

The meeting entered into executive session to hear a report on Lower Sproul plans from Alyosha Verzhbinsky, ASUC/GA Advising Architect.

#### Funding Committee Report: Round 1

The GA approved the Funding Committee’s recommendations on Travel Grant Allocations; Contingency Allocations, \$2,440; Grants allocations, \$17,543; GMER funding, \$45,000.

A system of “supergroups” was implemented last year for GMER funding, and the cap that groups could apply for was increased from \$500 to \$750. The GA voted on having caps of \$500 or \$750, and approved the latter. The GA also voted to move City and Regional Planning to the Professional Schools supergroup.

The GA voted to recommend that the Funding Committee review supergroups.

#### Budget Report

The Budget Report was tabled until the next meeting.

#### Advocacy Agenda

The Advocacy Agenda, items the GA will work on throughout the year, had to be determined by the October meeting. The E-Board and officers came up with possibilities: GSI benefits decentralization, professional degree fees; the State budget; equity and inclusion; grad-targeted mental health; and grad-specific career services.

#### Committee Formation

Delegate membership on committees was determined.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

### **End Summary of the Meeting**

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Fall Semester, was called to order by Bahar Navab at 5:38 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Navab, GA President, introduced herself. Normally, Philippe Marchand will chair GA meetings, but she'd do it for this meeting so Mr. Marchand could work with new Delegates and answer any questions. Ms. Navab said she was excited to see so many people there. For new students, she wanted to thank them for joining the GA right off the bat; and for those who were returning, she wanted to thank them for another dedicated year with the GA.

Ms. Navab said she would give a brief update on what people worked on over the summer. Most of this was in her report, which was included in the agenda packet.

Ms. Navab said that every summer, as administrators make the budget for the coming year, the GA puts together a budget memo on behalf of graduate students, used to inform the Chancellor and other campus units as to what grad student priorities are. She was happy to report that the GA's budget memo that year, along with their advocacy efforts, got an extra \$400,000 for mental health services and Counseling and Psychological Services. That was one of the main things Delegates said that they wanted. Also, another \$200,000 went into childcare services to make up for major cuts to childcare in recent years. The GA was excited about these achievements.

Regarding Lower Sproul, Ms. Navab asked how many people have heard about the BEARS Initiative and the redevelopment of Lower Sproul. A couple of years ago the students passed the BEARS Initiative, which puts money into redeveloping Lower Sproul. Over time, students will pay \$123 million to renovate the space and to build a new Eshleman Hall. The building will be demolished next summer and replaced. Eshleman is seismically unsafe and doesn't have enough room for everything that's needed. In addition, parts of MLK will be renovated to allow for better retail and lounge space. In addition, parts of Cesar Chavez will be improved. So this was a big initiative. The committees looking at the plans are made up of students and campus administrators.

The project was going through different phases. They went through schematic design for the outside of the buildings, and were moving into design development. Hopefully the Regents, at their November meeting, will approve the plans that have been made so far.

Ms. Navab said the GA that evening will see the current plans and what the building was projected to look like. Stakeholder meetings will be held throughout the month of September for students to talk about what they'd like to see, such as with furniture and the type of retail they'd like. She was hoping that some Delegates will sign up to be part of that stakeholder process.

Ms. Navab said another big item, Operational Excellence a campus initiative that aims to spend \$75 million in order to save \$75 million on a yearly basis. Campus units make proposals to the coordinating committee, which makes recommendations about what programs should be funded and which shouldn't.

Often times, these involve major changes on campus, such as with IT, HR, and student services. The campus will decide whether to move forward with the proposed initiatives.

Announcements -- Andrew Szeri, Dean, Graduate Division  
-- ASUC Representatives

- 5 -

As some of them know, OE has been a little controversial for things like benefits decentralization for GSIs. The GA talked about this last year. There are some good and some bad elements. On the positive side, students got the Adobe Creative Suite for free. The GA also got the Program Office to agree to give stipends to grad students who sit on OE implementation teams. That was a big issue because it allows grads to have direct input on programs as OE moves forward. If any Delegates were interested in serving on these they should let her know.

Ms. Navab said another big issue was ASUC Auxiliary transition. The Auxiliary is the staff that runs the operations of the GA and the ASUC. The Auxiliary has been under Business and Administrative Services and as part of OE, was moved to Student Affairs. And it's been quite controversial. The Auxiliary was put under the Dean of Students who also does Code of Conduct issues. Some students have raised issues about the ASUC's advocacy arm being under the Dean's office. Ms. Navab said she was happy to report that students got the campus to agree to a transition team to look at the Auxiliary and what its structure should be, and where it should be placed on campus. If people were interested in serving on this, a couple of at-large student seats are open.

#### Introduction of Andrew Szeri, Dean of the Graduate Division

Andrew Szeri, Dean of the Graduate Division, introduced himself. He's also an Engineering professor with a research lab and some Ph.D. students, and does all the normal things that a professor does. He's been Dean for four-plus years. He's really enjoyed it, especially working with the GA and its leadership. He was excited to see such a large number of people at the GA meeting because it meant that departments were being represented that might not have been represented in a number of years.

Mr. Szeri said the Grad Division is an organization of about 50 people, which he leads. He reports directly to the Provost. The Grad Division is charged with overseeing the care and well being, academically and otherwise, of graduate students on campus. There are more than 10,000 grad students there, about 6,000 Ph.D. students with the balance being Masters and professional school students. The Grad Division works on everything from admissions; to certification of degree requirements; to allocation of fellowship money to departments and interdisciplinary programs; to sponsorship of the GSI Teaching and Resource Center, which provides training in instruction for grads; to Academic Services, which provides opportunities for professional development for grads. The list was long. He called for any questions.

Ms. Navab said she would like to thank him for attending. If people have questions in the future, she meets with Dean Szeri regularly and would be happy to take questions to him on grads' behalf.

Mr. Szeri said there will be a graduate student forum on October 1. He was planning to speak on student funding and mentoring issues, the two areas he's done the hardest work on in his years as Dean.

#### Representatives from the ASUC

Andy Albright introduced himself and said he's an ASUC Senator that year and was one of the representatives of the ASUC to the GA. There were two other Senators present. Sydney Fang and Brisa Diaz introduced themselves.

Announcements -- Upcoming GA Events

- 6 -

-- Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Council member

Mr. Albright said he'll attend all GA meetings and will report on what the ASUC was doing. The ASUC Senate last night took an official stance, in a unanimous vote, to support the second half of the California DREAM Act. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked what the ASUC was. Mr. Albright said it's the student government, mostly serving undergraduates. But grads are allowed to vote in ASUC elections. Ms. Navab said the ASUC is the umbrella student government group. The GA is an offshoot of it and focuses on grad student issues. The ASUC is the campus-wide organization. Mr. Albright said that grads are allowed to run in ASUC elections and can vote and attend Senate meetings. The Senate meets on Wednesday nights in the Senate Chamber, starting at 7:00. They go a lot longer than GA meetings. Seeing no other questions, Ms. Navab said she would like to thank him.

