

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

May 5, 2012

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly concluded the Spring Semester. It was called to order at 5:31 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall.

Approval of the Agenda

The GA voted to fast track the following bills:

1205d, To Update Executive Board Summer Quorum Requirements

1205e, By-law Revisions from the 2011-12 Rules Committee's Annual Review

1205f, Encouraging Discussion on the Chancellor's New Governance Proposal

1205g, For the Endorsement of Take Back the Tap by the Graduate Assembly at UC Berkeley

Announcements

The GA will be part of an advisory committee to the Chancellor to establish an honor code.

The GA will host a barbecue on Friday

UC Tobacco-free Policy Steering Committee

UCOP passed a policy for all campuses to go tobacco free by the end of next year. The GA heard from Steve Maranzana, Health and Safety Department, asking for grad volunteers for a steering committee to implement the policy.

Guest Announcements

Ms. Hsueh said the Business Office would ask people to not wait until June 15 to file for reimbursements.

Elections

Interim Assembly Affairs Vice President

Mr. Marchand, AAVP, stepped down a little early in order to do research in Canada. The E-Board approved Gordon Hoople, AAVP-elect, as Interim AAVP. With no objection, the GA voted to affirm the appointment.

The GA Treasurer, Ms. Epstein, also stepped down. The GA elected Sanaz Mobasseri, Public Policy, as GA Treasurer for the end of the current term and for next year.

Graduate Council Representatives

The GA previously elected three Grad Council reps, and an Alternate seat was open. The GA elected Moneer Helu, Mechanical Engineering, to the position.

Reports

The GMSP Coordinator will host a graduation reception for all graduate diversity students.

Report from the GA President

The Executive Director position for the ASUC Auxiliary was open. This unit staffs the ASUC and the GA. The position is the GA's administrative rep to the campus. A Selection Committee's three finalists will be on campus for interviews that Delegates could participate in.

The Faculty Mentoring Awards ceremony was held in April that was very successful. The Provost pledged five years of funding for the GA for this award.

The Grad Division gave the GA \$6K for the New Grad Student Orientation for food costs, breakfast and lunch, and also gave the GA \$12K for grad student funding.

Student fee money was under-spent in the past, resulting in a \$7M surplus. CACSSF made recommendations to the Chancellor on how to spend it, based on requests for proposals from campus units. They've allocated almost \$3M. Proposals included \$30K for a Grad Student Parent Project Coordinator, a two-year pilot position; 50 stipends for students to mentor underserved undergrads for a year; \$1M for an online events system; \$80K to develop an online funding application for the GA and the ASUC; and \$558K for Anna Head student event space.

There were savings of \$30M that resulted from changes to Lower Sproul renovations. This will enable work on additional items, including additional renovations to Anthony Hall; the renovation of TRSP space; creation of a media center in Naia Lounge; and renovations to the upper floors of MLK, the Art Studio, and Student Musical Activities.

The Selection Committee for the new Chancellor will start to meet. A stakeholder meeting for students will be held, and there's been a request to have public listening sessions with the search team.

Regarding updates on ASUC ballot referenda, the Class Pass, to renew the bus sticker on IDs, was invalidated due to details that weren't fully worked out. The pass will continue through next year, when it will be on the ballot again. The VOICE Referendum, a \$2 fee for the Daily Cal, was approved by the students but was invalidated by an Executive Order of the ASUC President, due to ambiguities. The matter is being considered by the ASUC Judicial Council.

The Chancellor has a proposal to create local governance boards on each campus, somewhat reducing the power of UCOP.

Election of the Graduate Student Advocate

Kfir Cohen, Comparative Literature, was re-elected Graduate Student Advocate.

Advocacy Agenda Update

Delegates at the beginning of the year voted on three Action Agenda Items, and updates were given. For grad mental health, a survey was conducted that included this topic, the results of which are posted, as well as a collection of resources. Another Item was Professional Development Supplemental Tuition, and students worked to increase their input, e.g., when increases are proposed, and how they're used. Deans will now, as part of the process, send proposals to the GA on each campus. The third Action Agenda Item was GSI benefits decentralization, and the campus will take a holistic look at grad student funding.

The meeting recessed in order to convene a meeting of the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation would convene.

Report from the External Affairs Vice President

The GA is co-operating with the Chancellor's office to work on the interest rate for student loans. They're working on legislation for tax benefits for hiring, and working with the City on student-neighbor relations and for collaboration between the UCPD and the Berkeley PD, such as a joint pedestrian/bicycle patrol.

This was EAVP Ortega's last GA meeting, after many years of service.

Community Outreach Workgroup Presentation

The Community Outreach Workgroup conducted a survey, and from ~300 responses, found 40% of grads participate in some kind of outreach; 21% of that is through a campus group; and 66% were interested in a GA-sponsored program. The Workgroup identified barriers to participation: awareness of opportunities, access, and affordability.

The Outreach Workgroup created two opportunities: COCO, Community Outdoor Clean-up and Outreach, for a few hours; and LEO, Local Education Outreach, in conjunction with the BUSD, for classroom activities. The Workgroup is requesting GA funding of \$2K for pilot projects for COCO and \$1.2K for LEO.

Budget Presentation

Stipends have now been tied to hourly rates, at \$18 per hour, equivalent to a Step I GSI. Student group funding is up \$40K from last year, from \$110K to \$150K. Carryforward from 2010-11 was added to this year's budget, \$46K. The budget has a surplus of \$23K. Total salaries of Project Coordinators were cut \$4.8K, to reflect the amount people actually worked. The Business Office was budgeted more, \$16K, to reflect what actually happens, rather than have the BO reimbursed by other units. The budget for groups' room rentals was increased \$10K. A goal next year will be to reduce room rental fees. For Contingency, \$5K was added. Project budgets were shifted around to more accurately reflect what was happening.

Revenue from student fees is \$416K.

With no objection, the GA amended the budget to: add \$4K to the EAVP for the federal travel budget; and add \$3,450 to the Outreach Workgroup.

In response to a question, the Rules Officer ruled the Budget Committee had to consider the budget. A motion to overrule passed by hand-vote 19-4-0.

The 2012-2013 GA budget, as amended on the floor, passed by voice-vote.

Funding Revisions Presentation

The GA has \$40K more to allocate next year. Four changes, one of them major, were being proposed. (1) In 1205a and 1205c, Contingency funds would be introduced during Winter Break and over the summer. (2) In 1205b, a budget category would be established to fund publications; (3) In 1205b, alcohol was removed from things that could be funded by the Funding Committee; and (4) In 1205b, the GMER process was revised. Funding would be based not on 11 super groups, but on 57 academic units. Groups' ceiling would go from \$750 to \$500, with a floor of \$100. Also, an interdisciplinary group category was being proposed.

Consent Calendar

The following Resolutions were approved under the Consent Calendar:

1203c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the Middle Class Scholarship Act.

1204a, On Directed Action to Renew the Mandate for the Community Outreach Workgroup.

1205d, To update Executive Board Summer Quorum Requirements. The Treasurer would not be counted for E-Board quorum in June and July.

1205e, On By-law Revisions from the 2011-12 Rules Committee's Annual Review, dealing with filling vacancies in Officer positions and GA groups sponsoring events that weren't sponsored by the GA, and not approving controversial events.

1205f, Encouraging Discussion on the Chancellor's New Governance Proposal.

Resolution Discussion and Vote

For 1202e, the GA approved the bill by unanimous voice-vote, On Directed Action In Support of Chancellor Robert Birgeneau's Endowed Chairs Proposal.

For 1203a, the GA, by voice-vote, tabled the bill, as amended, On a By-law Amendment Defining Sustainable Food and Beverage Criteria. The bill would prohibit GA purchase of bottled water and called for the Environmental Sustainability Committee to submit food criteria to Delegates at the October GA meeting.

For 1205a, the GA, by unanimous voice-vote, as amended, approved On Directed Action to Establish Funding Rounds for the 2012–2013 Academic Year. The bill approves a Dedicated Summer Contingency Fund of \$8K, to be allocated by the E-Board, and establishes the funding round calendar for 2012-13.

For 1205b, the GA, by a vote of 20-4, as amended, approved To Revise Funding Committee Procedures. The bill: adds Publications as a fund category and prohibits funding certain items; changes the “super-groups” structure to one of “academic units”; creates “interdisciplinary groups”; and determines the algorithm for GMER allocations. It requires funding applications to have the signature of the group’s GA rep; or, the group could make its case to the Funding Committee. The bill also creates a publications funding category.

For 1205c, the GA, by unanimous voice-vote, as amended, approved To Establish a Summer Funding Workgroup and Directed Action. The Workgroup will make recommendations on contingency requests, not to exceed \$8K, to be approved by the E-Board. The bill was later reconsidered to call for the Workgroup to also amend the Funding Guide.

On 1205g, by voice-vote, the GA tabled the bill indefinitely, To Take Back the Tap. The ASUC passed the bill already. So absent GA modification, the policy stood for student government.

With no objection, the GA approved the following appointments:

Summer Funding Workgroup: Mr. Baur, Mr. Kline, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Kehoe, and Mr. Niederhut.

Outreach Workgroup: Mr. Kline, Mr. Niederhut, Ms. Arata, and Mr. Onak.

The meeting, concluding Spring Semester, adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

End Summary of the meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Spring Semester, was called to order by Bahar Navab at 5:31 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall. Ms. Navab said there were a couple of changes to the agenda and people should pick up the one-page addendum.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AND THE AGENDA

Ms. Navab said there was one more Resolution under Resolution Referral, 1205g, A Bill for the Endorsement of Take Back the Tap by the Graduate Assembly at UC Berkeley. She called for a motion to amend the agenda to add the Resolution. It was so moved and seconded. Mr. Kline asked for the text

of the Resolution. Mr. Trager read the Resolution aloud. Ms. Navab called for any objections to adding the bill to Resolution Referral. Seeing none, Ms. Navab called for a motion to approve the agenda and the minutes. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Navab called for a motion to approve the minutes of the April meeting, which were posted. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2012 PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

1205d, To Update Executive Board Summer Quorum Requirements

1205e, By-law Revisions from the 2011-12 Rules Committee's Annual Review

1205f, Encouraging Discussion on the Chancellor's New Governance Proposal

1205g, For the Endorsement of Take Back the Tap by the Graduate Assembly at UC Berkeley

Ms. Navab said there has been a request to fast track all the bills since this was the GA's last meeting of the year. Mr. Twigg asked if all the bills were included in the agenda. Ms. Navab said that 1205f wasn't in the packet and was a separate document. A motion to fast track the bills was made and seconded.

Mr. Kline moved to divide the issue. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

A motion to fast track 1205d was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A motion to fast track 1205e was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

On 1205f, Ms. Navab said the purpose of fast tracking the bill was because the Regents wouldn't discuss this unless there was pressure from the students to discuss it. A motion to fast track 1205f was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

On 1205g, Ms. Navab said this was the Resolution that Delegates didn't have in the packet, which Mr. Trager read. A motion to fast track was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Froehle said he believed that the By-laws state that they had to have a copy of any bill that is fast tracked. Ms. Navab said the Rules Chair concurred with that. Mr. Kline asked if she knew that before. Ms. Mendoza said she couldn't make a ruling until there was an objection. Ms. Navab said she would rule this discussion out of order. There was a point of order that 1205g could not be fast tracked because it was not appropriately posted. Ms. Navab said she would agree with that and would refer the bill.

Ms. Navab referred the following bill to committee:

1205g, On the Endorsement of Take Back the Tap by the Graduate, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, and Sustainability Committees

Mr. Trager asked if they could put the bill in people's boxes. Ms. Navab said it was not appropriately posted, according to their By-laws, and it had to be printed and posted.

Mr. Rabkin asked if they could move to suspend the rules in order to consider the bill. Ms. Navab said they could, according to the Rules Officer.

Mr. Marchand asked if they could amend some of the language of 1203a, on defining sustainable food and beverage criteria, which was already on the agenda, and the component dealing with bottled water. Mr. Trager said that would be possible. There were two separate bills, one in support of a campus initiative and the other dealing with campus policy.

Ms. Navab said they could suspend the rules by a two-thirds vote.

Ms. Mendoza said her understanding of the By-laws for fast tracking was that the reason they ask for seven days' notice before fast tracking a motion was to give all Delegates a chance to see the Resolution so they could decide whether to discuss it at the same meeting it was introduced. If Delegates were okay with suspending the rules for that reason, a two-thirds vote would be needed to do that.

Mr. Rabkin asked where the copy is of the bill. Ms. Navab said it was posted.

On a point of information, Mr. Kline asked when the most recent updates were made on the Web site of Delegate meeting materials. Ms. Navab said there have been several updates, including the budget. Mr. Kline asked if that happened that day, or if it wasn't seven days ago. Ms. Navab said that was correct. Ms. Mendoza said the budget was updated. Ms. Navab said this was the GA's last meeting of the year, so unless there was a serious objection, a motion could be made to suspend the By-laws, and people could take some time to read the Resolutions.

Mr. Helu moved to suspend the By-laws to consider the Resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rabkin.

Mr. Twigg asked to have 1205g posted to the Web site or e-mailed out. Ms. Navab said it was e-mailed out.

Ms. Navab said the motion was to fast track all the Resolutions under Resolution Referral just in case any weren't posted seven days in advance. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Kline said he primarily objected to the fast tracking of 1205g because he wanted to hear more research on it. He wasn't opposed to the principle and just wanted the Whereas Clauses to be vetted by GA committees first.

Ms. Navab said she wanted to remind the Assembly that once a bill was fast tracked, there could still be a motion to table the bill, and it wasn't automatically approved just because it was fast tracked. Mr. Kline said the bill still wouldn't be referred.

Mr. Rabkin said that as near as he could tell, there was no actual, decisive, operative clause in 1205g, and it was purely symbolic. There's no reason why this required very careful scrutiny to say they think people should buy fewer bottles of water. He thought the GA was quite competent to discuss this.

Mr. Riffe said that if they sent the bill to committee, he didn't think they'd get that much feedback on it, since it was primarily symbolic.

Mr. Froehle said the reason they have rules was to follow them. If they start breaking them for one reason, then they'd start to break them for another, and pretty soon they'd have no rules at all. It was unfortunate, but there was a lack of one week's notice, and the GA shouldn't set a precedent for it to be okay for them to not have to follow the rules.

Mr. Trager said he thought the rules that apply are those that encourage Delegates to think about things before voting on them. This has been something they've talked about. He thought it was appropriate in terms of representing their constituents. It was also symbolic that in a referendum, 83% of their constituents voted in favor of banning bottled water. The bill indicates the GA's support for that to the Administration. If 17% of them voted no and 83% of them voted yes, that would be representative of the actual vote.

Mr. Riffe asked if 83% of those who voted in favor of a ban were graduate students. Ms. Navab said it was all students who voted. She said that wasn't germane to the topic at hand.

Mr. Helu moved to call the question. The motion to end debate and come to an immediate vote was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO FAST TRACK RESOLUTIONS THAT WERE NOT POSTED SEVEN DAYS IN ADVANCE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE: RESOLUTIONS 1205d, 1205e, 1205f, AND 1205g.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Honor Code

Mr. Hoople said they're trying to form an honor code at Berkeley. At its last meeting the GA passed a Resolution to change the way an honor code would be implemented. He met with a couple of people about this and the result, as suggested in the Resolution, was to try to form an advisory committee to the Chancellor, with undergrad, graduate, and faculty support. Ms. Navab called for any questions.

Delegate BBQ

Ms. Hsueh said that she knew some of them were graduating and some were probably leaving the area right after submitting their papers, and going away for the summer. The GA will host a barbecue on Friday, from 4:00 to 7:00, in Anthony Hall. People had to bring their ID. Ms. Navab said that was because they're serving alcohol. Ms. Hsueh said the barbecue was to thank Delegates for their work and for their

participation for the whole year. She would ask them to please join them. Cal Catering will do the food, so it will be good. She hoped to see them on Friday.