#### Upcoming GA Events

Ms. Navab said she would yield the floor to the Chairs of the Grad Social Club. Aaron Welch said he had fliers for two events coming up in the next couple of months, a welcome back party on September 16, from 6:00 to 10:00, and an Oktoberfest party on October 21. They'll also have a speed dating event on September 30, tentatively at BEC's Bar. They want to plan a whole lot of events, and they really need a lot of help. They want some energetic people who aren't afraid of organizing. If people want to organize social events, they should come to the Grad Social Club's work party. The GSC has a Facebook site and they're connected to the GA Web site. So people could find them there.

Ms. Navab said that as Dean Szeri mentioned, the GA will host a graduate student forum to talk about the status of funding and the State budget, and what the GA could do. The date will be determined.

#### Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Council member

Kriss Worthington introduced himself and said he was from the Berkeley City Council. He just wanted to come and meet some of them. He was sort of famous for recruiting students to serve in student government, and they've quadrupled the number. But that just meant they were about 10% of the way towards students actually having fair representation in City government. Grads have been called his "secret weapon," because many of his commissioners are graduate students. Previously for some reason, people just thought undergraduates could do this. But graduate students do a great job. There are about 40 commissions that usually meet once a month. It's not a lot of work and but it's a great chance to actually take their ideas and see the policies implemented in the real world.

Mr. Worthington said the City was also working on redistricting, given the new census figures. There will be a lot of meetings. They already have three proposals for redistricting, two of them submitted by

students, he believed. Maybe someone from the GA was good at analyzing numbers and political trends and could come up with the redistricting proposal the City will adopt.

Mr. Worthington said there are also people on the GA's E-Board and through e-mails who are raised concerns about a program sponsored by a bunch of different groups. As far as he could tell, without telling

Approval of the Agenda and the May Meetings  
Presentation by the Student Regent and Student Regent Designate

- 7 -

the sponsors who the speakers will be, these groups decided to have a program in which it appears that every single speaker is white, and almost all of them are male. That didn't exactly reflect the diversity of UC Berkeley or the City of Berkeley. Unlike what has been said, Mr. Worthington said he wasn't demanding that the program be canceled and wasn't trying to get anybody fired. He was simply asking if a couple of women and a couple of people of different ethnicities would make the program more interesting. He hoped the GA will consider supporting that concept in whatever way.

Mr. Worthington said he wanted to thank the GA for giving him the time to speak. People should feel free to get in touch with him if they want to get involved in City issues, or if they want to complain or make suggestions.

Mr. Marchand, Assembly Affairs VP, said he talked to most Delegates already. He was looking to get a better room for the next meeting, and there was a question about that in the feedback form. People should return their feedback form when they return their name tags. People should also write their name on the sign-in sheet. For this meeting he'll stand in the back and people could ask him questions about anything being discussed.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MAY 2011 MINUTES

Ms. Navab called for a motion to approve the minutes to the May GA meeting. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES TO THE MAY 5, 2011 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Ms. Navab said she would ask for a motion to hear under Reports, at the top, a report on Lower Sproul redevelopment, since a guest speaker was coming in for that. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Navab called for a motion to approve the agenda, as amended. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Ms. Navab said the Student Regent was present and was requesting that they move to that agenda item. It was so moved and seconded to move to that agenda packet and passed with no objection.

Presentation by Student Regent Mireles and Student Regent Designate Stein

Jonathan Stein introduced himself and said he is a UC Berkeley graduate student at the Goldman School and the Law School. He's Student Regent Designate, which meant he's in the first year of a two-year Student Regent term. He was more or less getting his training this year.

Alfredo Mireles introduced himself and said he was a UCSF graduate student, studying health policy. But he's also a proud, former Golden Bear and was there as an undergrad. It was nice to have Mr. Stein there because his was one of the largest student populations.

Resolution Referral

- 8 -

Mr. Mireles that unfortunately, he wasn't able to attend GA meetings while he was the Designate, but hopefully would have a little more presence at Berkeley GA meetings.

Mr. Stein said that every year the Board of Regents, the governing board of the UC System, has two student representatives who serve staggered two-year terms, a voting and a non-voting Student Regent. Amidst the millionaires and billionaires and State officials, like the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, the Student Regent and the Designate are responsible for transmitting student concerns, frustrations, and opinions to the Regents. And in return, they translate Regental decision making to students.

If a problem is local to Berkeley, they should go to Ms. Navab and their representatives in the Delegate body. They should go to the Student Regent if they have a problem they feel is Systemwide, or that needs Statewide attention, or requires a need for coordination among campuses. They want the position to be as successful as possible for campuses. And students can be useful to the Student Regents in that they're only as powerful on the Board as the coalition of students they have with them on any given day. Students can call or e-mail, and they'll be totally receptive. And students will be useful to the students on the Board because they're only as powerful on the Board as the coalition of students they have with them on any given day.

Mr. Stein said that if the student members tell the Board of Regents that something was really important, the Regents would blow them off. But if there are organized student groups with thousands of people on every campus that supports something, all of a sudden they're a force that had to be listened to. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked if their vote was equal to the Regents. Mr. Mireles said it was. Mr. Stein noted that Mr. Mireles was frequently outvoted.

A Delegate said that now that students are paying more money to UC than the State was, she asked if it was possible to increase voting rights of students on the Board. Mr. Mireles said there were multiple approaches. There's a graduate student campaign by the UCSA that year. Ms. Navab said the UCSA is the UC Systemwide coalition of student governments. The graduate campaign was to get three Student Regent seats, for an undergrad, a professional grad student, and an academic grad student. Mr. Stein said there was momentum behind that. Last year he was part of the External Affairs team in the GA, so he knew the GA well. If people wanted to work on this issue, they could also go through the External Affairs office of the GA.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Ms. Navab said there besides the bills that were listed on the agenda, a few additional Resolutions were turned in at the last minute that she would read into the minutes. She referred the following bills to committee:

- 1109a, Budget Amendment to Partly Allocate Contingency Funds, to the Budget and Rules Committees
- 1109b, Updating the GA Charter, to the Rules Committee
- 1109c, Standing Policy and Directed Action in support of the UCSA Graduate Student Bill of Rights, to the External Affairs and Rules Committees

Committee, Workgroup, and Project Introductions

- 9 -

- 1109d, Budget Amendment to Restore Funding for External Affairs Legislative Directors, to the External Affairs, Budget, and Rules Committees
- 1109e, A By-law Amendment to Refer Time Sensitive Resolutions to Committees, to the Rules Committee
- 1109f, To Establish Funding for the Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator, to the Campus Affairs, Budget, and Rules Committees
- 1109g, In Support of the California SB185, to the External Affairs and Rules Committee s

Ms. Navab called for any changes to the referrals, and seeing none, said they were referred.

#### COMMITTEE, WORKGROUP, AND PROJECT INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Navab said they'd introduce the different GA committees. Later on, Delegates will select which of these committees they would like to be on.

For the External Affairs Committee, Alberto Ortega said it deals with advocating on behalf of grad students on issues that are beyond the campus Administration. It works with the City of Berkeley, the Office of the President, and State and federal governments. The work it does was pretty broad, and it could work on anything that affects students or future students. They coordinate with a number of Statewide and federal student organizations. The UCSA was primarily for State issues. The Student Advocates for Graduate Education was the main for graduate federal advocacy. They take students to Sacramento, to offices of representatives, and also to Washington, D.C. Part of it was working on items they decided were some main issues, but they also respond to things that come up that they may not have anticipated. That past year, for example, they dealt with the elimination of subsidized loans, which they found out about at the last minute.

Mr. Stein asked how much work was involved being on the Committee. Mr. Ortega said it was as much as somebody would want. It could be an hour a month. Or if somebody wanted to work every day, there was enough to do.

For the Campus Affairs Committee, Elizabeth De La Torre introduced herself. She's a third-year Law student and the Campus Affairs VP. She takes issues to administrators that grads want to work on, and vice versa. She focused on filling GA and campus committees. Campus committees have administrators and workgroups to work on campus issues. The Campus Affairs Committee works with campus committees to take the pulse of what was going on on campus and to communicate to the ASUC what was

going on, and to develop a reciprocal relationship, and take back to campus committees what the GA wanted. There are 79 different campus committees and she needed people to help out with that. Her e-mail was cavp@ga.berkeley.ed. She noted that that was the format for most of the GA's e-mail addresses.

For the Budget Committee, Mollie Epstein introduced herself and said she was Treasurer and chaired this Committee. It allocates the budget of the GA and helps with the transparency and efficiency of the process and works with the Business Office. She also started to work with the core businesses from the ASUC, including the Art Studio and the Cal Lodge, which were losing money. She was dependent on the interest of the committee who want to help with things.

Committee, Workgroup, and Project Introductions (cont'd)

- 10 -

Ms. Navab said the businesses in Lower Sproul and the Bookstore are owned by the ASUC. Whenever students support them, student government gets a percentage back. So the GA encourages grads to shop at those vendors.

For the Rules Committee, Adriana Mendoza introduced herself and said she was the Rules Officer and will chair the Rules Committee. The Committee monitors the actions of the GA to check it against the GA's Charter, By-laws, and MOUs. The Rules Committee also just got its first Resolutions to consider.

For the Funding Committee, Mike Sheen introduced himself and said he is the Funding Officer, dealing with everything that had to do with funding, which totaled about one-third of the GA's budget. It includes Grants, travel money, student group money, GMER, the Contingency Fund, any sort of event people want to put on. The Funding Committee will look at these throughout the year.

For the Sustainability Committee, Jason Trager introduced himself and said he was the Sustainability Officer. One of their projects this year is to raise a lot of money for Sustainability Scholarships for the GA and for graduate students. He just had a meeting with a Silicon Valley exec to do fundraising. So he would encourage them to volunteer for this Committee. Sustainability is about everything they do. While there are some things they do that are based on rules and structure, there is a future they're building in sustainability that will be basically why they were all there, because they're all concerned with the future.

Mr. Zachritz said that for the record, the Sustainability Committee was also largely responsible for the increase in bike racks on campus and the new recycling bins that will be coming out. Those were huge successes. Ms. Navab said that Mr. Zachritz is the former Sustainability Officer.

Brad Froehle introduced himself and said he is the on the Communications Committee. There's no chair for the Committee because it hasn't met yet. Workgroups are set up to elect a chair. He asked for a show of hands of people who have seen the GA's Facebook page or Twitter page, and asked who has been to the GA's Web site, and if they found the information they were looking for. He thought they could agree that they could do a little better with communications. This year they want to write a bunch of copy, edit it, and make it easy to use and accessible, so they reach average graduate students. This is a monumental undertaking and he would love to work on this with as many Delegates as possible.

Ms. Navab said that Mr. Froehle is also the GA's Systems Administrator. Mr. Froehle said he would like to make a pitch for any sort of techie people to help the GA was try get an online funding application system for grants and other resources. They're trying to do that in-house in order to save money. So if anyone was very techie, he would ask them to talk to him.

For Community Outreach, Dillon Niederhut introduced himself and said he is a Delegate from Anthropology. The Community Outreach Workgroup is attempting to create a campus-wide outreach program for grads and professional students to participate in. Based on feedback, it looked like this would be a two-pronged effort, with local educational outreach and mentoring, and then some sort of non-local, possibly environmental activity. If people want to join the Workgroup, their help was always welcome.

For the Faculty Mentoring Award, Ms. Navab said the GA every year puts together a workgroup to look at faculty mentorship on campus. They award three faculty and hold an awards banquet at the end of the year, along with the Graduate Division. It's a fun committee and doesn't meet that often. They look at applications, promote it, and put together a banquet.

#### Committee, Workgroup, and Project Introductions (cont'd)

- 11 -

As for the Projects, Ms. Navab said these are standing projects that pre-date the GA. They work on specialized areas the GA believes require dedicated staff to work on them. There are seven projects. People can serve on a project as a replacement to serving on a committee.

For the Graduate Minority Outreach, Recruitment and Retention Project (GMORR), Bianca Suarez introduced herself and said she's a fourth-year in Education and is the Project Coordinator. GMORR is an initiative from 2004 when Delegates created it as kind of a sister project for GMSP. There are pages for each project on the Web site. They focus on issues of equity and inclusion at the graduate level. She'll create committees and people can check that on the feedback form. The committee will try to get data from the Graduate Division across diversity metrics, compile a study, and do a comparison across different universities. They'll also work with graduate student groups that work around equity and inclusion initiatives.

Ms. Navab said it might be unclear why they were going through this. Delegates are required to serve on a committee, a Workgroup, or a Project. That's why these groups were being introduced.

For the Grad Social Club, Aaron Welch, Cellular Biology, and Luz Gonzalez, second year in Law, introduced themselves. Mr. Welch said he already told the GA about their upcoming events. They need a lot of help because they want to have a lot of fun events and connect people from various departments. A lot of the Delegates were first-years, so the GSC doesn't know what kind of parties they'll do. But they'll have big parties. They rent out Pauley Ballroom, a large room in the MLK Student Union. In the past, 4-500 people show up. This year they'll try and have some more structure, and maybe introduce some games to get people from diverse areas to interact. Ms. Gonzalez said they'll have at least one event a month, and that's a lot of work for the two Coordinators. So if people could join the Committee, it would really help. They're having one event in September, the welcome back party, and two events in October. So that need all the help they could get. They want to have as many events as possible. The parties are a lot of fun, with dancing and booze.