UC Tobacco-free Policy Steering Committee Volunteers.

Ms. Navab said they had a guest speaker to make an announcement about a UC tobacco-free policy.

Steve Maranzana introduced himself and said he worked for the Health and Safety Department. The UC Office of the President earlier that year passed a policy for all campuses to go tobacco free by the end of next year. Mr. Maranzana said his office has been tasked with implementing this new policy, and they're forming a steering committee. He thought it would be important to have graduate student representation. So he requested some time to ask the GA for volunteers to join the steering committee, ideally a smoker and a non-smoker. It won't meet very frequently, maybe every three months or so, for maybe five or six meetings, to guide how they'd go forward in implementing this policy on campus.

A speaker asked if this policy meant that people wouldn't be allowed to smoke on campus. Mr. Maranzana said there would be no smoking on any property that UC Berkeley owned or leased. He brought about five copies of the policy, and there were electronic copies. The copies he brought had his contact information, if anybody was interested in participating.

Mr. Hoople asked if there would be a perimeter out on campus where smoking wouldn't be allowed. His building was technically on the other side of the campus boundary. Ms. Maranzana said that if it was not UC Berkeley property, the policy wouldn't apply. However, the City of Berkeley also has a tobacco-free policy and had its own non-smoking areas. He would have to look at that map. He didn't know how that would really work. The steering committee includes a City of Berkeley member, so they'll work on this together.

Guest Announcements

Ms. Navab called for any Guest Announcements.

Ms. Hsueh said she had an announcement from the Business Office. She knew that some people in the Graduate Assembly were leaving. If they or their group applied for and received funding, she would ask them to please not wait until June 15 to file for their reimbursement, and would ask them to file as soon as possible. People had 30 days to file, but she was asking them to please not wait. Secondly, starting May 14, the Graduate Assembly Business Office will have summer hours. They'll be open Monday through Friday from 10:00 to 3:00 instead of 10:00 to 5:00. They'll have reduced hours and limited staff. So she would ask people to please file for reimbursement as soon as possible. They could note on their reimbursement whether they want their check to be mailed. That was an exception to the normal policy. During the school year they don't generate a check if it's under \$50 because it costs so much money to issue a check. But during the summer people could be away, and so people can specify how they'd like

their reimbursement. If the amount was less than \$50, the GA would be happy to make out a check and mail it to them.

Mr. Kline said that for future reference, he asked if the policy meant that it saved the GA money for people to select to be reimbursed by cash instead of a check. Ms. Hsueh said they don't give cash if it's over \$50.

Ms. Navab said that seeing no other questions or guest announcements, they would move on.

GA ELECTIONS

Interim Assembly Affairs Vice President

Ms. Navab said that as many of them knew, Philippe Marchand, the AAVP, stepped down a little early, rather than waiting until the end of the year, in order to do research in Canada. The Executive Board has approved Mr. Hoople as the Interim Assembly Affairs VP since he is the AAVP-elect for the coming year. But they'd like the Delegates to reaffirm this interim appointment, until June, when his actual term will begin. She called for any other nominations, and seeing none, called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO AFFIRM THE APPOINTMENT OF GORDON HOOPLE AS INTERIM ASSEMBLY AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. Ms. Navab said she would like to congratulate him. (Applause)

Ms. Navab said the GA's Treasurer stepped down on Wednesday because other stuff came up for her. So that position was now vacant. She believed there was someone who was interested in the position.

Mr. Sehgal nominated Sanaz Mobasseri. Ms. Navab called for any other nominations for Treasurer. The person would continue this year's term and would be in the position for next year as well. Seeing no other nominations, Ms. Navab asked if people would like to have questions or hear from the candidate. She asked Ms. Mobasseri to introduce herself.

Sanaz Mobasseri said she's finishing her Master's in Public Policy and will be there for five more years. She was at the GA a couple of meetings ago. She has also served on other committees and has been involved with budget stuff with the school for the past 12 months. Her background was in banking and finance.

Ms. Navab called for any questions and seeing none, asked Ms. Mobasseri to step out of the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After a vote, Ms. Navab asked to have Ms. Mobasseri brought back into the room and said she would like to congratulate Ms. Mobasseri for being elected GA Treasurer for the end of this term and for the next term. (Applause)

Graduate Council Representatives

Ms. Navab said the GA at its last meeting elected three Grad Council representatives. They still had the Alternate seat available. She called for any nominations for the Alternate position.

Mr. Helu nominated himself. The motion was seconded. A Delegate nominated Mr. Riffe, who respectfully declined. Mr. Trager nominated Mr. Sehgal. Ms. Navab said he was already a Grad Council rep. Ms. Navab called for any other nominations, and seeing none, asked if Mr. Helu would like to say a few words.

Moneer Helu introduced himself and said he's a fifth-year Ph.D. student in Mechanical Engineering. This was his third year in the GA. He mostly worked with Alberto Ortega in External Affairs and helped with student health intern stuff. He was excited to try and represent grads in another forum. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about the departments of other Grad Council representatives. Ms. Navab said that Mr. Sehgal is from Health Services and Policy Analysis; Mr. Niederhut is from Anthropology; and Ms. Arata is from City and Regional Planning.

Ms. Navab asked Mr. Helu to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a vote, Ms. Navab asked to welcome Mr. Helu back in, and said she would like to congratulate him for being elect GA Grad Council Alternate. (Applause)

Ms. Navab said she would like to request that they table the vote to elect the Graduate Student Advocate. The current GSA would like to run again and should be arriving momentarily. A motion to table was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

REPORTS

Ms. De la Rosa said she would like to introduce Mr. Gray, the GMSP Coordinator. David Gray introduced himself and said he's the Graduate Minority Student Project Coordinator. The GMSP hosts a variety of things through the year. Delegates have probably seen a lot of their announcements. That coming Wednesday, May 9, they'll host a graduation reception for all graduate diversity students who will have completed their studies that spring or that summer. They'll have catering from Ann's Catering, live performance from an African dance company based in Oakland, and free food and free drinks, both alcoholic and non-alcoholic. If Delegates have some time, such as an hour, to get some free food and network with other people, that would be great. It will be Wednesday, May 9, from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. in the Morrison Reading Room, located in Doe Library. If people need any additional information, Mr. Gray said he'd be there for the entire meeting. It was nice to meet everybody, and he'd like to thank them.

Report from the GA President

Ms. Navab said it's been a while since she gave the Assembly a report. The ASUC Auxiliary is the administrative unit that staffs the ASUC and the GA. It's the branch that Susan Hsueh and Amanda Ridel work for. The ASUC Auxiliary is looking to hire an Executive Director. The position has been vacant since last September. Since that time they've had an interim ED. Brad Froehle sits on the Selection Committee with her, and the candidate pool has been narrowed down to three candidates, who will come to campus in two weeks, May 14, 15, and 16. Open interview sessions will be scheduled, including sessions for ASUC Senators and GA Delegates. If any Delegates were interested in meeting the candidates and giving their feedback on who they think should be hired, they should attend.

Ms. Navab said she knew the GA didn't have as much exposure to the Auxiliary as the ASUC did, but this was actually a big deal for the GA. The Executive Director is the GA's administrative representative to the Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor, etc. The ED makes a lot of policy decisions that affect the ASUC and the GA. So it was a really important seat. They have some really good candidates, and it would be great to get Delegates' feedback. The interviews are at different times and different days, with a different candidate each day.

Mr. Froehle asked if they're doing pre-training before the interviews. Ms. Navab said she believed that will occur, although she hasn't gotten any indication of that. Mr. Froehle said that it was very important that people be on time. Ms. Navab said that if people could attend, she would ask them to let her know and she would send them the résumé information in advance, as well as a short interview guide of things people need to know. For example, people can't be asked if they could attend a meeting at 8 p.m., and instead, had to ask if their schedule was flexible. If anybody was interested in this, she would ask them to please let her know, or to indicate that on their feedback forms.

Ms. Navab said they held the Faculty Mentoring Awards ceremony on April 18. It was the best attended awards ceremony the GA has had for a while. The administrators who were there also said it was the best event of its kind that they've seen. And the food was really good. But most importantly, the Provost pledged an additional five years of funding for the GA for this award.

Ms. Navab said the Graduate Division has given the GA \$6,000 for the New Grad Student Orientation, for the food costs for that event, since the GA provides breakfast and lunch for the new grad student. The Graduate Division has also given the GA \$12,000 for grad student funding. Ms. Navab said this funding and the funding from the Provost were big wins for the GA.

Ms. Navab said that CACSSF is the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services and Fees. It's basically made up of administrative representatives as well as members of the GA, the ASUC, and the Committee on Student Fees. Whenever there is either a surplus or an increase in student fee money, this Committee makes recommendations to the Chancellor about how to spend the money. And by and large, the Chancellor takes those recommendations. This year, because they under-spent student fee money in the past, there's a \$7 million surplus. CACSSF has requested to spend it in the next two years. They haven't allocated all of the \$7 million and have so far only allocated just under \$3 million, she believed. What happened is that a proposal process went out to campus units asking for proposals. The ASUC, the GA, and Committee on Student Fees also put in proposals. The slide showed some of the things that have been tentatively approved by the Committee. They're just waiting for the Chancellor's approval.

Ms. Navab said they got \$15,000 a year for a two-year pilot position to create a Grad Student-Parent Project Coordinator position. They've been getting a lot of requests from grad students to work on family

housing issues and on student-parent issues, and this would allow the GA to invest money to see if it's worth it, and to make some policy and programming gains.

Ms. Navab said CACSSF also recommended a joint program for graduate student mentors who work with underserved undergrads on the campus. This is a joint program between the GA, the Graduate Diversity Program, SLAS, Student Learning Academic Services, and a couple of other different groups. It will fund stipends for 50 students to do mentoring for a year.

There was also money for events. They're trying to change how they work with Event Services at the Auxiliary. The ASUC and the GA will also gain more student-controlled space, so they're trying to revamp Event Services. She didn't know if any Delegates have tried to put on a campus event, but people have to fill out alcohol permits, UC food permits, UCPD permits, insurance forms, and meet with a whole bunch of different groups on campus, including OSL, OSA, and a bunch of other acronyms. So instead of asking students to meet with so many different people on campus, Ms. Navab said they're trying to create one events system online that would talk to all the units, automate the process, and make it easier for commercial space to be offered to generate money. That has been priced at between \$800,000 to \$1 million. CACSSF has approved up to \$1 million to create this. If anybody would like to work on this, and perhaps do it cheaper, that would be great. All savings would come back to CACSSF.

Ms. Navab said the GA has been working on its online funding application. They've invested money for phase 1. Phase 2 came back at around \$40,000. The GA asked for \$80,000, to be able to also add ASUC group funding with that form as well.

Also, Ms. Navab said the Anna Head Alumni Center is a new building being constructed on Channing Way. It will partially be student housing and partially event space. Whoever was willing to pay the remaining \$558,000 would control the space over the summer and at times during the school year. It will be for school events, but will be additional student space during the summer. It will also create revenue-generating space for the ASUC Auxiliary, money that comes back to the GA and the ASUC. CACSSF agreed to pay \$558,000, so the ASUC would control the space year 'round. It would give them more storage space and was also something that would generate money for them.

Ms. Navab said she was happy to go into the other CACSSF proposals, but the ones she mentioned were the ones that she felt most impacted the GA.

Regarding Lower Sproul, as people may or may not know, Lower Sproul's budget had some changes made to it that generated \$30 million in savings. Per an MOU Addendum the students have with the campus, any savings had to go back into Lower Sproul. The \$30 million allows them to get some additional scope items that had been either put on hold or were things they didn't think there was money for, and were therefore not considered before.

Ms. Navab said she listed some of the scope items that she thought were most important to Delegates. One item includes some additional renovations to Anthony Hall. They include: replacing its windows and removing asbestos from caulking from the windows frames; a new audiovisual system that will be built in; new flooring; and new low-flush toilets. The Sustainability Committee should like some of these things. She had the floor plans if anybody was interested. There are multiple copies at the GA and people were welcomed to look at them.

Additionally, TRSP, the Transfer, Re-entry, and Student Parent Center's space, will be renovated. There will also be the creation of a media center in what was currently considered Naia Lounge, the space next to the Art Studio. It will house the Open Computing Facility as well as CalTV, the Student Publications Center, and the California Yearbook.

In addition, Ms. Navab said they had initially put the renovation of the top floors of MLK on hold because they didn't have enough funding in their original Lower Sproul budget. But now they can actually re-do those spaces, on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th floors of MLK. They'll also renovate the Art Studio. It will get a new roof. Grad students use the Art Studio a lot, and they'd like to see it renovated. They'll also renovate Student Musical Activities space, which has also been neglected in the last few years.

Regarding the selection of the new Chancellor, Ms. Navab said that as Delegates will recall, the GA appointed her as its representative to the Chancellor's Selection Committee. The undergrad representative is Shahryar Abbasi, the ASUC's incoming External Affairs VP. The Selection Committee will have its first meeting on Friday. There will be a stakeholder meeting for students, and some Delegates are on that. Additionally, there's been a request by some members of the campus and some students and faculty to have town halls or listening sessions with the entire search team, so people feel like they've given input on what they're looking for in a new Chancellor. The first one of those will be held on May 10 from 2:30 to 4:30. The second is tentatively scheduled for May 22. Delegates should have received an e-mail about this from Linda Williams, the Associate Chancellor.

Regarding updates on student fee referenda, as they knew, the Class Pass was on the ballot in the April ASUC elections. It was a vote to renew the bus sticker on their students' ID cards. It also pays for the perimeter bus, the hill line, and things like that. The fee expires next year, meaning next year would be the last year for this service. There was a referendum to renew the fee. However, since putting it on the ballot, they learned that the deal hadn't been fully worked out. It was unclear, for instance, who would administer it, or who would bear extra costs if something went wrong with the contract, things like that. Because of so many unknowns associated with the referendum, the campus was asked to invalidate the election and hold it again next year so that students wouldn't get slapped with questions about who would cover the costs if pricing went up.

Mr. Helu asked if the Class Pass will continue throughout next year. Ms. Navab said it will, and it goes through next August, she believed. So there's a year to renew it before it expires. With that said, there's a settlement before the Judicial Council for renewal, and it wasn't known if the J-Council will renew it.

Mr. Riffe asked if there was a group in the ASUC or the GA that was negotiating this. Ms. Navab said it was actually the Parking and Transportation office that was negotiating, with members of the ASUC and the GA who sit on an advisory committee for that. She believed Mr. Froehle sits on that committee. Mr. Froehle said there are two grads on it. Ms. Navab said there are undergrads as well. If people have questions they could talk to Mr. Froehle. If people were interested in sitting this committee next year, they should talk to Ms. De la Rosa or Ms. Suarez.

Mr. Twigg asked if they know the results of the vote on the Class Pass Referendum. Ms. Navab said they don't. Part of the charges was an objection to all the results of the election. Mr. Twigg asked if there would be a lapse in service if nothing was passed next year. Ms. Navab said it should be seamless. But it won't automatically be on next year's ballot and will have to go through the same process to get on the ballot.

Ms. Navab said the VOICE Referendum was a \$2 fee for the student newspaper, the Daily Cal. There have been several different issues brought up about this. One of the largest issues was a whistleblower complaint filed to the campus saying that the referendum violated current policy of the UC Office of the President. OP policy says that student fees cannot fund non-University entities, especially student fee money, as a result of a referendum. The Daily Cal is a 501(c)3 independent newspaper. Even if it was to apply to be a student group, the only way to get student fee money as a student group was to go through the ASUC or the GA. But the newspaper was pursuing neither of those avenues. An MOU would be required, and among other things, students wouldn't have a say in the terms of the MOU. So implementation seemed problematic.