Ms. Navab said that a lot of people have asked about one of the Grad Social Club's events, the Ph.D. comics movie screening. There will be two screenings, September 21 at 7 p.m. in 145 Dwinelle and a second one later.

For the Graduate Support Services Project, Ms. De La Torre said the Coordinator, Tierra Bills, couldn't be there. The workshops she wants to have include financial management in September; "Surviving Oral Exams" in October; stress management in November; and a relaxation day in December, with possible

messages. All the events are on the Web site. Ms. Bills is also responsible for the New Grad Student Orientation.

For the Graduate Women's Project, Ms. De La Torre said the Coordinator is being hired. She sent out an e-mail about the opening.

For the Graduate Women's Project, Ms. De La Torre said it provides space for graduate women and allies to come together and deal with issues that affect graduate women. It also provides a space for study hall. In the past, the Project has things like monthly study halls and yoga classes. This year it will try to focus more on advocacy.

For the "Berkeley Graduate," Matt Hoberg said he was the Project Coordinator. It's an online publication within the GA, at [berkeleygraduate.com](http://berkeleygraduate.com). It used to be a print publication but it's now transitioned entirely

Committee, Workgroup, and Project Introductions (cont'd)

- 12 -

online. They have really good writing on a variety of issues. He would encourage any grads to get involved, whether a Delegate, an Officer, or staff. They could write about the work they do for the GA, their own research, and important issues in the City, on the campus, or nationwide. They pay bloggers and have a budget for that.

A Delegate asked what the readership was like. Mr. Hoberg said he's been trying to increase the visibility of the publication. It was improving through fliering and social media, and networking the blog with other blogs in the area.

Mr. Rabkin said that "The Berkeley Graduate" was one of the things the GA must not cut. The only reason the GA is allowed to have its building, Anthony Hall, is because it was given in bequest for the support of student publications. "The Berkeley Graduate" is the hook on which the GA lease rests.

A Delegate said that most of the projects weren't on the sign-up form. Ms. Navab said people would write names in. There was a list included in the agenda packet.

For the Women of Color Initiative, Ms. De La Torre said the project was responsible for putting on the GA's biggest conference of the year and for creating a space for women of color to come, coalesce, and talk about issues of importance to them. Ms. Navab said the Empowering Women of Color Conference is in its 27th year.

For the Graduate Minority Students Project, Ms. De La Torre said that David Gray is the Coordinator. They're trying to have the Project that advocates for equity and inclusion on campus. It's a sister to GMORR, but the GMSP is for current grads, to make sure they retain grads that matriculate to Berkeley. Ms. Suarez said the GMSP also puts on the New Minority Graduate Student Orientation, held after the New Grad Student Orientation. Mr. Gray is a second-year student in the Goldman School and is graduating in the spring. The GA will be looking to hire a new person, and people joining the Committee would be in a good position to learn about the scope of the project. It also puts on the Graduate Diversity Brown Bag Series.

Ms. Navab said that Ms. De La Torre will introduce campus committees. Ms. De La Torre said these are a way to get involved in the general campus Administration. If there was an issue someone was really worried about, there was a committee for that. There are openings they really need to fill. Examples

were the Chancellor's Committee on Student Fees, and on Education Policy. There's a list in the agenda packet. These committees involve grads on a bigger level. Ms. Navab said there's a more extensive list on the GA Web site. Regardless of GA committees Delegates join, they are welcome to join campus committees, which tend to meet once or twice a semester. Delegates are also allowed to sit on multiple GA committees and workgroups.

Mr. Sheen said that funding in the GA has been contentious and he wanted to make a special pitch for the Funding Committee so they have diversity, not just with ethnicity, but with departments as well.

A Delegate asked about the difference between the Budget and Funding Committees. Ms. Navab said Funding awards money to student groups and travel grants, and Budget works on and creates the entire GA budget.

#### Report on Lower Sproul Redevelopment Funding Committee Report: Round 1

- 13 -

Ms. Navab said that before they do committee selection, she would like to introduce the people sitting at the desk with her. Steve Litwak is their stenographer and prepares the minutes; and Adriana Mendoza is the Rules Chair and Parliamentarian. She would also introduce Susan Hsueh, the GA Business Manager, who makes everything run.

Ms. Navab called for a five-minute recess for people to talk to Committee Chairs, decide on committees, and fill out their forms. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Ginger Jui, Delegate from Integrative Biology, introduced herself and said she was on the Campus Bicycle Committee and that year she organized a Bike to Campus Day. If they bike to campus they could get a lot of free stuff at different stations. There will also be a big party in Lower Sproul from 3:00 to 7:00 with live music. The event was to promote bicycling as a sustainable form of transportation.

#### Report on Lower Sproul Redevelopment

Ms. Navab said that because this was still being planned and was confidential, the GA needed to move into closed session. Only elected Officers, Delegates, Alternates, and elected officials of the ASUC were allowed to remain. A motion to allow staff to remain would have to be made. She called for a motion to move into closed session.

A Delegate asked what kind of information was being divulged. Ms. Navab plans will be shown that were still being negotiated with the architects. So the Daily Cal couldn't report on this. If they don't go into closed session, their Consulting Architect wasn't authorized to show slides. A motion to meet in closed session, to include Ms. Hsueh, Mr. Verzhbinsky, and Dianna Chandara, the Funding Advisor, was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Navab said that obviously this meant people couldn't divulge any information they hear and wouldn't take photos or notes. This meeting entered into closed session for a presentation by Alyosha Verzhbinsky, ASUC/GA Advising Architect, on the Student Community Center.

## Funding Committee Report: Round 1

Back in open session, Mr. Sheen said he would report on activity that occurred over the summer. The Summer Funding Workgroup was initiated in May in an attempt to have people work on funding over the summer and for the first round of funding in the Fall Semester, under the GA's new structure.

Summer contingency funding was set up to fund student groups that operate over the summer and groups that needed funding up to September 9, when the window closes. Student groups that wanted funding for their first meeting in the fall had to apply during the summer.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 14 -

Mr. Sheen said the Funding Workgroup in the summer has expanded discretion over how to fund things. Awards could be completely based on merit. Final approval is made by the Executive Board. The total allocated was \$3,387. The remaining \$5,487 will get rolled over to the 11-12 budget.

Mr. Sheen said that in broad strokes, four types of funding occur over the year. Grants funding was mainly for larger projects, in the categories of Student Activism, Campus Diversity, Community Service, and Educational Improvement. These are GA priorities for funding projects and things that students do that the GA supports on their merits. No food, stipends, salaries, or alcohol is funded through Grants.

Mr. Sheen said 32 grants applications were submitted, the most they've ever seen in a single semester. They allocated \$17,543 out of a requested amount of \$32,314. Traditionally, this has been an all-or-nothing kind of fund. If an application requested \$1,500 and the Funding Committee didn't feel it could fund the full amount, the Committee would fund it at \$0. This year they tried to negotiate with groups and award lower amounts.

The GA has internal cost control measures they impose on themselves, such as not having meals cost over \$7. Ms. Navab said the GA follows funding procedures. They won't fund events that were far from campus or weren't accessible to the whole campus. The Assembly could ignore those rules, but the Funding Committee had to follow them.

Ms. Navab said the GA modified the structure of funding rounds last year. They now have just one round per semester, whereas last year they had two.

Mr. Sheen said that Contingency is for applications that don't fit in the GMER, Grants, or Travel categories. They are extraordinary requests and everything else. The Funding Committee has a lot of discretion in this area. They reviewed two applications for Contingency that fiscal year and so far have allocated \$2,400, with a projected budget of \$15,000 for the year.

Travel Grants are less discretionary and are pretty much automatic for valid reasons for academic travel. So far, \$4,200 has been allocated. Ms. Navab said that if there are too many applicants and the requests exceed the pot, then it becomes a random lottery drawing and it's not at the discretion of the Funding Committee.

Mr. Sheen said their current Interim Funding Advisor is Dianna Chinora, who has been at the Business Office for over five years, and has been in this capacity for over a year. She makes up the reports, tabulates the numbers, provides staff support, deals with all the individual student groups, and does training. The GA is in the process of hiring a new full-time person they're very excited about. The position will do analyses and budget projections for the coming years.

Mr. Sheen said that if they join the Funding Committee, they'll look at more Contingency applications, Round 2 for Grants and GMER funding, and also look at funding policies. This is the second year they've operated under the new funding procedures, so they're still in sort of a test phase, seeing the results of the rules they implemented. They'll evaluate funding formula and criteria and see if their rules, like \$7 per student meal, were reasonable. They'll try to streamline the application process and make it easier for groups to understand. They've also been talking about putting together training for Delegates so they know how to apply for student funding, because it didn't seem like a lot of people know how to fill out the form. And then they hope to have an online funding application. All errors, e.g., would be checked in real time.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 15 -

As for Round 1, Ms. Navab said that since GMER will have a couple of different debates, they could approve Grants, Travel, and Contingency first. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Navab said they were under consideration of Grants, Contingency, and Travel.

Ms. Navab said that travel was randomly allocated and the GA doesn't normally review the grants. They're on the Web site.

Mr. Klein moved to approve Travel Grant allocations. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRAVEL GRANT ALLOCATIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Ms. Navab said they were under consideration of Grants and Contingency funding.

A motion to approve Contingency allocations was made and seconded. A motion to call the question and come to a vote failed by voice-vote. Ms. Navab said they were back to consideration of Contingency Fund allocations. The packet includes awards for Grants, GMER, and a single page for Contingency.

Mr. Klein asked what LAGSES encompassed, and if the three groups were combined. Mr. Sheen said they were. Ms. Navab said that under 1, there are three groups, which are jointly hosting the event. Mr. Klein asked about the event. Mr. Sheen said it's a conference in San Jose geared towards underrepresented students in the sciences. The request was for part of the travel expenses, and the GA also granted money for food.

Mr. Klein asked about the Funding Committee's general policy on travel for individual students, and asked how that was handled under Grants. It was very rare to fund travel for students. Ms. Navab said that policy was for Grants. For Contingency there is no policy. Mr. Sheen said the Funding Committee thought it was okay.

Mr. Niederhut asked if individuals' names were supposed to be included on the sheets. Ms. Navab said they probably weren't, and they'd be more careful about that in the future.

A speaker asked if there was a precedent to fund going to a conference in San Jose at \$4,000. Ms. Navab said the recommendation was \$1,500. Mr. Sheen said the \$4,000 was what was requested.

A Delegate asked how the GA makes a judgment to approve this, and if there was a justification. Ms. Navab said the way the GA generally works is to trust that the Funding Committee vested the application. If people had a question about a specific application, it could be pulled up and reviewed more specifically. But generally, Delegates don't go into the nitty-gritty of specific applications.

A Delegate asked how many people were on the Funding Committee that reviewed this. Mr. Sheen said there were four voting members and him, who chaired the meeting. Membership for the Committee was established in May.

Mr. Zachritz asked if there was discussion about the conference being in San Jose and not being accessible to everyone. Mr. Sheen said there was. There was discussion on how much they should even fund

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 16 -

travel. He believed that people thought this was a good cause and felt this was something that fell in line with GA priorities.

Ms. Navab said that if people have questions they could approve some items under Contingency and come back to the others. Members of the Funding Committee could also feel free to talk about the Committee's decisions.

Mr. Froehle said he reviewed this application. He believed the actual event is in late October. So he thought it would be okay for the GA to revisit this in a month.

Ms. Navab said that if people didn't want to approve the first item they could table it until the October meeting. They could approve just the second Policy Matters Journal request.

Ms. Suarez asked what would happen to the money if the GA says they can't go. Ms. Navab said the money would stay in the pot. Mr. Sheen said the use would be up to the GA.

Ms. Navab asked if there was a motion about Contingency or Grants. A motion was made to vote on both items. A motion to vote on the Contingency as it stood passed by voice-vote.

**THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONTINGENCY ALLOCATIONS PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, \$2,440.**

Ms. Navab said the GA would next consider Grants funding. Ms. Navab said Grants was a two-page report. There were requests from 32 applicants.

Mr. Ahmed asked what the rationale was for the Graduate Journal being denied funding, #13. Mr. Froehle said the application was for \$1,000 to pay a group member to develop a Web site. That seemed to be nepotistic, so the Funding Committee was pretty uncomfortable funding that. Mr. Ahmed said he

would like to move to restore funding to the group, item 13, at \$1,000. The motion was seconded. Ms. Navab said they would debate the motion.

Mr. Ahmed said this is the Graduate Journal of the Arts. The group is designed to give Berkeley students in the humanities an opportunity to have a Web site where they could post translations, poetry, prose, non-fiction, and music. Berkeley is one of the few institutions that doesn't have a literary journal. People in the English Department came up with this as a remedy to that. They'd start off with a Web site, and if it did well, they could possibly move into print. This would be an interdisciplinary Web site to communicate with people in foreign language, music, and art.

Mr. Kehoe asked if this is a grant to pay someone. Mr. Ahmed said it wasn't. Ms. Pymmer said the money would go to someone developing a site, not towards other costs. Mr. Ahmed said it was supposed to go towards developing the Web site and towards a developer and server space. Mr. Froehle said he didn't recall server space in the written application.

Ms. Navab said the Assembly could put conditions on funding, and specify what funding could be spent.