As a result, the ASUC President issued an Executive Order to invalidate the Daily Cal referendum in the elections. The Executive Order was overturned by the Judicial Council, but there are now new charges pending in front of the Judicial Council. The J-Council was currently negotiating plea agreements and what not. But the vote tally did come out for that, and the VOICE Referendum did pass.

Mr. Kline asked if the Judicial Council was wrong in overturning the Executive Order. Ms. Navab said she thought it was a matter of interpretation. There's some ambiguity in the ASUC's By-laws about Executive Orders. The By-laws state that the President can act if he or she feels the functionality of the ASUC was being threatened. And the definition of "functionality" was a little unclear. The J-Council obviously ruled that it didn't feel it was necessary to protect the body's functioning.

Mr. Twigg asked why this wasn't stressed before the election. Ms. Navab said that was another issue that came up. The Daily Cal was aware that it would need an MOU, but didn't think that was a big deal. Members of the campus knew, but they also thought that they'd figure things out in implementation. The ASUC Attorney General should have picked this up, but missed it. Ms. Navab said she thought there were a lot of communication failures.

Ms. Navab said the Chancellor has a new governance proposal that just got issued last week, she believed. Basically, it would create local governance boards on each campus. It reduces somewhat the power of the Office of the President and gives more power to local governing boards. Members of these local governing boards would be campus administrators, faculty, two students, and two Regents. The idea was that it would give provide more accountability and more transparency, and also allow for quicker and more localized decision making. For example, decisions affected by this could deal with capital projects, fee limits, things like that. The OP, Pres. Yudof, came out and said he didn't support the proposal. There's a Resolution about this later on that evening that the GA will consider. It doesn't ask the GA to support this change, since obviously none of them have had a chance to really read and vet the proposal. So they're asking to have the Regents put this on their agenda and to have a conversation about it, and to consider the merits of the proposal, do a little analysis, compare this to some other campuses, etc., especially since it would give a lot more power to students to have a say in policy making.

Mr. Riffe asked if the proposal would also reduce the power of the Regents. Ms. Navab said it wouldn't, and they'd still set overall UC policy. Her cursory reading of the proposal was that it would prevent having to apply for exceptions every month or having to write campus policies that fit within OP policy. It would allow the Regents to work with campuses for quicker policy decisions, to get things done quicker at the campus level, and to have more campus-specific decision making. Mr. Riffe asked if students would have a say. Ms. Navab students would have a bigger say in that there would be two students on every board. So it would result in 20 student reps on campus boards rather than the two students at the

Regental level. She wasn't saying the GA should endorse this and she's only done a cursory reading of the policy. The Resolution just encourages conversation.

Mr. Twigg said he would presume students on each board would be selected on each corresponding campus by some procedure. Ms. Navab said the policy lays out the process for selecting reps.

Mr. Twigg asked if they knew why Pres. Yudof opposes the policy. Ms. Navab said she could only guess that it's because it reduces his power.

Mr. Sehgal asked if she's sent a copy of the proposal to anybody. Ms. Navab said the proposal is posted on the campus media center site.

Mr. Twigg said there was \$12,000 for student programs from the Grad Division. He asked if that was on par with what the GA has received in previous years. Ms. Navab said they've recently gotten between \$10-12,000 from the Grad Division for student group funding. But in cleaning up the GA office, they found a document showing that they used to get a lot more than that. Obviously, however, budget cuts have occurred. Seeing no other questions, Ms. Navab said she would like to thank them.

Ms. Navab said she would entertain a motion to go back to the election of the Graduate Student Advocate since he was now present. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Election of the Graduate Student Advocate

Ms. Navab called for a motion to nominate the Graduate Student Advocate for a second term, Kfir Cohen. It was so moved by Mr. Helu and seconded. Ms. Navab called for any other nominations, and seeing none, asked if people needed a reminder of what this position does. The Grad Student Advocate is a new position the GA created that year. When a grievance is filed against a student, or when a student wanted to file a grievance, if they'd like someone to work with them and advocate on their behalf, that's where the Graduate Student Advocate came in. The position was created at the request of the ASUC Student Advocate Office because it was getting an increase in graduate cases.

Ms. Navab asked Mr. Cohen if he would like to say a few, quick words.

Kfir Cohen introduced himself and said he's an eighth-year grad student in the Department of Comparative Literature. The GA voted him in to the position at the February meeting, and since then he's met with the ASUC people in the Student Advocate Office. There have been two cases, both involving student parents. One was resolved successfully and they're moving on to the second case. Mr. Cohen said he's found that it's been useful for people to know about this position. It was a challenge to make sure people know about it and to use the service. For now, it seemed like the GA office was able to do this work, and he was happy to help students.

Ms. Navab called for any questions, and seeing none, asked Mr. Cohen to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Ms. Navab asked to have Mr. Cohen brought back in and said she would like to congratulate him.

Advocacy Agenda Update

Ms. De la Torre said that at the beginning of the year the GA voted on Action Agenda Items. These were three items to work on more specifically throughout the year so they could be a little more practiced in working on things. The three Action Agenda Items they voted on were graduate mental health, benefits decentralization for GSI's, and Professional Development Supplemental Tuition.

Ms. De la Torre said the GA was tasked with stating at this GA meeting what they've done for the year, and also to write things up for next year. She asked if anybody had any questions the Advocacy Agenda.

Ms. De la Torre said they divided Action Agenda Items among Executive Officers. The Campus Affairs VP got grad mental health, as it had to do with on-campus mental health. One thing she wanted to do that year as CAVP was to get more information about graduate mental health in general. To do that, she hired someone to help her conduct a survey on grad mental health. It turned out to be a little broader than just mental health, but it did include mental health questions. She already put up the results of the survey, in a nicely designed format. They can see the results at ga.berkeley.edu. Hopefully it's user friendly. If people have questions about it, they could ask her.

Ms. De la Torre said the second part of what she did as part of this Action Agenda item was to collect graduate mental health resources. A lot of people, GSIs, question what to do with a student who has a problem, or how to refer a friend, or where people could go to find mental health help. So Ms. De la Torre said they gathered information and tried to put it in a centralized place, trying to answer all those questions. So now that information is published, at ga.berkeley.edu, resources.

Ms. De la Torre said the next Action Agenda Item dealt with Professional Development Supplemental Tuition. Mr. Ortega said PDST is something the GA, through different graduate students, has been working on for the past six or seven years. As they knew, professional students have an additional fee to pay for attending their programs. This fee has been growing quite fast over the last few years. About six years ago the Student Regent at the time, who was a grad student at Berkeley, implemented a Systemwide policy for students to have more input in the fee process and to set some caps in terms of how much fees could be raised. In practice, even though that policy exists, the University hasn't really been following it. What happens is that anybody can apply for an exception, and those exceptions have pretty much always been granted, with only one exception, the School of Public Health, a few years ago, which had its proposal reduced in half.

Mr. Ortega said the GA has been trying to work with the OP and specifically the Provost, to increase the input students have and how much that fee increases, what it's used for, and to ensure that guidelines are followed on a year-by-year basis. There hasn't been a way to report back how the fees were used, only the proposal on how they were intended to be used. But there was no actual check on whether or not those fees were used in the appropriate manner.

Mr. Ortega said students have been able to get some additional components included in a form that all Provosts have to submit to the OP. So now questions are a lot more comprehensive, and Provosts now have to include more detail in proposals to raise fees. They must have a component from the Graduate Division, and students get to weigh in. The main people working on this are the current Student Regent and Ms. Navab, in an advisory function.

The main issue that year has been for deans to send their proposals to the graduate assembly on each campus as well, as part of the process. This was for grad students to learn about what's happening and to bring more awareness about this. They don't get to weigh in and actually have a final say, and it was really the Regents who did. But students did have quite a bit of influence over certain people who could help them if something outrageous were to be proposed, or if a procedure wasn't being followed.

Ms. Navab said there are a couple of different programs at Berkeley that have put in requests to either increase their fees or add new professional fees. They include an Engineering program, the staff program, and a new program, a Development Masters program. Haas is asking to increase its fee, as was the Law School, she believed. If any Delegates haven't seen those proposals and were interested in them, they should let the GA know. Additionally, the Regents are likely going to discuss approving these over the summer. Students feel that's a really bad time because most students aren't in town and couldn't come and speak on these issues. But if grads were interested and would be around, particularly, for the summer, she would ask them to please let the GA know, because they'd love to have grads speak on these issues.

Mr. Helu asked if there's a list of the programs seeking increases. Ms. Navab said she didn't think the GA could publicize the actual levels requested, but they could list the ones that were proposed for an increase.

A Delegate asked if people who graduated could be on these committees. Ms. Navab said this question will come up at the June Regents meeting, which was open to the public. Unfortunately, usually the only place people could have a say was during public comment, which was often very short. But that was better than nothing, because comments often generate conversation among the Regents. The Regent meeting dates were posted on the Regents Web site.

Ms. De la Torre said the last Action Agenda Item was GSI benefits decentralization. This came under the AAVP. Mr. Marchand said this was a recap of the issue. He had a meeting with Erin Gore, the campus' Chief Financial Officer. He wrote a longer summary, which was posted. They ended up getting data for GSIs by appointment and by which person assigned them. That information didn't come from the campus or the union, but from their own records. There are variations from department to department. Some departments use 25% GSIs; some 25-50%; and some, over 50%. From the fall 2011, there was a reduction in the number of GSI positions, compared to 09-10. It seemed that departments were cutting GSIs, at least in terms of the number of positions. This was part of an overall financial model. The good news is that the campus, through the Finance division and John Wilton, is interested in taking a holistic look at graduate student funding. If this was an Action Agenda Item next year, people could discuss this as a more general topic in terms of how they see funding for grad students on campus, and multi-year funding packages. They have good data from the GA survey that shows that graduates were really insecure about funding, as they don't know from year to year how much funding they'll have. That was something the GA should address. It's something the Erin Gore and John Wilton want to work on. This might be something the GA can influence.

Ms. De la Torre said that people could find information on the Web site. Ms. Navab said the information was under that afternoon's meeting information. Seeing no other questions, Ms. Navab said they'd move on.

Ms. Navab said she would call for a ten-minute recess. During that time, the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation would convene.

This meeting was recessed.

Report from the External Affairs Vice President

Back in session, Mr. Ortega said that starting with federal work, they continued to follow-up on their advocacy. One of the more notable things was their cooperation with the Chancellor's office to work on the interest rate for student loans. That applied more to undergrads, but it was something for the GA, as an organization, to also be concerned with. They're also working on this with SAGE.

Something else they're trying to follow-up on is legislation for tax benefits for hiring, and they hope to find an author and some sponsors at the State level. They've been represented at a couple of State functions. They've been mostly meeting with legislators and having some combined meetings with administrators and students in Sacramento.

The UCSA's last meeting will be that weekend and will deal with the budget and how it will be used next year. For the most part it will continue as it is. A number of Resolutions will also come up, and at the fall GA meeting he'll tell the GA the results of those bills.

At the City level, Mr. Ortega said they've been working with the City in terms of student-neighbor relations. They've sent out a number of proposals in terms of the UCPD and the Berkeley Police Department to work together for a variety of things. That's been pretty successful. There was a pilot program from that past year that will be expanded, combining a pedestrian/bicycle patrol with police from the City of Berkeley and the UCPD. They'll have permanent police in the same area, so students become familiar with who the officers are and get to be more comfortable with them.

Mr. Ortega said student/neighbor relations was a big thing that came up at the last meeting they had with the campus, with members of the City Chamber of Commerce, the Administration, and students, to see how they could collaborate, become better neighbors, and to look at programs they could implement. Over the next few months they'll work on looking at how to give more information to incoming students about how to find housing, what their rights are as a renter, how to buy renter's insurance, how to get involved with student groups, and e-mail servers to put them in touch with a Councilmember. He called for any questions.

Mr. Hoople said he would ask the GA to thank Mr. Ortega for his service, as this was his last GA meeting. (Applause)

Community Outreach Workgroup Presentation

Mr. Niederhut said he was the current Chair of the Community Outreach Workgroup, and with another member, Heather Arata, will talk about what the Workgroup has been doing for the past two years.

Mr. Niederhut said he'd like to start by talking about why this outreach work was important. They all know it's good to help out their neighbors and to be involved in the community. But it was particularly

important for graduate students for three reasons. One reason, which people know about if they've applied for federal funding, is that most federal agencies, for fellowships or research grants, require people to be involved in some kind of outreach or community engagement. Secondly, and something he and Ms. Arata will talk about, is the public's opinion of the University, which appears to be pretty strongly tied to its opinion of graduate students and of students in general. Having grads out in the community doing good things, acting as good role models, will increase people's perception of UC as a public good that deserves public funding. As they all knew, public funding from the State of California to the University has dropped by about two-thirds over the past decade, resulting in drastic decreases in teaching appointments and in the quality of service. The third reason outreach was important was because, as grad students, they'll be there for a while, and it's nice for all of them to actually feel like they're involved in their community.

Mr. Niederhut said it was hard for some people to figure out how to get involved in their community, and that's what he and Ms. Arata will talk about. Last year the Outreach Workgroup posted a survey to the graduate and professional student community and got about 300 responses. The good news is that about 40% of them already participate in some kind of outreach; but the bad news is that 60% were not so involved. About 21% of the graduate students who responded to the survey participate in outreach that was not through a campus-affiliated organization, or through their department. In and of itself there was nothing wrong with that. But each one of those students will have needed to search for those opportunities on their own time. That's something he knew about, since he had to do it. Even if only 10% of graduate and professional students do that kind of search, that would be 1,000 students spending 10 hours each to do searches, which was a lot of wasted time. And as Delegates knew, time was one thing students don't have a lot of.

Mr. Niederhut said the Workgroup wanted to identify what the barriers were for graduate and professional students to participate in outreach. They identified a number of them, as seen on the slide. They summarized them into three separate categories: awareness, access, and affordability.

A lot of graduate and professional students just don't know what kind of opportunities are out there for them. Community Resources for the Sciences (CRS) is a great outreach organization, but as the name suggests, it's only open to people who do science. Someone in the humanities, or in history or language studies, couldn't participate in this particular activity. As for the third barrier, affordability, that didn't just apply to money, but also to time. Many ways grads can participate require commitments of multiple hours, e.g., five hours a week, or commitments of two years or more for particular concerns.

Mr. Niederhut said the idea was to address these particular concerns. It wasn't enough to just address any one of them, because if there's a problem in one area, the odds are that there will be other barriers to grads' participation. So addressing one barrier will not help that many people. As the slide showed, if they address all of the barriers at the same time, they could meet a huge portion of this unmet need.

Ms. Arata said the survey results also showed that 66% of people would be somewhat or very interested in an outreach program sponsored by the Graduate Assembly. What the Outreach Workgroup has done is to create an opportunity for people to participate, and they came up two different programs. The first is COCO, Community Outdoor Clean-up and Outreach. This is a large-scale activity where people could meet up, take a bus to a site, and clean it up. So the commitment is only a few hours, and people don't have to devote a whole day, or a certain period of time to it.

The other opportunity to participate is LEO, Local Education Outreach. In this program, people would actually go into a classroom and set something up that dealt with science, or whatever their field was. Again, people wouldn't have to take on a long-term commitment.

Ms. Arata said the slide showed a picture from the April clean-up at the Emeryville shoreline. After that event there was a survey of people who participated in it. They found that the biggest downside to this event was that there was really short notice. Having a stable source of funding would allow people to better prepare for these events, and to organize them better.

Mr. Niederhut said the Local Education Outreach portion, which they've been working on for the past year, required a lot of back and forth with the Berkeley schools volunteer program and the Berkeley Unified School District. Mr. Niederhut said they've done a bit of market research. The slide showed the figures from a survey of teachers in the Berkeley Unified School District to see how difficult it was to get guest speakers to their classes. It was broken down by teacher tenure, and it wasn't the case at all that it was the younger teachers who were having this problem. Rather, it was a problem across-the-board in the District. And one of the biggest problems with funding cuts to public schools was having materials to host enhancement activities. That was something grads could help with.

Mr. Niederhut said they asked teachers what kinds of speakers they'd be interested in, and the good news is that they were interested in everything. Raw numbers of respondents were on the left side of the graph. There are at least three teachers in the Berkeley Unified School District who were interested in having a graduate or professional student in every major division of campus come speak in their classrooms.

Mr. Niederhut said that one thing that came out of the survey was that in the School District, teachers' perceptions of the University, and how engaged it was in the community, and how useful it is, had to do with their perception of whether or not graduate students were helpful in being good role models for their students. Mr. Niederhut said the good news was that most of them think graduate students are good role models.

Mr. Niederhut said the Workgroup wanted to see how related that was to whether or not teachers would like to have graduate students in their classrooms. And there appears to be a pretty strong relationship. No one who responded to the survey was not interested in seeing grads come for a visit. Even the one person who strongly disagreed that grads were good role models still wanted one of them to come to their classroom.

Mr. Niederhut said that to continue doing this work and to step it up, the Workgroup is running pilot programs at that time. They'd like to do something really powerful to help graduate students meet this unmet demand. They would like to request \$3,540. The GA budget has \$20,000 surplus, and this request is for a very small part of that. They're estimating \$2,000 for the COCO project for the cost of transportation, water, and food for volunteers; and \$1,200 for LEO, based on the Community Resources for Science model of \$30 per classroom visit, for 40 classroom visits.

Mr. Niederhut said he thought there would be 40 visits at a minimum. A lot of teachers in the BUSD are looking for graduate and professional students to come talk about what it's like to be a grad student, and what it's like to pursue a degree in higher education, and in particular, what it's like for a first-generation college student, or someone coming from an underrepresented group. Obviously, this didn't require a lot

of fancy equipment. So this is a low-cost activity. Lastly, \$250 was budgeted for food and meetings, which was pretty standard across committees. He called for any questions.

Mr. Davidson asked if anyone has done a presentation at a public school. Mr. Niederhut said they just had a volunteer orientation earlier that afternoon, so presentations should start in the next couple of weeks.

Ms. De la Torre asked if he could clarify where the money would go. Mr. Froehle said for COCO, it's transportation, food, and water for volunteers. Mr. Niederhut said buses were expensive and they might not bus people too far from the area, because that's a very large part of the budget. That means they get to do more cleanup activities. As far as the educational program, a student, e.g., might use a model for anatomy, or a presenter in the Humanities might actually wear a costume, and maybe dress up like Ben Franklin, e.g. Those things cost money, and they can't expect grad students to pay for them out of pocket; and it was really difficult to justify that kind of money coming from local school districts.

Ms. Navab said they were out of time for this item. Seeing no further questions, she said they'd move on. Mr. Niederhut said he would like to thank them. (Applause)

BUDGET PRESENTATION

Ms. Navab said that people should have picked up a printed version of the budget at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Hoople said he had a few slides to show that would cover some big changes and then they'd open it up to questions. Hopefully, people had a chance to look at the budget.

Mr. Hoople said the name of the game with this budget was transparency. They really tried to go line item by line item and figure out what was going on and how to make everyone understand what the operating costs were of the Graduate Assembly.

Mr. Hoople said the major change with stipends was to tie them to hourly rates. They didn't print it out, but on the Web site there's a stipend worksheet that breaks down expected hours. They set stipends at a salary of \$18 per hour, which was about a Step I GSI salary across campus, and set the number of months worked throughout the year. The President works 12 months because she's working all the time, whereas other positions, such as Treasurer, he believed, was at 9 months, because they don't need to work over the summer or over Winter Break.

Mr. Hoople said that student group funding is up \$40,000, from \$110,000 to \$150,000. The GA got a lot more money for student groups and for the Funding Committee. They got an additional \$46,000 in revenue from carryover from two years ago, 2010-11. They changed carryover they budget from the previous year to two years ago because they don't know what the previous year's carryover is until midway through the next year. So the way this was written into their By-laws is to budget the carryover from two years ago.

They also broke things out to be a little clearer about the difference between Executive Officers and "Committee Officers," as they're calling them. These are basically people who were not necessarily on the Executive Board, but who do get salaries. That would include the Funding Officer and a couple of others, positions that were shown on the worksheet.

Mr. Hoople said that for overall asset changes, the big takeaway is that Ms. Navab has done a great job in getting money from a lot of different places around campus. They get money coming in for Auxiliary Business Office staff, including the recorder's salary. The big takeaway is that in this budget, they have a \$23,590 surplus, which was outstanding. They're really happy about that.

They changed Executive Officer salaries around, as seen on the worksheet. The President will get paid a little bit more. Mr. Hoople said he advocated for that, not Ms. Navab. But basically, there's net no change. For Committee Officers, because of the way they reclassified things, they added a little bit of money for the Funding Officer.

For projects, they cut salaries significantly, by \$4,806. They went back and looked at how much people actually worked in the past year and determined the expectation they'd have going forward next year. Most projects are at about 10 hours, with a few significantly higher because they have 15-hour work loads. That resulted in a significant decrease in Project Coordinator salaries, \$4,806, and for Committee Officers, \$2,702.

Mr. Hoople said that student funding was taken from other places in the budget. They identified additional sources of revenue to add for that. So there was an additional \$40,000 in student funding.

The Business Office is budgeted more for next year, by \$16,299, because the budget now will actually reflect what money goes through the GA. Before, some stuff that was happening in the Business Office was covered exclusively by the Business Office, for which the Business Office got reimbursed, without the GA really caring about it. But those things were now back in the Business Office budget.

Mr. Hoople said there are a couple of new things that are classified as quote "assets," that were not there last year.

Ms. Navab said the other piece of that increase in the Business Office is that they used to have the Supplies budget for all other positions, and that has now been moved under the Business Office, to avoid having the GA buy duplicate supplies, and to have the Business Office handle supplies.

The Business Office will also handle additional costs that year, such as for the alarm system they added after thefts they had, and the maintenance cost for that.

Ms. Hsueh said they also increased the allocation for room rentals to \$10,000. Ms. Navab said that was funding for people when they apply to rent rooms, such as for Pauley and for other rooms.

Mr. Froehle asked about the approval process for rooms. Ms. Navab said that's not under the Funding Committee. Mr. Froehle asked if the money for room rentals wouldn't be spent by the Business Office, but allocated by the Business Office to student groups. Ms. Navab said these funds aren't allocated by the Business Office, but by the Treasurer, with recommendations from the Funding Committee. That money is for student groups.

Mr. Hoople said that perhaps next year they should reclassify that just to make it clearer that's what was happening. Also, a goal of his for next year was to figure out how to reduce rental fees, which were astronomical. This is something the Funding Committee has talked about a lot.

Ms. Navab said that from her end, she was also working on that from the policy side, to get room waivers for the GA. Mr. Hoople said the GA was really upset about room rentals and they want to get students access to rooms without having to pay.

Mr. Hoople said that for Contingency, they added another \$5,000 since they had a surplus and they figured it would be better to have more in Contingency in case things came up that the GA needed to cover. That way they wouldn't need to have a Resolution to do that.

As for salaries, Mr. Hoople said the slide showed the salary worksheet. The President's salary went up. The others stayed effectively the same, or changed maybe \$100. Project Coordinator salaries were decreased significantly. On the worksheet could be seen the hours of work per week that the GA expects. For the President, the hours of work that were expected weren't exactly accurate. Ms. Navab said it would be nice if she only worked 17 hours a week.

Mr. Cole said that in addition to cutting the hours for the Projects, he asked if they cut the number of months they expect Projects to work. Mr. Hoople said they tried to identify the number of months people should actually work on projects. Talking to the CAVP and some Project Coordinators, it looked like some people were there for the summer and some people weren't. Most people don't work over Winter Break. They basically tried to identify where they paid people for work that wasn't getting done. Ms. Navab said the reverse was also true, and people were getting paid for work that was being done. That's why some hours were different for people.

The other thing for Projects budgets was that the Programming line items have shifted around a little bit. Previously, for example, other projects would kick over money to the Empowering Women of Color Conference, one of the GA's biggest expenses. So rather than having other Projects do that, the budget now accurately reflects that more money needed to go to the Empowering Women of Color Project and less to other Projects. They tried to make the budget more reflective of the work that was actually done, and to make it more transparent.

Mr. Trager said that under Committee Officers, he asked what Committees had Officers. Ms. Navab said they included Rules, Environmental Sustainability, Funding, the Graduate Student Advocate, and Operational Excellence. The budget had all of them included. They understand that not all of them have committees, but they were trying to find something to call them other than "non-Executive Officers."

Mr. Trager asked why, as an Officer, he doesn't get paid an hourly commitment. Mr. Hoople said the reason for that is because Mr. Trager set the salary last year and just left it alone. Ms. Navab said that Mr. Trager asked for a reduction of his salary in order to increase other things. They could restore that if people would like. Mr. Trager said he thought that was in line with his values. But in all fairness, they should consider how many hours the Sustainability Officer works. Mr. Hoople asked how many hours that was. Ms. Navab said this discussion was out of order.

Mr. Helu said that if they're already being more accurate about the amount budgeted for different programs, he asked how the GA would hopefully keep people accountable if someone exceeds the budgeted

amount. Mr. Hoople said what they budgeted should be used as a guide and represents the workload that was expected. If someone is elected or appointed to one of these positions, they must do at least a certain amount. If they want to do more, that was fine. But this was what the Graduate Assembly expected, and what was required to complete satisfactorily the tasks the GA has laid out as expectations.

Mr. Helu asked about the Grad Social Club that year asking for \$12,000 because it needed funds. Ms. Navab said that was like a loan, and was partially bad planning. The GA put in policies and procedures to prevent things like that from happening in the future. They've also given the GSC a little more staff support so it could do better programming and so people in the group wouldn't feel like they were stressed, trying to make everything happen. So the GA was trying to preemptively deal with situations like that. Ms. De la Torre said that anything over \$500 has to be approved by the Treasurer. Ms. Navab said they also couldn't sign a contract without the Treasurer's approval. Mr. Ortega said that whenever there's a reimbursement, it had to be approved by the Business Office. And if it's out of line, it wouldn't be approved.

Mr. Kline asked what the carryforward was from year 2009-10. He noticed the GA got \$46,000 in carryforward from two years ago and asked where that was shown for this year's budget. Ms. Navab said that every year their carryforward is from two years back. Mr. Kline said he understood, and said that line item was not in the 2011-12 budget. Ms. Navab said that generally, some carryforward gets used in the budget and some gets put into reserves. She asked if Ms. Hsueh knew the answer. Ms. Hsueh said she thought that for 10/11, ending June 30, they had the biggest carryforward, \$46,000. But the year before, ending 09/10, she believed it was about half of that amount. Ms. Navab said that last year's budget was on the Web site. Ms. Hsueh said it was up to the Treasurer to decide if they want to use any carryforward. The Treasurer may decide not to use it, and put carryforward into a GA pot and accumulate the money. They may want to deposit it to the Fund Functioning as an Endowment. But they don't necessarily use carryforward each year.

Mr. Kline said it looked like the GA has a lot of money for next year because of carryforward. He thought the GA should be careful about implementing any policies they want to keep at a particular funding level for future years, since in the future they could have relatively reduced funding. Secondly, he asked if this budget was approved by the Budget Committee, and if there was anything from the Budget Committee to be presented, and asked if this was allowed by the By-laws.

Ms. Navab said the Rules Officer would look that up.

Mr. Riffe asked what the amount was of the carryforward from 2009-10. He asked how much extra money from three years ago went to last year's budget. Mr. Hoople said he believed Ms. Hsueh said they about \$20,000.

Mr. Riffe said revenue sources from student fees was shown at \$416,000. He asked if that was for the ASUC and the GA combined. Ms. Navab said the figure was just the GA's portion. The undergrads had a lot more money. The GA gets the grad students' portion of student fees; and grads are about one-third of the students on campus. It was roughly around \$417,000 every year, give or take a few thousand dollars.

Mr. Rabkin asked why so much was budgeted for Business Office staff, by far the biggest part of the budget. They broke it up, and now this budget was going up by \$16,000. Mr. Hoople said that if they

look at the assets, there was an allocation from SSF to pay a portion of the Funding Advisor's salary, \$15,000. They put that into assets and also added it to the Business Office, because they wanted to accurately reflect what it costs. Ms. Hsueh said they wanted to show how much expenses and how much revenue they had. Mr. Rabkin said that in the future they might reword it as "income," not "assets," to make it clearer. In the future, it would be good to tell the GA explicitly, instead of an appendix in the end, as to what changes have been made. If they put that in writing on the back, it would take care of these questions.

Mr. Ortega said he would like to request a budget amendment. When he put together his budget for next year, it was before they knew they had additional funds, and he asked that they not request funds they really needed. And now that they have funds, he would like to request an additional \$4,000 in travel. The reason is because Heather Arata was elected a Vice Chair in a national organization and needed to attend meetings. Also, it was difficult for the GA President to go to different schools and also attend meetings. This amendment would allow others to go. The way they usually fund this was to have travel funding go through External Affairs, rather than being under the President's budget.

Mr. Kehoe asked if this would be a new line item. Mr. Ortega said it could either be a new line item or an increase to travel under the Officer's budget.

Mr. Helu moved to add \$4,000 to the federal travel budget for the EAVP. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE BUDGET PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Riffe asked if there was any plan to add money from this year's revenue. Mr. Hoople said there was no point in doing that because they're not sure if the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation will continue as an entity to add money to. Mr. Riffe asked if they planned to add money if it does continue as an entity. Mr. Hoople said there are no plans in the budget. Ms. Navab said they haven't been using their budget as a way to do that, and instead, use their reserves to fund the BGSF. In order to do that they'd need a Resolution to take money out of either their Commercial Reserves or their Student Fee Reserves.

Ms. Navab called for any other questions or amendments.

Mr. Helu said that since they were discussing stipends, he asked when they needed to do in order to add funding for Sustainability Officer's stipend. Ms. Navab said he could make an amendment to do that, and said that Delegates could make amendments to any line items.

Mr. Niederhut said that if the GA was taking amendments, he would like to add \$3,450 to the Outreach Workgroup. Ms. Navab said that was under Committee Officers. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE BUDGET BY ADDING \$3,450 TO THE OUTREACH WORKGROUP PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Rabkin said that the reason the GA pays stipends was to convince people to do the job. They're not counting out the money simply out of a spirit of equity or sympathy, but to reward hard work. He thought people shouldn't get too carried away with counting the number of hours people work. The purpose was not simply to demonstrate the GA's evenhandedness, but to get the job done. Jobs that could be done without pay didn't necessarily mean they should be paid. He thought the GA ought to be conservative in its spending.

Mr. Kehoe said he thought salaries reflect essentially the amount and difficulty of work done for the Graduate Assembly. Mr. Rabkin said positions could be difficult to hire. Mr. Kehoe said they figure it's 17 hours per week.

Mr. Trager said that when they pay people, he thought the GA should consider the pay a measure of how they view the importance of the job, and not just a function of how hard it is to do, or how well they feel somebody should be remunerated. What they pay people was a reflection of GA values.

A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made by Mr. Davidson and was seconded and failed by hand-vote 21-14, requiring a two-thirds vote.

Ms. Navab said she would go back to a rules issue that came up over whether the Budget Committee needed to approve the GA budget. She'd make a recommendation. It was a little bit unclear if the Treasurer could make a recommendation without the Budget Committee's recommendation. The GA's rules say the Budget Committee was supposed to make a recommendation. In this case, the Budget Committee didn't do that. So the GA had two options. They could either suspend the rules and vote on the budget being presented, or they could unofficially approve the budget, which would force the Executive Board to act because they'd have an urgent situation and the Exec Board would have to vote on it. Otherwise, the GA couldn't spend money next year.

Mr. Kline asked if a third option was to approve a partial budget, or a summer budget. Ms. Navab said that wasn't an option. Ms. Mendoza said that's because the Budget Committee has not voted on a budget.