Mr. Niederhut asked if they've looked at Web resources, such as the Townsend Center Web resources, which is offered to student groups in Berkeley for free. Mr. Ahmed said they hadn't.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 17 -

Mr. Rabkin said there are a lot of free resources of varying kinds for hosting Web sites. He asked what was needed that required \$1,000 worth of hosting and code. Mr. Ahmed said it was basically flash design. None of them have experience with that, or with server space. The site will have music and high-resolution photos. Mr. Rabkin asked if they did an estimate of how much space the group would need.

A Delegate thought the proposal met the needs of the GA. Berkeley doesn't have such a publication of this sort, and it was important to communicate their strengths to all students.

Mr. Kinsley said that from what the Funding Committee said, he didn't think it was clear whether or not the money was necessary for the stated goal.

A Delegate said that people asked for volunteers for Web work. For flash, they could always find an undergrad or grad who would do it for free, or for very little money. He asked if the group has done that yet.

A Delegate said she thought they couldn't pay stipends to grad students. Ms. Navab said it wasn't a stipend. This was a bit of a fuzzy area, but generally, grants can't be used to pay stipends.

A Delegate asked if that was in the By-laws. Ms. Navab said that was a funding procedure recommendation. Delegates could amend that.

Ms. Cohen asked if it was common to discuss a particular proposal so thoroughly. Ms. Navab said it was. The Delegate asked if there were possibilities that they could collect more information and discuss this next month. Ms. Navab said that the GA could approve everything but this item, and table this line item and consider it in October, should it choose to.

Mr. Kinsley said he was in favor of paying people to do things, but he was a little concerned that it was mentioned that the group hadn't done all the research to find out about free services. It might be a good idea to consider that and to research other opportunities.

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

A Delegate moved to table this item until the next GA meeting. Ms. Navab said they could vote it down and then table the line item. They could vote on increasing the amount to \$1,000. If that was voted down, the amount would stay the way it was currently in the report, \$0. A Delegate said the group could come back in October with a request for Contingency funding.

A motion to restore funding to item #13 failed unanimously by voice-vote.

Ms. Navab said they were back to consideration of all grants as a whole. A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed by hand-vote 44-11.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE GRANTS ALLOCATIONS, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, \$17,543.23.

Mr. Sheen said he would be happy to work with Mr. Ahmed in the next month.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 18 -

A Delegate asked if, in future versions of the Funding Committee report, it would be possible to include a column indicating what the funds were being requested for. Mr. Sheen said they'll work on that.

A Delegate asked if they could get the Funding report ahead of time. Ms. Navab said there was a time crunch around this. Mr. Sheen said their final decisions didn't occur until last night.

Regarding GMER, Mr. Sheen said that was the last pot. It's more mathematically sophisticated. It funds graduate meetings, events, and resources. That usually means it's for student groups that just want to meet during the course of a semester and wanted money for food, supplies, and resources for general upkeep and maintenance of student organizations. This year 120 student groups applied. The amount was requested was \$78,965. The annual budget is \$55,000. They allocated \$45,000 this semester. That amount was based on past reimbursement rates. They looked at the last year of funding. Student groups don't actually spend all the money they end up getting. Based on last year's numbers, the Funding Committee projected that 25 to 30 reimbursements will actually be granted. So they think this allocation would still be healthy.

A Delegate asked what happens if student groups don't spend all their funding. Mr. Sheen said that if a group doesn't submit receipts for reimbursement within 30 days of the event, they are no longer entitled to a reimbursement, and the money goes back into the pot. The GA knows how much money was left each month that wasn't reimbursed.

Mr. Sheen said the Funding Committee implemented supergroups, which was started last year. It was an attempt to equalize funding across clusters of departments that were deemed to be like-minded or generally in the same sort of area. The Funding workgroup has very little discretion for GMER, which is

almost automatic. If a group applies for appropriate and the request was in the realm of legitimacy, the group was entitled to that amount.

Last year the GA raised the cap on what student groups could apply for, increasing the cap from \$500 to \$750. However, the budget didn't change.

Mr. Sheen said the slide showed the supergroups that were established last year: Biological Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Humanities, Math, Physical Sciences, Professional Schools, Public Health, and Public Policy.

The way they calculate is to divide the pot of money based on the population for each supergroup. Each supergroup has groups within it. If the groups don't exhaust the pot, the rest of that goes back to the rest of the groups.

Ms. Navab said the idea of a pot for supergroups was based on how many people were in the group as a percentage of all graduate students. The way supergroups are set up, a group can only get back the cap on what they put in. So collectively, if her Department, Public Health, makes up 11% of the population, they can only get back 11% of GMER funding. If there are more requests in the supergroup than the 11% allocated to the supergroup, then groups in the supergroup end up competing with each other.

Ms. Navab said the GA acknowledges the composition of supergroups was somewhat arbitrary. So if a group didn't like where their department was housed in a supergroup and would like to change that, they could get the GA to do that.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 19 -

Mr. Rabkin said this model was called "fair share." If they have less than their fair share of the total funds, they get priority. And then after each round, the money is reallocated.

A Delegate asked how they could contest where a group a placed. Ms. Navab said they'd need to make a motion that the GA would approve by a two-thirds vote. The change wouldn't take effect that evening or for this round.

Mr. Kehoe asked if a Resolution was needed. Ms. Navab said it wasn't.

Mr. Sheen said that if people have technical questions, he'd love to talk about them afterwards.

Mr. Sheen said there were some complications with this round. The Round 1 window started September 9. If people applied for events held before that date, the request was denied. In this round, 5 of the 11 supergroups did not receive their full request. Student groups in five supergroups basically requested X amount, but the supergroup as a whole, exhausted its entire pot. There are also some disparities in final allocations across supergroups.

Mr. Sheen said there are possible impacts on Contingency funding for the year if the \$750 cap is retained. The Funding workgroup was divided on this issue. They proposed two alternatives. Alternative A is the \$750 cap. When there are more groups within a cluster, those groups tend to get less than they ask for.

Alternative B is a proposal that they aren't bound by, to reduce the cap back to \$500, based on the model that was used last year. That puts more groups in line with the math. Groups that receive more than \$500 are cut down to that amount. And groups that receive less than \$500 are brought a little closer to that fig-

ure. Ms. Navab said the \$500 was changed at the May meeting. The slide showed what this would have looked like under the old system.

Mr. Sheen said the next slide showed a calculation of what supergroups received at the end of the day divided by the number of groups un that supergroup. It was like a per-student allocation.

Ms. Navab said that the Business supergroup doesn't request any money, so that money is divided among the other pots.

A Delegate asked about Humanities and Social Sciences being two distinct categories, and asked how the numbers would move around per student. Mr. Sheen said it was hard to say. A Delegate said it would be nice to know that. Ms. Navab said a proposal could be amend to split them.

Mr. Sheen said the next slide showed some talking points for each alternative.