Mr. Kline said that if they were going to suspend the rules, they could do that and pass a three-month extension budget. Ms. Navab said she would recommend against approving a three-month budget. That would open them up to a whole lot of problems. But people could suspend the rules and do whatever they wanted.

Mr. Baur asked if they were currently debating any particular amendment. Ms. Navab said they weren't. They were out of time on the budget and they had a procedural issue to resolve.

Mr. Rabkin said he would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair. The GA can, by majority vote, overrule the Chair and just say that the GA had the authority to pass its budget. He believed the GA did have that authority. This was a meeting of the Delegates and this was their budget, and they could pass it.

Ms. Navab said people would be overruling the Parliamentarian, not the Chair, that the Budget Committee had to consider the budget before it coming together the Assembly.

Mr. Rabkin moved to overrule the decision of the Rules Officer. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Riffe asked how many votes were needed to override. Ms. Navab said it took a simple majority to overrule. The motion was to overrule the Rules Chair and allow the GA to approve the budget without the budget going through the Budget Committee.

Mr. Twigg asked if the Budget Committee has seen the budget. Ms. Navab said the Committee talked about the budget and made some recommendations, but no official budget has been approved by the Committee.

Mr. Davidson asked what budget they were talking about the Budget Committee approving. Ms. Navab said it was the GA budget that was posted and printed, with the two amended line items.

Mr. Twigg asked if the motion to overrule was debatable. Ms. Navab said it wasn't.

A Delegate asked what the difference was between overruling the Rules Officer and suspending the rules. Ms. Navab overruling the decision was a lower threshold. She said this was out of order and they couldn't debate the motion to overrule.

THE MOTION TO OVERRULE THE DECISION OF THE RULES OFFICER THAT THE BUDGET COMMITTEE HAD TO APPROVE THE GA BUDGET, AND TO CONTINUE VOTING ON THE BUDGET, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 19-4-0.

Ms. Navab said the decision was overruled. Since they were out of time, the question on the budget would be called.

Mr. Kline moved to extend speaking time by ten minutes. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2012-2013 GRADUATE ASSEMBLY BUDGET, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab said she would like to thank Mr. Hoople.

FUNDING REVISIONS PRESENTATION

Mr. Baur said he would stand in as representative of the Funding Committee that evening because Mike Sheen was unable to attend. At the last meeting, Mr. Sheen presented an outline for the proposals that Delegates would see in several Resolutions the GA will consider that evening. Given the feedback they got and further deliberation by the Funding Committee, they went ahead and put those proposals into actual Resolution format in Resolutions 1205a, b, and c.

Mr. Baur said he thought the most important thing to keep in mind as he went through the presentation was that the GA had \$40,000 more to allocate next year. They're rolling in dough, at least for one year.

Four major changes were being proposed, although there was really only one major change and three more minor changes. The first is a slightly new plan for the way that funding rounds work, designed to make the process more transparent and easier for student groups to navigate, and easier for the Budget Office to process.

Secondly, they'd talk about publications. Many groups apply for publications funding and that complicated the process with the current breakout of subcategories the Funding Committee decides on. So they're proposing to basically make a new, separate category devoted specifically for funding publication costs.

A third proposal dealt with GA guidelines concerning the funding of alcohol.

And lastly, and the most major change being proposed, was to revise the way in which student groups are represented and the way in which money is allocated to student groups through the GMER process, Graduate Meetings, Events, and Resources. They'll go through that at the end.

Mr. Baur said that for funding rounds, the slide being shown was exactly what was displayed at the last GA meeting. The basic idea is to introduce contingency funds during Winter Break and over the summer that aren't covered during the normal fall and spring funding rounds. The full proposal is in 1205a. He also wanted Delegates to note that 1205c was related and calls for the creation of a summer funding working group to basically cover contingency decisions that might come up this coming summer. Those two Resolutions were sort of related. But on the whole, it's very straightforward. If people have questions, they'll take them at the end.

Mr. Baur said that past year they've seen an increase in the number of student publications requesting funding through GMER, through grants, and through contingency. To date, the Funding Committee has been hesitant to really devote much grant money to cover the costs of publications. That's because they haven't had clear guidelines and they've been unsure how to decide the proper funding allocation between event grants and publication grants. It was kind of like comparing apples and oranges. So they're proposing to create a whole separate category that would set aside a certain part of the overall \$150,000 the GA has next year explicitly to fund student publications. In that way, the Funding Committee would have clearer guidance for how to handle those requests.

As they could see in the amendment language contained in 1205b, they're basically proposing to create a separate category. They'll evaluate it based on general criteria, such as the audience reached, the cost per issue, perceived value to graduate students, and so forth. They'll also work with the Sustainability Committee, which has expressed interest in finding ways to incentivize and promote the move to electronic distribution in publishing as opposed to hard, paper copies.

Mr. Kehoe asked if the idea behind this that because of requests to the Funding Committee for various desktop publishing software, and if that would apply under publication allocations, or that if that would still be prohibited by a ban on software.

Ms. Hsueh said that for software, it used to be under GA Resources. Groups can apply for this funding for meetings, meals, and resources. Software is considered a resource. In the past, student groups would apply to purchase software. The Funding Committee reviewed this a couple of years ago and decided not to fund software, because once software is funded to a student group, it's basically giving money away and the software doesn't come back to the GA. So the Funding Committee decided not to fund software. If a group applies for software, that should not fall under Publications. Publications was mainly for publication of, e.g., the "Berkeley Science Journal," or the "Law Journal."

Mr. Baur said he wanted to note that in certain slides, they could see strikethroughs and the underlining, based on recommendations of the Rules Committee. Certain amendments are being proposed, and the Rules Committee needs those changes to be approved.

Lastly under publications, by grouping everything together under one category, Mr. Baur said they might be able to get a little additional leverage to get support from the central for campus student publications.

It might open up opportunities to bargain with vendors and various companies that participate in publications to maybe negotiate some sort of group fees at reduced rates. So it might overall give them a chance to reduce costs for student publications if they set out a separate category.

Mr. Baur said that in the Resolution as it was currently worded, the Funding Committee thought it might be a good idea to strike "alcohol" from the list of things that could be funded. They thought that would make life easier for the E-Board and so forth. But based on a Rules Committee suggestion, it was decided that the Funding Committee should really not have jurisdiction over whether or not to fund alcohol, and that decision should be made through the current process. Basically, they need an amendment to unstrike that word out of the Resolution.

Mr. Rabkin said it seems like a substantive policy topic. He asked if Mr. Baur wanted to fund alcohol through the Funding Committee. Mr. Baur said they thought they did and wrote the Resolution like that, but the Rules Committee thought it was a bad idea.

Mr. Baur said the biggest thing the Funding Committee wanted to talk to the Assembly about that evening was the proposed revisions to the GMER process. As many of them were aware, the current system, which groups departments and schools together in supergroups, was controversial for a number of reasons. It raised certain disparities depending on whether a supergroup was very large, with a very small number of participating student groups, or was a small supergroup that had a large number of student activities. There were disparities in the levels of funding that graduate students actually received.

Mr. Baur said the idea was to hopefully make their system fairer. They've run some numbers to support that this was actually going to work. The proposal is to dissolve supergroups and run the allocation algorithm based on academic units, as recognized by the Graduate Assembly. To put that in context, he believed there are 11 or so supergroups currently, and the GA currently recognizes 57 academic units for this year, of which around 40 have groups that apply for funding. So the proposal could spread things out more. But it would also make the funding per student more equitable across the campus for GMER events.

At the same time, Mr. Baur said the Funding Committee was proposing to lower groups' ceiling to \$500, which it has been in the past. It was raised to \$750 that past year. Most groups did not come anywhere near reaching that \$500 ceiling. Some were over. The Funding Committee thinks this will work best if they roll the ceiling back to \$500, to promote equity. At the same time, because some academic units have very few students in them, the Funding Committee was proposing to introduce a floor of \$100, to be allocated across an academic unit, for any groups that apply for GMER funding through those academic units.

Lastly, in keeping with the GA's commitment to foster cross-campus interdepartmental and interschool graduate social relationships, and what not, the Funding Committee was proposing an interdisciplinary category for groups that really do span departments. A couple of examples are for the Medievalism group, which they'll talk about later. It encompasses many of Humanities departments, even though it's currently housed in just the German Department.

Mr. Baur said the Committee had a request to run some numbers for before and after scenarios for a couple of different academic units across campus. On the slide, the top table represents the funding allocation according to the old system and the bottom table represents how the allocation would have worked

according to the new system they're proposing, based on academic units. The Department of Environmental Science Policy Management was previously housed in the Public Policy supergroup. That's a small supergroup with about 720 students. But it has a very large number of student groups. As they could see, under the new system, the funding would go up a little bit for the student groups in this department. If they then look at a supergroup that had a very large population, in this case the Mathematics supergroup, which had over 1,000 people, and a far smaller number of student groups, they could see that the Pure Mathematics Department group would get reduced funding to reflect, again, a fairer allocation, given its student population.

Mr. Kline said the Mathematics Department has more students in it and was now getting less money. Mr. Baur said the Mathematics supergroup had 1,056 students last year. The Public Policy supergroup had 720. As they could see from the money that was allocated, there was gross inequity. The Funding Committee managed to correct that a little bit to bring allocations back in line.

If they look at German, a particularly small Department, the disparity is even greater. The German groups, for a Department of 32 people, were allocated over \$2,000. And under the current system, that would be brought back in line to a fairer distribution. He noted that the floor was per academic unit. Mr. Twigg said it was per academic unit and per discipline.

A Delegate asked if the slide showed an exhaustive list of the student groups for this Department. Mr. Baur said he was 99% sure it was.

Mr. Kline said he would like to know about his group, and to see a spreadsheet. Ms. Navab said that was out of order, and Mr. Baur needed to finish the presentation.

Mr. Baur said they wanted to demonstrate what happens with interdisciplinary groups. Medievalisms was currently housed in the German Department, even though it includes grad students from many humanities. Under the old system, it got \$540. Under the new system, because they were just housed in German, they would be able to do very little. So if they wanted, they could apply to the interdisciplinary category and they could get a \$289 allocation, and get a bit of a bonus because the group is interdisciplinary and brings people together across campus.

Mr. Cole asked if the increase was due to the increased number of students, given it was interdisciplinary. Mr. Baur said the amount of money from the total pot available for each funding round that is devoted to the interdisciplinary category floats with the number of groups applying. So the more groups that apply for interdisciplinary funding, the greater the percentage of the pot is allocated to interdisciplinary groups. The Funding Committee recognized that this category would create a potential for groups to try to take advantage of the interdisciplinary category. With that said, the way the Resolution was written, the Funding Chair has authority to approve groups that want to be interdisciplinary. And there's a requirement that these groups have at least two Delegates from separate academic units sign off on the application in order to fall under the interdisciplinary category. So there are several administrative steps along the way to try to ensure that groups that claim to be interdisciplinary truly are interdisciplinary.

Mr. Kehoe said the Resolution doesn't appear to define how student groups are allocated into their academic units. Mr. Baur said it's by Delegate. The Delegate for the academic unit had to sign off on it, or had to be put down on the group's application, before the group could be affiliated within an academic unit. Mr. Kehoe asked if that was in the By-laws. He didn't believe what was just said about defining

academic units was actually defined in the Resolution. Between now and the time they discuss the Resolution, he would request that text for that be prepared.

Mr. Twigg asked where in the Resolution it establishes the limit of \$500 per group. Also, it was stated that the funding floor was \$100 for academic units and also \$100 for interdisciplinary groups. It was acknowledged there's danger of abuse with interdisciplinary groups. He asked if Mr. Baur also feared that smaller departments could get together to get the floor of \$100, and still, again, get a disproportionate amount of resources.

Mr. Hoople said they were out of time on this.

On a point of information, Mr. Kehoe said this presentation was on a series of Resolutions that the GA will debate.

Ms. Navab asked if there was a motion to increase time.

Mr. Helu said that any changes people want to make to Resolutions could be done when the Resolutions are discussed. Ms. Navab asked if that was correct.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

Ms. Navab said there were a lot of Resolutions to consider. They were listed on the board. She would propose having a Consent Calendar. That meant that people could remove any bill they'd like to discuss or amend, and all the bills remaining under the Consent Calendar automatically pass. Unless people have actual changes, she wouldn't recommend changing a Resolution just to put a Whereas Clause in. If there are substantial changes they want to make, they should pull a bill from the Consent Calendar.

The following bills were up for consideration under the Consent Calendar:

1205a, 1205b, 1205c, 1204a, 1202e 1203a, 1203c, 1205d, 1205e, 1205f, and 1205g

The following bills were removed from the Consent Calendar: 1203awas 1205b, 1205a, 1205c, 1202e, 1205g.

Ms. Navab asked if anyone wanted to pull anything else.

The following bills remained under the Consent Calendar: 1203c, 1204a, 1205d, 1205e, and 1205f. Ms. Navab called for a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. It was so moved and seconded.

Ms. Navab noted that 1205f was not included in the agenda packet and was a separate sheet that was distributed.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION:
1203c, 1204a, 1205d, 1205e, AND 1205f.

The following Resolution, Resolution 1203c, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Bahar Navab, GA President and Alberto Ortega, GA External Affairs VP:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE
MIDDLE CLASS SCHOLARSHIP ACT

- WHEREAS, California has long promised affordable access to education for students of all income classes, a promise that helped spur innovation and prosperity for decades; and
- WHEREAS, the promise of affordable higher education is in jeopardy because of enormous fee increases at the University of California, the California State University and California community colleges; and
- WHEREAS, student fees at the California State University have increased by 191 percent since 2003-04, from \$2,046 to \$5,970; and student fees at the University of California have increased by 145 percent since 2003-04, from \$4,984 to \$12,192; and
- WHEREAS, financial aid programs have expanded to mitigate the impacts of the fee increases for lower-income families; and
- WHEREAS, middle class families, who make too much to qualify for financial aid programs but too little to afford the high fee levels, are forced to rely on staggering levels of student loans or give up on the dream of higher education; and
- WHEREAS, corporate tax law changes in 2009 provided \$1 billion in annual tax breaks to out-of-State corporations to the competitive disadvantage of California businesses; and
- WHEREAS, the Honorable John A. Pérez, Speaker of the Assembly and former UC Berkeley student, has introduced the Middle Class Scholarship Act -- revenue-neutral legislation that slashes student fees for middle-class families by two-thirds and pays for the scholarships by pulling back the \$1 billion tax benefit provided to out-of-State corporations; and
- WHEREAS, the Middle Class Scholarship will be available to California students from families earning less than \$150,000 per year; and
- WHEREAS, the Middle Class Scholarship Act will save 42,000 University of California students nearly \$8,200 per year, or \$33,000 over a four year period; will save 150,000 California State University students \$4,000 per year, or \$16,000 over a four year period; and will provide \$150 million to community colleges to improve affordability; and

Consent Calendar -- 1203c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the Middle Class Scholarship Act (cont'd) - 34 -
-- 1204a, On Directed Action to Renew the Mandate for the Community Outreach Workgroup

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE MIDDLE CLASS SCHOLARSHIP ACT (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Middle Class Scholarship Act will provide immediate economic benefit by returning tens of thousands of dollars to middle-income families and dramatically reduce the massive student loan debt that middle income families currently must rely on; and

WHEREAS, the Middle Class Scholarship Act will make higher education affordable in California again from a dedicated funding source and will pave the way for scarce budget increases for higher education to go entirely to improving the quality of the systems; and

WHEREAS, though this Act targets undergraduate students, many of these undergraduate students are future graduate students or are the siblings and students of current graduate students; and

WHEREAS, it is important for graduate students to stand with undergraduate students in supporting State reinvestment in higher education;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that to help keep the promise of affordable higher education in California the Graduate Assembly supports AB 1500 and AB 1501, the Middle Class Scholarship Act

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the GA directs the President Bahar Navab to send a copy of this resolution to UC President Yudof and Speaker Pérez.

The following Resolution, 1204a, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Heather Arata, Liz Boatman, Sanne Cottaar, Christopher Klein, Nicole Fay, and Dillon Niederhut:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO RENEW THE MANDATE FOR THE COMMUNITY OUTREACH WORKGROUP

WHEREAS, at the December 2010 meeting, the Delegate Assembly approved the creation of an Outreach Workgroup to research the extent of and create recommendations for fostering community outreach, in Resolution 1011a; and

WHEREAS, this Workgroup conducted an online survey in the spring of 2011 which revealed that 39% ($\pm 5.6\%$) of UC Berkeley graduate and professional students report an unmet demand for outreach opportunities; and

WHEREAS, a major barrier preventing graduate and professional students from participating in outreach is a lack of programs that are tailored to the unique abilities and constraints of graduate students; and

Consent Calendar -- 1204a, On Directed Action to Renew the Mandate for the Community Outreach Workgroup (cont'd) - 35 -
-- 1205d, Update Executive Board Summer Quorum Requirements
-- 1205e, On By-law Revisions from the 2011-12 Rules Committee's Annual Review

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO RENEW THE MANDATE FOR THE COMMUNITY OUTREACH WORKGROUP (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Outreach Workgroup has spent the 2011/2012 school year putting together an outreach program that will benefit graduate and professional students by lowering the barriers to outreach activities as well as the community and the university; and

WHEREAS, the Outreach Workgroup is running pilots of the proposed programs this semester, in cooperation with the East Bay Regional Parks District and Berkeley Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the Outreach Workgroup is coordinating with the Communications Workgroup and CalCorps on increasing awareness of opportunities to become involved in the community; and

WHEREAS, the Outreach Workgroup will need to exist in order to continue these efforts;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Outreach Workgroup and its procedures be renewed for the 2012/2013 academic year.

The following Resolution, 1205d, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Gordon Hoople:

RESOLUTION TO UPDATE EXECUTIVE BOARD SUMMER QUORUM REQUIREMENTS

WHEREAS, the treasurer is required for counting quorum at Executive Board meetings; and

WHEREAS, the treasurer is not paid for June and July and is therefore not required to attend the Executive Board meetings;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the treasurer shall not be counted as a member of the Executive Board for the purposes of quorum during June and July.

The following Resolution, 1205e, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Adriana Mendoza and the 2011-12 Rules Committee:

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW REVISIONS FROM THE 2011-12 RULES COMMITTEE'S ANNUAL REVIEW

WHEREAS, the Rules Committee is charged with an annual review of the GA By-laws and Charter as per Article 4.15.3 of the Graduate Assembly By-laws;

Consent Calendar -- 1205e, On By-law Revisions from the 2011-12 Rules Committee's Annual Review (cont'd) - 36 -
-- 1205f, Encouraging Discussion on the Chancellor's New Governance Proposal

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW REVISIONS FROM THE 2011-12 RULES COMMITTEE'S ANNUAL REVIEW

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following changes are made to the Graduate Assembly's By-laws:

2.3.5 Vacancy. In the event that a position becomes vacant, a special election shall be held at the next Assembly meeting and will be the first order of business. The delegates must be given one week's notice of the vacancy and upcoming election. If time does not permit before the upcoming Assembly meeting, the Executive Board shall share the duties of the vacant position until the following Assembly meeting, with the exception of the President position. In the event the President resigns or is unavailable, there will be a determinative order of succession in the interim among the Executive Board, as follows: Campus Affairs Vice President, Assembly Affairs Vice President, External Affairs Vice President, and Treasurer. The interim or acting President shall serve with the assistance of the Executive Board until the special election at the following Assembly meeting.

[The outdated 2.3.5 and the following sections shall be renumbered accordingly]

6.8 Official Graduate Assembly Sponsorship. Groups holding events not sponsored by the Graduate Assembly yet seeking Graduate Assembly sponsorship shall request Delegate approval at the Assembly meeting. Sponsorship will be approved by a majority vote of the Assembly. If time does not permit, the Executive Board is authorized to make the sponsorship decision. As a matter of policy, the Executive Board should not approve controversial events. The definition of "controversial" is left to the discretion of the Executive Board.

The following Resolution, Resolution, 1205f, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by GA President Bahar Navab:

RESOLUTION ENCOURAGING DISCUSSION ON THE CHANCELLOR'S NEW GOVERNANCE PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, Chancellor Birgeneau, in collaboration with Provost Breslauer, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance John Wilton, and Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education Jud King, issued a report entitled "Modernizing Governance at the University of California: A Proposal that the Regents Create and Delegate Some Responsibilities to Campus Boards"; and

WHEREAS, in this report, they propose a new governance structure for the UC system; and

Resolution Discussion and Vote

RESOLUTION ENCOURAGING DISCUSSION ON THE CHANCELLOR'S NEW GOVERNANCE
PROPOSAL (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the abstract of that report says: "The University of California (UC) needs to respond to the fundamental and ongoing changes that are occurring around it if it is to remain financially sustainable, accessible, and academically excellent. As the campuses that make up UC have matured in the past 50 years they have, rightly, developed unique strengths and challenges. The uniqueness of individual campuses has been a natural response to the increasing complexity of our world and the highly competitive nature of higher education. These differences have been compounded by the facts that a much lesser fraction of the University budget now comes from the State and that there has been a continual evolution in the missions of the University as a whole. We propose that the Regents create and delegate appropriate responsibilities to campus-based governing boards to enable more effective campus oversight and management, while retaining their University-wide policy and fiduciary responsibilities."; and

WHEREAS, the new governance structure proposed in this report raises some interesting points, such as increased student representation in decision-making bodies, more localized control of policies, increased transparency, etc.; and

WHEREAS, it is important for the UC System including the students, Regents, faculty, and staff, to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of this proposal and/or suggest modifications to it; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has not yet had time to fully review and consider this proposal;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that while the Graduate Assembly has not endorsed this proposal, we strongly encourage the University of California community to discuss and consider its contents.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly encourages the Board of Regents to discuss this proposal at length at an upcoming meeting.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President is instructed to send a copy of this Resolution to President Mark Yudof and Regents Chair Sherry Lansing.

RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

Ms. Navab said she would go in bill number order in considering the bills.

The following Resolution, 1202e, was authored by Alberto M. Ortega Hinojosa:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANCELLOR ROBERT
BIRGENEAU'S ENDOWED CHAIRS PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the University of California is a public university supported in part by taxpayers, directly through State appropriations and indirectly through federal and State grants; and

WHEREAS, over the past four decades, the State of California has continuously decreased its contribution towards the University of California; and

WHEREAS, new financial models are needed to ensure that the University of California remains financially accessible to students regardless of their income; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Robert Birgeneau has developed a new funding model that will create endowments whose disbursements will be targeted towards graduate education and is modeled as follows:

The program will create endowed chairs at the amount of \$3 million per chair, whose annual disbursement of \$150,000 will be used to fund a faculty's salary and a doctoral student's education. The program highlights include the following:

- Federal and state governments match new philanthropic investments in university endowments 1:1:1;
- States also maintain existing funding levels for participating universities;
- Federal government appropriates \$1 billion annually for ten years for the program; this funding could represent a redirection of existing funds;
- Federal funds are available to all states and distributed according to objective criteria;
- The nation's leading Ph.D. granting public research and teaching universities would be eligible;
- Funding would support endowed academic chairs, directly supporting teaching and research; and

WHEREAS, the Chancellor's Endowed Chairs Proposal will create a long-term reliable and predictable source of income; and

WHEREAS, the Endowed Chairs Proposal will benefit UC Berkeley graduate students; and

WHEREAS, we understand that the proposal is still in draft form and the Chancellor is actively editing it to improve it;

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANCELLOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU'S ENDOWED CHAIRS PROPOSAL ((cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of California, Berkeley Graduate Assembly, supports Chancellor Birgeneau's Endowed Chair Proposal and is committed to collaborating with him in promoting its goals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice President and the External Affairs Committee will work at the State and federal levels to educate legislators and other relevant offices about this proposal.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice President will present this Resolution to the University of California Student Association and seek Systemwide student endorsement.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice President will present this Resolution to Student Advocates for Graduate Education and seek to include it as part of SAGE's priorities.

Ms. Navab said the Endowed Chairs Proposal was put forward by Chancellor Birgeneau. It would reallocate funding to create endowed chair positions that would then fund 10,000 grad student positions nationally, she believed. The proposal has been getting a lot of traction, with the Chancellor advocating for this federally. SAGE has also been advocating for this.

The Resolution states that the GA supports Chancellor Birgeneau's proposal; has the External Affairs Vice President advocate for it; and has the Resolution presented to SAGE and the UCSA. There was analysis by the External Affairs Committee saying it was excited about the proposal and recommended it pass.

Mr. Twigg said the one question the Rules Committee had was how this agenda item they'd lobby for would affect other items they're also lobbying for, given there are a limited number of things they could lobby for.

Ms. Navab said the GA is part of the SAGE coalition and SAGE is already advocating for this. So whether or not the GA advocates federally with SAGE, the GA advocates for the platform that SAGE was advocating. When the GA advocates for things Statewide, the Endowed Chairs proposal would be one of them.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1202e PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE,
RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU'S ENDOWED CHAIRS PROPOSAL

The following Resolution, 1203a, as amended on the floor, was authored by Jason Trager and Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT DEFINING SUSTAINABLE FOOD AND BEVERAGE CRITERIA

WHEREAS, section 6.2 of the By-laws requires the GA to purchase environmentally preferable products, defined as “products that have a lesser or reduced effect on human health and the environment when compared with competing products that serve the same purpose”; and

WHEREAS, food and beverage expenses represent the biggest portion of annual GA purchasing; and

WHEREAS, tap water is safe to drink, inexpensive, and a sustainable alternative to bottled water (considering both manufacturing costs, transport costs, and waste); and

WHEREAS, in the spring of 2011, UC Berkeley students passed, by 5-to-1 margin, a referendum to end the sale of bottled water on campus; and

WHEREAS, there exists a number of third-party certifications and standards -- such as the Real Food Challenge, of which UC is a participating institution -- aimed at qualifying what is sustainable food; and

WHEREAS, the GA also has a fixed food budget, and set limits for food expenses at meetings;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following paragraphs be added to section 6.2.3 (Required Practices) of the By-laws:

6.2.3.2. Water. The Graduate Assembly shall not purchase bottled water when tap water is available.

6.2.3.3. Food. The Environmental Sustainability Committee shall submit a list of criteria for Delegate approval at the October Delegates meeting for sustainable food purchases. The GA shall preferentially purchase food meeting the criteria approved by the Delegate Assembly, while respecting its existing food budget restrictions and Delegate Assembly preferences.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the following paragraphs be renumbered accordingly.

Mr. Trager said he’s been talking about this for quite a while. The Environmental Sustainability Committee had the idea that they should have some guidelines for the food that Delegates eat, and for the food to be environmentally sustainable, and for the GA to represent the true cost of food in its purchasing decisions. The bill was designed to do these things. Per the bill, the GA would maintain a list of criteria for sustainable food purchases and the GA would purchase food according to those standards.

Mr. Froehle asked why this needed to be a By-law amendment since it seemed that this was a standing policy and could just be agreed upon as an Assembly, rather than amending the By-laws. Mr. Trager

passing it as a By-law would mean the GA agreed upon it. It would be much stronger if it was in the By-laws.

Mr. Kehoe asked what evidence there was that having this as a standing policy wouldn't be strong enough. Mr. Trager said the evidence was the fact that there's been a lot of trouble conveying the educational portion of this policy. He thought a By-law would be stronger. Mr. Kehoe asked if the reason they didn't make this a workgroup was because the point of having an Environmental Sustainable Officer was to be part of the sustainability mission. If the Environmental Sustainability Officer couldn't bring up to the GA food choice considerations for Assembly meetings, he asked what point the position had. Mr. Trager said wording in the By-laws would give the policy teeth.

Mr. Onak asked what went into the "true cost of food." Mr. Trager said that if they bought beef that was raised in a concentrated animal farming operation, they could get it cheaply, at the same cost they get cheap veggies and semi-decent sustainable vegetarian food. If they buy animal products that come from sustainable production operations, that would be a little more expensive, depending on what animal they buy. Part of this was to eliminate buying non-sustainable food and part of it was to help the GA keep to these choices.

Mr. Rabkin asked how this currently worked in terms of who picks food vendors and what that was based on, and asked how many options they'd have. Ms. Navab said that for Delegate meetings, it was usually the Executive Assistant who places the food order, Lindsay Cast and Roxana Moreno. This semester they experimented with food from the Berkeley Food Co-operative, going through the Sustainability Committee. When people order food for other things, such as committee meetings and other things like that, what they bought was up to the committee chair.

Mr. Rabkin asked how well things worked with the Food Co-operative. Ms. Navab said she would let her fellow Delegates answer, because she knew that some of them had strong feelings about that.

Mr. Rabkin said he would like to have a sense of how strong a preference this was. The GA had many goals, and sustainability was one of them. Other goals for food were dollar cost, nutrition, dietary restrictions, large-volume prices, getting the food delivered, etc. They had many different requirements, and from the text of the Resolution, he didn't understand what the trade-offs would be among those preferences. It was well and good to be sustainable, but if the food didn't get there, it wouldn't be eaten.

Ms. Petros-Good said that while the GA tries to do things sustainably, that was a very broad term. As a body they don't have any rules about how they're willing to define it. The UC System has some sustainable food purchasing guidelines, but there are a large number of different ways the GA could make its own sustainable purchasing decisions. One idea was to have 20% of purchases come from certain categories. If the GA developed something like that, it would be much clearer how they actually wanted to make food sustainable.

Ms. Petros-Good said that in order to develop this thoughtfully, she moved to accept the Rules Committee's recommended amendment. The motion was seconded. The Rules Committee proposed striking "~~6.2.3.2. Food. The Environmental Sustainability Committee shall create and maintain a list of criteria for sustainable food purchases, based on recognized third-party standards. The GA shall preferentially purchase foods meeting these criteria, while respecting its existing food budget restrictions.~~" The

amendment would replace that language with the language stated in the bill above: “6.2.3.3. Food. The Environmental Sustainability Committee shall submit a list of criteria for Delegate approval... for sustainable food purchases. The GA shall preferentially purchase food meeting... Assembly preferences.”

Ms. Navab said they were in discussion of the amendment.

Mr. Kehoe said there was some reasoning behind the amendment the Rules Committee proposed. First, if they want to have rules to which the GA commits, those rules should be subject to Delegate approval. Second, while sustainable food at Assembly meetings was important, more important was the sustainability of the GA itself. And if the food wasn't good, people wouldn't attend Delegate meetings. That's the idea about Delegate Assembly preferences. People might not want to eat only vegan food. If they're to go sustainable and find the most sustainable food, and get it for every meeting, with no variety, no one would like that. So in addition, they should also take into consideration what people are looking for.

Mr. Helu moved to call the question. The motion was seconded. Ms. Navab said that motion wasn't debatable. The motion to call the question passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RULES COMMITTEE AMENDMENT PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab said they were under discussion of the Resolution, as amended.

Mr. Sehgal asked where the language was from about products that have reduced effect on human health and the environment, in the first Whereas Clause. He was also curious about the third-party standards for sustainable food purchases mentioned in the original Resolved Clause wording. He realized that might be preliminary since the proposal was now amended, but he was just curious. He might be in the minority, but he actually appreciated the direction that food has taken at Assembly meetings. He didn't have a problem with food that has been available. He thought the Resolution was well tempered. The GA would make preferential purchases to the extent that they're able, and try to be more responsible. He didn't think this was a mandate or a referendum for meetings or to source the vendors that would provide their food. To the extent that they could do so, the Resolution would have them make better, more responsible, more sustainable decisions.