Mr. Froehle said he would argue in favor of maintaining the status quo, \$750 per supergroup, which the GA adopted last May. It's what the GA said it was going to do. There were issues last year about changing the rules over the summer, with lots of discontent. Groups in a department could submit parallel applications, and had they known the cap would be lowered to \$500, they may have chosen to submit two applications. Funding policy also states that GMER funding is done on a merit-blind fashion in proportion to student population. The \$500 amount was highly inequitable per student population. Groups like Math, Engineering, Humanities, and Social Science would receive less than half what other groups receive, like Law and Public Policy, on a per capita basis.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 20 -

Ms. Navab said that funding rules were not binding for the Delegate Assembly, but were binding on the Funding Committee.

Danny Yost introduced himself and said he was in Public Policy. He served on the summer Funding Committee. He didn't think a lot of Delegates understood the changes made at the May meeting. He had no clue and was a first-time Delegate in May. He wasn't sure everybody knew the implications. Law and Public Policy think they're separate, but they're incredibly interdisciplinary. They serve people beyond their supergroup boundaries. There were all sorts of groups that transcend a school's student population. Law and Public Policy are kind of natural homes for similar groups. And because they're interdisciplinary, they push for things that impact everybody. Also, for the \$500 cap, instead of having 5 of the 11 supergroups not receive as much funding as they could, only 2 out of 11 would be hit by a cap of \$500, instead of \$750. So there's less of a disparity between groups in other departments that aren't inherently interdisciplinary.

Ms. Navab called for a motion.

Mr. Rabkin moved to approve Alternative A, a \$750 cap on GMER allocations. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Kehoe said that GMER money is beer and pizza money, funding for meetings, not activities. That's what Grants was for; and Grants was heavily weighted towards Law and Public Policy.

Ms. Navab said they would hear pro and con speakers on Alternative A.

Mr. Yost said GMER didn't just fund food, but also funds office supplies. And Grants don't just go to Public Policy and Law. A lot of Law groups apply, but a lot of groups from all over the campus apply for things like journals or special events.

Ms. Pymer said she was in favor of Alternative A and doing GMER in that way was because her department coordinates from on high; and then the money trickles down to the different student groups. The department applies for money as a block rather than having a bunch of student groups apply separately. Chemistry, with one student group versus Mathematics, with five student groups, and then getting five times \$500, and Chemistry just getting one times \$750, would be a little less even than just having a cap for all of them. People tried to coordinate this in different ways, and this was one way of trying to equalize things. And she thought that was reflected in the numbers. This would make sure everybody got the same amount of food. An analysis was done last year to look at how much food was funded, and it totaled 90% for food.

A speaker said that GMER was more than beer money. They have clinics, give out training manuals, and give pamphlets.

A speaker asked if this was all or nothing. Ms. Navab said the numbers are the maximum allowed.

Mr. Niederhut said he was uncomfortable that his department deserved less funding per student just because they only have one student group instead of having 20. It seems that there was an easy way to get around this. There are approximately 120 grad students in his department. If each one formed a grad student organization, they'd get a whole lot of money. But he didn't think that was the right way to run things.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)

- 21 -

Mr. Froehle moved to recess for five minutes to organize the plates. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Kinsley said they could probably slice the numbers however they want to make allocations favorable. But the important thing was that each group has a plan to do something and was involved in putting on events. The money wasn't just for food. Each application represents a lot of activity on campus. He thought it was really hard for the GA to try to start to divvy up the money or try to pull these groups together. They're penalizing groups that are really active and have a lot of different events. It was important to encourage student groups on campus. By supporting alternative B they'd give groups as much money as possible to do as many activities as possible, without penalizing them.

Mr. Rabkin said that this is his fourth year in the GA, and every year they have a tussle about funding at the beginning of the year, and every year the fuss is the same. Some department have one big group that does a whole lot of activities, and other departments have a bunch of little groups. So there are two different models of how to organize a department. This wasn't about which groups do more, but how big the groups are. The reason the GA wanted to do the supergroup system was so departments that were organized the same way would compete for funding against each other, in order to avoid having one organizational model that wouldn't work for all departments.

Mr. Rabkin moved to call the question. The motion to end debate and come to a vote passed by voice-vote.

A Delegate asked why only \$10 was approved for one group. Mr. Sheen said that was an example of an administrative change the Funding Committee made. The amount for this group was because the food calculation was for \$8 per student instead of \$7. The Funding Committee just adjusts those numbers down.

Ms. Navab said the vote was on Alternative A. It would approve the Funding Committee report on GMER allocations using Alternative A.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEES RECOMMENDATIONS ON ALTERNATIVE A) FOR THE GMER FUNDING REPORT, WITH A \$750 CAP, TOTALING \$45,000.07, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 44-17-2.

Ms. Navab said that if people wanted to move to change a specific line item, they could do so at that time.

Ms. Mousallem moved to switch City and Regional Planning into the supergroup category of Professional Schools. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Mousallem said she and Ms. Arata are Delegates in City and Regional Planning, which is in the College of Environmental Design, which also hosts Architecture and Landscape Architecture. Architecture is already a professional school, and it didn't make sense for C&RP to be in another supergroup, as it's a two-year professional program.

Mr. Kehoe asked if somebody on the Funding Committee could speak to this. A Delegate she did that, and apparently she screwed up.

Funding Committee Report: Round 1 (cont'd)  
Budget Report

- 22 -

Mr. Yost said they were considering this particular motion. An alternative would be to collapse some of the supergroups.

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

THE MOTION TO MOVE CITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING TO THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS SUPERGROUP PASSED BY HAND-VOTE. Ms. Navab asked the Funding Chair to please note the change. Ms. Navab said this change would not apply for this funding round.

Mr. Yost moved to reconsider supergroup assignments by the Funding Committee. Ms. Navab said this was a directed action to the Funding Committee to review supergroups. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Yost said they don't know the implications of everything that will happen as a result of this. He was afraid that interdisciplinary departments that greatly impact student life on the campus will be unnecessarily harmed by the actions the GA took that evening, and he would like a committee to review the implications of moving groups around. Groups that have the ability to do so can petition for moves, and maybe the GA should completely reconsider the supergroup process altogether. Ms. Navab said speaking time was up for the discussion on funding rounds. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Navab said they would go to a vote of having the Funding Committee review supergroups. THE MOTION TO HAVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REVIEW SUPERGROUPS PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 28-12-2.

Mr. Niederhut asked if directed actions needed to be submitted as Resolutions. Ms. Navab said the Parliamentarian was checking on that. If they find that was the case, the motion the GA just voted on would be invalid.

A Delegate asked if the funding for that group moves with it when a department is reallocated to a different group. Ms. Navab said it would move, but not for this round.