Ms. De la Torre said they didn't really get any guidance from the Environmental Sustainability Committee about buying food that past year, so she took issue with the fact that it was mentioned that they hadn't followed that. This policy wouldn't just affect GA meetings, but would also affect the Projects, as well as committee meetings. Guidelines were a good idea, but they should also consider that this would affect other groups.

Mr. Froehle said he didn't policy think this belonged in the By-laws. The amendment the GA passed was non-sensical. It just says they'll do this in October. He asked if that would be this October, or every October. The whole thing didn't really seem like it was well thought out enough to be a part of the By-laws. Maybe they should put this on hold and revisit it in the fall.

Mr. Helu moved to table the Resolution until October, and in the meantime, to direct the Environmental Sustainability Committee to come up with a list of guidelines the GA could debate on how to actually implement their standing policy of sustainability in food choices. The motion to table was seconded.

On a point of information, Mr. Trager said they have preliminary guidelines.

THE MOTION PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE TO TABLE RESOLUTION 1203a UNTIL OCTOBER, RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT DEFINING SUSTAINABLE FOOD AND BEVERAGE CRITERIA, AND TO DIRECT THE ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE TO COME UP WITH GUIDELINES ON SUSTAINABLE FOOD CHOICES.

The following Resolution, 1205a, as amended on the floor, was authored by Mike Sheen:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING ROUNDS FOR THE 2012–2013 ACADEMIC YEAR

WHEREAS, By-law 4.15.4. requires the Funding Committee to make recommendations to the Delegate Assembly on how to allocate the funds under the authority of the Graduate Assembly. The goal of such recommendations shall be to improve the quality of graduate student life by supporting individual graduate students, departmental activities, and graduate student groups; and

WHEREAS, By-law 2.3.2 calls for the Officers to take specific action as directed by the Delegate Assembly, the Executive Board, and/or the President, provided that those actions are consistent with the Charter and By-laws. If the directed actions contradict each other, the action directed by the Delegate Assembly shall take precedence, followed by the action directed by the Executive Board; and

WHEREAS, By-law 4.13 requires Delegate approval of Funding Committee Procedures; and

WHEREAS, there is a gap in servicing student funding needs due to the summer break that cannot be efficiently addressed by requiring Delegate approval of the funding report following the summer holiday (“Round 1 Funding Report”); and

WHEREAS, the Business Office Manager, Funding Advisor, and Funding Chair estimate the service gap -- spanning from the start end of the Spring Semester to the start of the event period covered by Round 1 in academic year 2012-2013 -- can be closed by a Dedicated Summer Contingency Fund of up to \$8,000.00. Said funds would come out of the existing funding award budget. *This is not an additional budget request.* This amount represents approximately 6% of the funding award budget and 2% of the total Graduate Assembly budget;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Executive Board be authorized to approve funding only for the Dedicated Summer Contingency Fund of \$8000.00, thereby closing the gap. Any unallocated Dedicated Contingency funds return to the funding award budget available for Round 2 in academic year 2012-2013, as per current procedure.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the 2012-2013 funding round calendar be as follows:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING ROUNDS FOR THE 2012–2013 ACADEMIC YEAR

<u>Funding Round</u>	<u>Application Deadline</u>	<u>Event Timeline</u>	<u>Notification Date</u>	<u>Deadline for Receipts</u>
Summer	Rolling	Jun. 1–Sept. 13	Rolling	30 days after event
1 (Fall '12)	Aug. 30	Sept. 14–Dec. 6	Sept. 14	Dec. 11
Winter Contingency	Nov. 19	Dec. 7 – Feb. 7	Dec. 7	30 days after event
2 (Spring '13)	Jan. 24	Feb. 8–May 17	Feb. 8	May 21

Mr. Twigg moved to adopt the Rules Committee’s amendment to the first Resolved Clause: “Resolved, ~~that the Executive Board be granted Directed Action to approve funding only for~~ *that the Executive Board be authorized to approve funding only for* the Dedicated Summer Contingency Fund of \$8000.00....” The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FIRST RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Helu moved to call the question. The motion immediately come to a vote was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1205a, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING ROUNDS FOR THE 2012–2013 ACADEMIC YEAR.

The following Resolution, 1205b, as amended on the floor, was authored by Mike Sheen, Patrick Baur, and Gordon Hoople:

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, the Funding Procedures are in need of revision as documented in the attached addendum;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, to amend sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Funding Committee Procedures accordingly:

3. Categories of Funds. The GA distributes ~~four~~ *five* categories of funds:

- A. Group meetings, events, and resources (GMER),
- B. Group Grants
- C. Publications
- D. Individual Travel Awards
- E. Funding Contingency and Appeals

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES (cont'd)

Note: *The following activities and items will not be granted funding in any category: weapons, alcohol, illegal substances, fundraisers, gifts, fellowships, direct contributions to political campaigns. Durable goods and computer software may be granted funding so long as they are made accessible to all graduate students.*

A. GMER Allocations. Funding awards made for Graduate Meetings, Events, and Resources (GMER) are allocated in an attempt to serve the largest graduate student population. GMER applications that are completed accurately and in accordance with the policies and guidelines set forth in these procedures and the Funding Guide will be funded as determined by the supergroup academic unit method described below. Merit is *not* assessed during the funding allocation process for GMER applications.

i. Supergroups Academic Units and Interdisciplinary Groups. In order to serve the maximum number of departments across campus, the Funding Committee, established ~~disciplinary~~ “supergroups” for the following funding year by the preceding May Delegates Meeting. This is the Membership of Supergroups: two categories for student groups:

- ~~1. **Definition** Departments are categorized into supergroups based on anticipated social affiliation, disciplinary overlap, or by departmental petition. Supergroups include one or more academic units in related disciplines and are guaranteed a percentage of available GMER funds relative to the student population. This supergroup system also addresses the concerns of allocating funds to small departments who serve communities larger than the number of graduate students dedicated to that discipline would indicate.~~
 - ~~2. **Populations** The number of students in each academic unit is determined by the Graduate Division. The population count will take into account only units that pay the ASUC activity fee. In cases where there is a discrepancy between the number reported by the Graduate Registrar and the Graduate Division (e.g., for the professional schools), a GA Delegate from that academic unit may submit an official letter from his or her Registrar (or equivalent administrator) to the Funding Committee to correct the discrepancy. The Funding Committee will use the most recent official numbers of graduate students available when calculating GMER funding.~~
 - ~~3. **Notice and Delegate Approval** The listing of the Membership of Supergroups used for the current funding year will be made available by the April Delegates Meeting. Delegates are asked to suggest changes to the Memberships of Supergroups by the May Delegates Meeting, at which time the Delegate Assembly can approve the Membership of the Supergroups by a simple majority. If a simple majority cannot be reached, the previous year’s Membership of Supergroups stands.~~
- 1. Academic Units (AUs).** Academic Units are defined using the same grouping of departments and programs used by the Graduate Assembly to assign Delegates (See Graduate Assembly Charter § 2.1). Each academic department or program represented by one or more Delegates will have an associated Academic Unit for funding purposes. The Academic Affairs Vice President is responsible for maintaining this list.

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES (cont'd)

- i. Populations.** The number of students in each Academic Unit is determined by the Assembly Affairs Vice President based on census data from the Graduate Division (see By-law 6.6). The population count will take into account only units that pay the ASUC activity fee. In cases where there is a discrepancy between the number reported by the Graduate Registrar and the Graduate Division (e.g., for the professional schools), a GA Delegate from that academic unit may submit an official letter from his or her Registrar (or equivalent administrator) to the Funding Committee to correct the discrepancy. The Funding Committee will use the most recent official numbers of graduate students available when calculating GMER funding Academic Unit Population.
- ii. Consolidation of Academic Units.** If so desired for the purposes of GMER funding, Academic Units may be consolidated and renamed accordingly. All active Delegates from each original Academic Unit must agree to the consolidation in writing and submitted to the Funding Chair for approval.
- 2. Interdisciplinary Groups.** Certain groups across campus do not fit neatly into Academic Units. In order to prevent individual Academic Units from bearing the burden of funding these organizations, a separate subcategory of Interdisciplinary Groups will be created. Student groups that believe they are interdisciplinary will be asked to demonstrate significant membership across multiple AUs as well as receive the endorsement of Delegates from at least two different AUs. The Funding Chair will make the final determination as to whether or not a group should be classified as interdisciplinary. Appeals may be brought to the Funding Appeals Committee.
- ii. GMER Allocation Process.** If the funding requests in a supergroup are below its guaranteed allocation, the remainder of funds is distributed to remaining unsatisfied supergroups in proportion to their graduate student population. This process is repeated until all funds are allocated. If the funding requests from a supergroup exceed its guaranteed allocation each student group in this supergroup receives a fraction of the amount requested; that fraction is equal to the ratio of the allocated funds over the requested funds for the whole supergroup. The following algorithm will be followed for assigning funds:
1. All AUs and interdisciplinary groups applying for GMER will receive a minimum floor of funding. This floor will be determined by the Funding Chair and will not be less than \$100. No interdisciplinary groups shall be guaranteed a minimum floor funding as stated in this section.
 2. Interdisciplinary groups in the aggregate will be awarded funding proportional to the amount requested by interdisciplinary groups divided by the total amount requested to GMER.
 3. Each interdisciplinary group will receive an amount proportional to the total amount requested.
 4. The remainder of GMER funds will be distributed amongst each academic unit in proportion to their population.

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES (cont'd)

5. For those AUs who are receive the total amount requested, the remainder of unallocated funds will be redistributed to all remaining Academic Units, in proportion to their graduate student population, until all GMER funds have been distributed.

iii. Departmental Declaration. Applications for all funding rounds (except before the Fall Semester begins, see below) require the signature of the GA Delegate(s) or Alternate that represent that group's membership. The named Delegate must approve via signature that the group is part of the Academic Unit. By default, when a graduate student group submits a GMER funding application the Funding Committee will use the department affiliation(s) of the named GA Delegate(s) to assign the student group to an Academic Unit for that funding round using the Membership of Academic Units.

~~Groups applying before the Fall Semester begins must list their expected and accurate department affiliations(s). The Funding Committee will review previous group department affiliations(s) to ensure accuracy, and follow up with GA Delegates once they are appointed. Applicants who are later found to have misrepresented their group will be ineligible for GA funding for the remainder of the school year. The named Delegate must approve via signature that the group is part of the Academic Unit. The Funding Committee shall have discretion to waive the requirement for a signature and the Funding Committee shall consult with the Delegates from that department before making a decision to waive the signature requirement. If a student group is unable to obtain the name signature of a GA Delegate or alternate, the group may submit a funding application and make its case to the Funding Committee. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all academic units indicated in a membership roster, if provided, in proportion to representation in the membership roster or at the discretion of the Funding Committee.~~

iv. Interdisciplinary and Cross Supergroup Applications ~~In the case of multiple GA Delegate signatories from different supergroups, the Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging in equal fractions to each of the different supergroups linked to from the GA Delegate signatories.~~

~~If a student group is unable to obtain the name of a GA Delegate, the group may submit a funding application and make its case to the Funding Committee. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups indicated in a membership roster, if provided, in proportion to representation in the membership roster or at the discretion of the Funding Committee.~~

B. Group Grants Allocations. Group grant applications are evaluated based on the extent to which grant projects serve the goals and values delineated in the Funding Guide: diversity, community service, student activism, and educational improvement. ~~Grant applications either receive the full amount requested (up to the funding limit) or are denied funding.~~ An expensive application with moderate merit will receive a lower funding priority than an application with a moderate budget and equivalent or greater merit. This policy facilitates the Funding Committee in allocating the GA's limited available funds in a manner which best serves the graduate community.

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES (cont'd)

~~A representative from each group is invited to make themselves available, either by phone or by email, to respond to questions or requests to modify a grant funding application at designated Funding Committee meetings. The student group representative may be asked to amend the request to remove a specific line item to allow for a modified project to be fully funded.~~

C. Publications Allocations. Groups wishing to fund publications with money from the Graduate Assembly should apply to this category. Applications for publications will be reviewed based on the total audience reached, ~~dollar per issue~~ printing cost per issue, perceived value to graduate students, as well as other criteria the Funding Committee establishes. The Funding Committee will work with the Sustainability Committee in developing guidelines related to publications.

D. Travel Grants Awards Allocations. Individual graduate students are encouraged to apply for up to \$300 in travel money to present at a conference. If the amount requested in travel grants exceeds the available funds, the allocations will be determined by lottery. The Business Office administers the distribution of travel grants.

E. Funding Contingency and Appeals Allocation. Applications for contingency funding will be granted funds at the discretion of the Funding Committee, based on the application's merit and urgency. Groups are also encouraged to apply under this category for computer software that can be made accessible to all graduate students, and durable goods that will be housed in Anthony Hall and are available for checkout by all graduate student groups. The Funding Appeal Committee will allocate contingency funds to resolve funding appeals.

At the end of each academic semester (not more than three weeks before the last day of the semester), the Funding Committee may allocate any unallocated contingency funds in service to the GA by contributing to GA projects funding, purchasing property for the GA, or supplementing other GA budget categories. Traditionally, the Fall Semester surplus contingency funding will be rolled over into Spring Semester group funding.

4. Funding Rounds. Funds in each category are distributed over several funding rounds. The application deadline and time period covered by each round is published in the Funding Guide. The allocation of funds amongst different rounds and funding categories will be determined by the Funding Committee, in accordance with historical trends of funding demand (as obtained from the GA Business Office).

5. Funding Limit. By the May Delegate Assembly meeting of the preceding year, the Funding Committee may set a limit for the amount that can be request by any applicant in a given funding category. Applications that request more than the limit will be denied.

Mr. Hoople said he had several amendments. Mr. Kline moved to divide the amendments. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Hoople moved to amend the Resolution by unstriking "alcohol" in Section 3, Categories of Funds, the "Note:" section. The amendment would include "alcohol" among the items not granted funding in

any category of funds and would read as follows: "Note: The following... items will not be granted funding...: weapons, alcohol....".

Mr. Rabkin said that at first the GA didn't fund alcohol because he thought their funding had strings attached, and GA money couldn't be used for alcohol. He didn't mind having the Funding Committee saying yes to events with alcohol and just wanted to know what their concerns were. Ms. Navab said the GA could not spend student fee money on alcohol. Just so everyone was clear, it was commercial money that had to be allocated for that.

Mr. Kehoe asked if there was currently commercial money allocated to student group funding. Ms. Navab said there's a line item for alcohol in the budget, a small pot, about \$4,000, generally used for GSC events and the things like that. A request for funding from that line item could be made to the Executive Board for approval. And if there was a request to spend a significant portion of money on alcohol, they'd actually have to actually allocate that money from commercial reserves.

Mr. Hoople said he struck out "alcohol" and later changed his mind, because he thought it made more sense to have the Grad Social Club and the Executive Board regulate alcohol, just as a matter of procedure and policy. He didn't think the GA didn't want to give alcohol to small group functions, and want to reserve it for larger events that have interdisciplinary components, with a bunch of people attending.

Mr. Rabkin asked if this was just because there wasn't a lot of hard money without strings, or if there was some other reason. Mr. Hoople said the main reason is that their commercial money was totally separate. It was also significantly lower than the GA's student funding, around \$50,000 in commercial revenue, about one-third of the overall budget. That commercial revenue was also precious because it could be used to sue the University.

Ms. Navab said that commercial revenue was the GA's unrestricted pot of money, the only pot they could be use for basically whatever they wanted.

Mr. Kehoe said that even if the GA did have unrestricted money they could use for alcohol, it seemed like a bad idea to just allow groups to apply for alcohol, and they might just apply for it every time. He thought there should be some level of merit applied to such requests.

A motion to call the question on the amendment was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO UNSTRIKE "ALCOHOL" IN THE SECTION 3 "NOTE:", AND TO INCLUDE ALCOHOL AMONG THE ITEMS NOT GRANTED FUNDING IN ANY CATEGORY OF FUNDS, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Hoople said the second amendment would unstrike 3.A.iii, Departmental Declaration, and to add a sentence at the end of the second paragraph: "The named Delegate must approve via signature that the group in question is indeed part of the academic unit."

Mr. Kline said it sounded like the idea was to require groups to get a signature from a sponsoring Delegate. Mr. Baur said that was correct. Mr. Kline said he thought it was very dangerous to require a student

group to get approval from its sponsoring Delegates. A possibility could be envisioned where a Delegate didn't like a particular student group and that student group could therefore be barred from getting funding.

Mr. Kehoe said this came up last year and they had a solution.

Mr. Kline moved to combine the amendment to unstrike iii. Departmental Declaration, and replacing the above language with, "The named Delegate must approve via signature that the group is part of the academic unit." THE MOTION TO COMBINE AMENDMENTS WAS SECONDED AND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Cole moved to keep the language constant, and to amend the amendment, to change the word "super-group" to "academic unit" in iii, Departmental Declaration. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Rabkin said he thought it was useful to have a Delegate as a checkpoint. In a big department with many student groups, like Math, the groups compete for the same pot of GA money from that Department. Somebody in the Department needed to be able to keep track of how many requests were being made so people in the same department wouldn't find themselves competing against each other. There should be some interdepartmental coordination. In his Department, the GA Delegate is the only person who could do that, and the only person who would be paying attention to GA funding policy. It's useful to have somebody who had to sign off. He thought the fear that a Delegate might blackball some student group in a department was farfetched. GA Delegates are elected by the department and he didn't think a department would put somebody up if a GA Delegate was refusing money to a group. He thought departments were very qualified to police their own Delegates, whereas it was difficult for student groups to police what a Delegate was doing.

Mr. Twigg said he thought if they didn't want to have items on the agenda that Delegates can't answer for. It made it more complicated for the Funding Chair to pull up records.

A motion to call the question on the amendment was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO 3.A.iii, DEPARTMENTAL DECLARATION, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab said the last amendment from the Rules Committee was in 3.C., "Publications Allocations." The Committee recommended that "dollar per issue" be struck and replaced by "printing cost per issue, perceived value to graduate students,...." As amended, the wording in 3.C. would read as follows: Applications for publications will be reviewed based on the total audience reached, ~~dollar per issue~~ *printing cost per issue, perceived value to graduate students*, as well as other criteria the Funding Committee establishes.

Mr. Helu moved to call the question on the amendment. The motion to come to a vote was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO 3.C. RECOMMENDED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Hsueh said she appreciated a Delegate would sign the funding application, and thought that was a good point. But from the point of view of the Business Office, so many times people submit an application right at the deadline, and they wouldn't be able to get their Delegate to sign. She asked what they'd do about that. There would be many times the office wouldn't be able to accept an application by the deadline because of not having a Delegate signature. Also, Delegates may sometimes not arrive on campus to actually sign an application. She asked if there was any provision for that, because otherwise, very good education would have to be done in departments so they're aware of this new policy.

Mr. Baur said that in further consideration, he would propose adding a clause to the end of line 133 that basically says, "The Funding Committee shall have discretion to waive the requirement for signature."

Mr. Kehoe asked if that language was already in the Funding Guide. Ms. Navab said the language currently says that a signature wasn't needed. The signature was still on the form, but it wasn't required at the moment. Mr. Kline said needing a signature was implied. Ms. Navab said funding isn't denied if there's no signature.

Mr. Davidson asked how this language would affect assigning a group to a particular academic unit. If the Funding Committee has discretion, he asked where it would place the group, and thought there should be language about that. Mr. Baur said this dealt with the discretion of the Funding Committee to waive the requirement for a signature. Mr. Davidson said there's no line on the funding application. Ms. Navab said the funding application would be revised.

Mr. Helu said it was risky to allow someone to place a group wherever they thought was appropriate. He was in favor requiring a signature because it would actually encourage departments to have Delegates who participate in the GA, which was part of the whole funding decision originally. Secondly, there have been groups that used his name on an application and he didn't know who they were or what they were doing. He wanted to make sure that groups in his Department that use his name get an appropriate amount of money. Not having a Delegate's signature represents a greater risk than allowing no signature.

Mr. Niederhut said that if someone turns in a form without a signature, he asked why they couldn't send an e-mail, and asked why somebody couldn't e-mail him about a group in his Department.

Mr. Hoople said it was a lot of work for the Funding Committee to deal with this stuff. They're trying to push responsibility for funding to the groups that apply. If someone applies for funding they should be able to take the time to identify their Delegate and ask them about it, whether it was a good idea, and how to get through the Funding Committee. Ms. Navab said groups might not have a Delegate.

Mr. Riffe said a signature was still needed from somebody in the department to approve everything in lieu of a Delegate. He asked if they could have a department chair or student administrator sign it, some representative staff, to sign off in a Delegate's absence.

Mr. Froehle moved to leave this up to the discretion of the Funding Committee.

A motion to call the question and come to a vote was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Kline said they could amend the amendment to say that the Funding Committee must contact the Delegate of the department during deliberations in order to waive the signature. That way a department

Delegate would be contacted and would know that people were asking to go above their head, essentially, to get money.

Mr. Kline moved to amend the amendment, to read as follows: "The Funding Committee shall consult with Delegates from that department before making the decision to waive the signature requirement." The motion was seconded by Mr. Froehle. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT TO 3.A.iii PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Sehgal asked if a department that wasn't represented would not qualify for funding. Ms. Navab said it was her understanding that this was amended last year when the GA removed the signature requirement, that they do not have a Delegate. But apparently, that wasn't reflected. Mr. Kehoe said that it took the Committee two hours to work out the language if a student group was unable to get a GA Delegate to submit a funding application.

Ms. Navab said there wasn't anything that says that an Alternate could count or not count as signature approval. That would need to be specified in the Funding Guide, and whether or not people wanted an Alternate to be able to sign off.

Mr. Baur said it was important for the Funding Committee to have some discretion, because if they have hard, fast, and rigid rules, the outcome would be that groups wouldn't get funding if they don't meet the letter of the law, and if the GA didn't have discretion. He didn't think that was an outcome any of them really desired. The GA has a lot of money and they'd like to give it to groups that were deserving.

Ms. Navab said the motion was add a clause to line 133, "The Funding Committee shall have discretion to waive the requirement for a signature and the Funding Committee shall consult with the Delegates from that department before making a decision to waive the signature requirement." THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab said they were under consideration of the entire bill, as amended.

Mr. Kline asked what the Astronomy Students Society would have received in Round 2 of that past year under the new funding policy. Mr. Baur said he had no way to answer that. Mr. Hoople said he thought there would have been a slight reduction, but nothing like a cut of half or two-thirds. Mr. Kline said that was great for him, but he was asking for everybody. Mr. Hoople said they put up very representative cases and what happened in general was that groups in a supergroup that had a lot of money and not a lot of groups, would get less money in the new system. But the Funding Committee felt this was a more equitable distribution of funding resources across the entire graduate student body.

Mr. Twigg said his concern was with interdisciplinary groups and giving them a guaranteed floor of \$100. That's how it was worded in 3.A.ii.1., GMER Allocation Process. Mr. Hoople said the way they ran the procedure through in the spreadsheet for calculations was with a floor. Mr. Twigg asked if everybody got a floor. He felt that given a number of interdisciplinary groups, the situation would result in the exact situation as they had this time. The German Medieval group under the current system could have the same scenario, and could vastly exceed its funding proportion because some of those departments are more amenable to interdepartmental, interdisciplinary activities. And since they have a floor of \$100, they could get quite a bit more money.

Mr. Helu moved to get rid of the motion they just made, about not getting a signature, and replace it with the language on lines 146 to 150 that everyone already spent a lot of time on last year. That seemed to make sense with him. The amendment would also strike “name” and replace it with “signature” on line 146 and to strike “supergroup” wherever it appears in the paragraph, to be replaced by “academic unit.”

As amended, 3.A.iii., would read as follows: “If a student group is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate or alternate, the group may submit a funding application and make its case to the Funding Committee. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all academic units indicated in a membership roster, if provided, in proportion to representation in the membership roster or at the discretion of the Funding Committee.”

Mr. Kehoe said that one important thing about this language with respect to the new system is that with supergroups, there are new interdisciplinary groups that are treated separately. If they're unable to obtain a Delegate signature, if the group is multidisciplinary, the only other option would be to place it to the interdisciplinary group. This would allow for proportional representation.

Ms. Petros-Good said this didn't make sense with the way that funding groups will work out. She didn't think they could make this change without contradicting themselves.

Mr. Twigg said the reason they're requiring Delegates to know about the application is so that when it goes to a vote, they know there would be at least one Delegate who can speak to the application.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO 3.A.iii, DEPARTMENTAL DECLARATION, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 11-9.

Mr. Froehle said he would like to speak on academic units. As written, the By-laws are not consistent in the sense that they ask the GA to allocate money beyond what money it might have. The GA would have a floor cap plus a proportional part if certain situations would add up to more than the amount of money they're allocating. He thought a floor was unnecessary and thought they should strike the language of having a floor. He moved to strike the entirety of lines 109 through 111 in clause 1. of “GMER Allocation Process,” with 3.A.ii.1 to read: “All AUs and interdisciplinary groups *applying for GMER will receive a minimum floor of funding. This floor will be determined by the Funding Chair and will not be less than \$100. No interdisciplinary groups shall be guaranteed a minimum floor funding as stated in this section.*”

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Kehoe said it made sense to strike that for interdisciplinary groups. He thought it was fine if they just say this was for academic units, and thought that made sense, since these are very small departments that could fall under that cap. There's never going to be enough academic units at \$100 to go over the funding budget for groups. So Mr. Kehoe said he would like to amend the amendment to simply strike “and interdisciplinary groups,” to read as follows:

3.A.ii.1, GMER Allocation Process: “All AUs ~~and interdisciplinary groups~~ *applying for GMER will receive a minimum floor of funding. This floor will be determined by the Funding Chair and will not be less than \$100.*”

Mr. Kehoe's motion to amend Mr. Froehle's amendment was seconded.

Mr. Sehgal asked why the Committee proposed this, and didn't know that the language of the amendment would be trumped by the fact that the Committee has this direction as drafted in the amendment as a whole. If the discretion of the Committee trumps the minutia of this amendment, perhaps the GA should consider the decision of the larger group.

Mr. Baur said the rationale behind the floors was equivalent to the rationale behind why the US House of Representatives allots every state at least one representative, and the purpose of a floor was to protect really small academic units. Even if there was an academic unit with a handful of students, it was hard to imagine even being able to order pizza and Pepsi with the current food and drink guidelines. That \$100 floor was there to ensure that groups have a certain minimum amount of funding that the GA thinks was roughly enough to host several regular events throughout a semester.

Mr. Twigg said that since they're only striking interdisciplinary groups, those are very tiny groups that would already be covered by academic units. The amendment was valid to the objection, but amending the amendment covered that.

Mr. Cole moved to call the question. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. KEHOE'S AMENDMENT TO MR. FROEHLE'S AMENDMENT, STRIKING "ALL INTERDISCIPLINARY GROUPS," PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Froehle said his objection was to the interdisciplinary group allocations. Most groups are interdisciplinary. His Department, Mathematics, is actually in the Logic Group. Together, they're interdisciplinary, and thus eligible for the interdisciplinary allocation. If most groups are interdisciplinary, that would bring the GA back to the problem of not every group getting an equal amount of the pot, and it actually went back in the other direction.

Mr. Niederhut said he wasn't sure how comfortable he felt with the whole Resolution. He liked the idea of supergroups and that the GA was trying to be fair in its allocations. He didn't want people in different departments getting different amounts of pizza.

A Delegate said that since the bill splits money for publications and money for meetings, he asked if it was possible for one group to apply for two separate allocations, one for each. He asked if that was stipulated. Ms. Navab said it was the GA's current practice that groups could apply for either pot. But they couldn't be stacked, or doubled. The Delegate asked if the same group could apply to different pots. Ms. Navab said they could, and could exceed caps.

The Delegate moved to amend the Resolution to change "Delegate" to "Delegate or alternate" in all cases where that made sense, for signature and verification requirements. The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Quiroga moved to amend line 81, to strike the words "GMER funding" and replace them with "Academic unit population," to read as follows:

“3.A.i.1.i. ASUC activity fee. In cases where there is a discrepancy..., a GA Delegate may submit an official letter... to correct the discrepancy. The Funding Committee will use the most recent official numbers of graduate students available when calculating ~~GMER funding~~ *academic unit population*.” He said the section talks about population. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Quiroga moved to amend 3.A.ii.1, to add a final sentence, “No interdisciplinary groups shall be guaranteed a minimum floor of funding as stated in this section.” He was trying to remove ambiguity and make it clear to everyone.

Mr. Kehoe said he objected. Academic units and interdisciplinary groups were defined separately and weren't the same thing. There's nothing about interdisciplinary units. It just seemed unnecessary. No one will read through this and ask why they're discriminating against interdisciplinary groups.

Ms. Navab said that seeing no further speakers the question was automatically called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO 3.A.ii.1, ADDING A FINAL SENTENCE, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab said they were back to discussion of the Resolution as a whole. Mr. Cole said that if they think about this in terms of how an individual group of theirs might fare, or their department, he would ask them to think about the overall process. There's a certain amount of arbitrariness in how supergroups are defined. Implementing a policy like this could make it clear what was happening. There was confusion about how people get assigned to various supergroups, or what the rationale was. Under the proposed system, there wouldn't be the same sort of discretion. It would be a clearer system, something everybody bought into.

Mr. Kehoe said he understood the issue with everybody moving to be an interdisciplinary group in the future, which would be a problem. However, current wording leaves the proportional allocation structure intact, which would allow the GA to perhaps eliminate interdisciplinary groups if it chose, and fall back on the existing infrastructure without having to reinvent it. Or, the proportion of money allocated to interdisciplinary groups could be capped. There were many ways to fix this if it becomes a problem. But it serves a useful purpose to have interdisciplinary groups that might be campus-wide groups, perhaps.

A motion to call the question on the Resolution, as amended, and passed by hand-vote 15-6.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1205b, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 20-4, RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.

The following Resolution, 1205c, as amended on the floor, was authored by Patrick Baur and Mike Sheen

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SUMMER FUNDING WORKGROUP AND DIRECTED ACTION

WHEREAS, Resolution #1205a proposes a two-round funding structure; and

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SUMMER FUNDING WORKGROUP AND DIRECTED ACTION

WHEREAS, this new funding structure specifies that funding for events taking place between the end of May through August should come out of contingency; and

WHEREAS, the Delegate Assembly is not in session during this period; and

WHEREAS, the funding committee did not deliver a funding guide as required in the By-laws;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a Summer Funding Workgroup be established. This Workgroup shall have a minimum of four (4) and a maximum of eleven (11) Delegates. The Workgroup will be chaired by the Funding Officer and will convene as necessary to consider contingency.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that since the Delegate Assembly is not in session over the summer, the Executive Board is authorized to review and approve contingency recommendations put forward by the Summer Funding Workgroup.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Summer Funding Workgroup amend the Funding Guide in accordance with the revised funding procedures, and present it to the Executive Board for approval

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that summer (June 1, 2012 - September 13, 2012) contingency funding shall not exceed \$8,000 in total allocations. Round 1 funding in the fall will not be impacted by this cap.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Summer Funding Workgroup shall review Round 1 funding applications and make a recommendation to the Delegates for approval at the September 13, 2012 Assembly meeting. This Summer Funding Workgroup shall be dissolved as of September 13, 2012.

Mr. Hoople said they need a Workgroup over the summer to deal with funding matters.

Mr. Helu asked what was needed to be done by the Workgroup. Mr. Hoople said that all the stuff they just talked about needed to be implemented.

Mr. Kline asked if they also had to approve the Funding Guide.

Ms. Navab said that as