Mr. Rabkin moved that if the previous directed action goes into effect, that the GA further direct the Funding Committee to try and get to that item early and to tell Delegates what the result was so that other committees, notably the Rules Committee, could look it over sooner. His motion was to report the results of the deliberation to the Delegates and the other committees well before a vote. If the GA votes on it in October, the information should get out to Delegates several weeks in advance. Ms. Navab said that motion was unnecessary because if the Funding Committee wanted to change the composition of supergroups it would have to submit a Resolution. Mr. Rabkin said he would withdraw his motion.

### Budget Report

Mr. Froehle moved to table the motion until the next meeting. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO TABLE THE BUDGET REPORT UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING, OCTOBER 6, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Advocacy Agenda

- 23 -

### ADVOCACY AGENDA

With Ms. Mendoza chairing the meeting, Ms. Navab said the Executive Board needed to come up with a proposal for an Advocacy Agenda, and the Delegates had to finalize those items by the October meeting. She would present a list of items the E-Board and Officers came up with, and ask the Delegates for feedback on those items, and ask for any additional items Delegates would like to propose.

The E-Board and officers came up with a list of six areas. Three are related to graduate funding. The first was to work around GSI benefits decentralization. For those unfamiliar with this, previously, the campus would collect money for GSI benefits and then pay them out based on how many GSIs there were. The campus gives back to departments, clumped together, benefits for lecturers, staff and GSIs, and the departments decide where that money goes. The concern about this was that maybe some GSI spots would be lost because it costs more to pay benefits for two 25% GSIs rather than one 50% GSI. Or, it's cheaper to get a lecturer, who isn't paid benefits, than it was to pay a GSI. So there have been some concerns about the opportunities for GSIs diminishing or changing. This came out of Operational Excellence.

Ms. Navab said the other issue they came up with was professional degree fees, which are now called "professional degree supplemental tuition." It's a fee that professional school students pay on top of their

tuition. The problem is, there's no campus-wide policy on this. There's a UC policy, but it's quite vague. So it's left up to each of the deans to make proposals about how they want to increase this fee. What that's meant for the Law School, e.g., is that it's now more expensive to be an out-of-State Law student and go to Berkeley than to go to any other law school in the top 75 schools, including Harvard, Yale, and Stanford. That meant that Berkeley can't compete with those schools. Cal used to be able to offer a cheaper education and they can't offer that any more. And on top of that, students in professional programs end up with a heavier debt load. So the idea was to work on this issue and come up with a better campus policy about how these fees get raised, along with increased accountability about where the money goes.

A Delegate asked how big the supplemental tuition is. Ms. Navab said that for some schools it's tens of thousands of dollars, and for others, a couple of thousand.

Ms. Navab said the next issue was to work around the State budget. The UCSA is a lobbying group made up of the student associations at the UCs. It's working on a component of Prop. 13 that would put add a tax to property tax on the top 1% of commercial real estate, with that money to go back to the General Fund. It's not specifically for education, but a chunk would come back for education. The estimate is \$3-8 billion would go back to the State budget. So that's something else the GA could be actively involved with.

Ms. Navab said another issue they came up with was around equity and inclusion. They currently don't get diversity data or numbers of minorities and breakdowns of who is in departments. They have that information by school, but not broken down by each program. So they can't really figure out who wasn't coming there and can't target programs. So they'd work to get that data broken down.

As for mental health, Ms. Navab said a lot of Delegates in the past expressed how it was difficult to get graduate-specific services. GSIs don't want to go to the Tang Center and run into their students. So the

Advocacy Agenda (cont'd)  
Question Period

- 24 -

issue was to get more dedicate, targeted mental health service for grads. Another issue was whether there are particular times in programs that really stress students out, increasing the need for more health services, and targeting department-specific mental health services.

The last issue is graduate-specific career services and working with the GA around grants and job opportunities.

Ms. Navab said those are six items to choose among. People should think about them. Delegates could make points on their feedback forms. If there are other issues what they'd be more interested in than what was on the list, it would be great to include that. This will be up for a vote at their next meeting.

Ms. Navab said they hope to discuss these issues more at the Graduate Student Forum they're putting on and give more details. They also hope to come up with other things that students were interested in working on.

Mr. Ortega asked for a minute to introduce the new State Affairs Legislative Director, from Law.

## QUESTION PERIOD

With Ms. Navab chairing the meeting, Ms. Navab said this was open question period for any questions people might have.

Mr. Froehle asked what the major actions were that the Executive Board took over the summer. Ms. Navab said the major actions were included in her President's report and in the summer Contingency report, which had the amounts they approved for summer Contingency.

Ms. Navab said there are some things the GA needed to vote on that were tabled in the E-Board because the Board felt it was more important for the Delegates to decide. They tabled moving leftover money from last year into line items. They'll present that at the next meeting.

Mr. Klein asked if the GA lost money in the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation, their investment. Ms. Navab said they haven't. She believed that was approved and will check the minutes as for as moving the money.

Ms. Navab said that a directed action does require a Resolution, according to their Parliamentarian. So the directed action that was made earlier for the Funding Committee to review supergroups was invalid. However, the GA could informally request that from the Funding Committee. Ms. Mendoza said the rules were very ambiguous. She made a ruling, and if anybody would like to write a Resolution, she would encourage them to submit it to the Rules Committee so they could continue to update the rules around directed actions.

## Committee Formation

Committee Formation

- 25 -

Ms. Navab said that Mr. Marchand would read out committee memberships. Mr. Marchand said that if people signed up for a campus committee, they're probably on it, if nobody else signed up for it. They'll hear back from Ms. De La Torre on that.

Mr. Marchand said that if someone's first choice was a project, they're automatically on it. They tried to give people their first choice. They also tried to equalize committees and not have two people from the same department on the same committee.

Mr. Marchand read out memberships for the following committees: Campus Affairs, Rules, External Affairs, Budget, Funding, Sustainability, Communications, Outreach, and Faculty Mentorship Awards.

Ms. Navab said that if people didn't hear their names read out they should talk to Mr. Marchand. Those on campus committees, or committees that don't meet that frequently, should perhaps join an important small committee. Rules only has three people and is very important.

Mr. Marchand said they'll send out the list. They'll probably consider committees again at the next GA meeting.

Mr. Yost asked which departments were represented on the Funding Committee. Mr. Marchand said they were Ethnic Studies, Law, English, Psychology, Linguistics, Agriculture and Resource Economics, Logic, and Environmental Science.

Mr. Klein asked how people could get removed from a committee and replaced, if people want to do that. Ms. Navab said that if people miss more than two committees, removal was up to the discretion of the Assembly Affairs Vice President. Mr. Klein asked if committee members could be removed for other people to join the committee. Ms. Navab said she didn't believe that was the case. The Rules Chair could look that up. Mr. Klein said he felt that Delegates should approve committee memberships.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

This meeting, commencing the Fall Semester, adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary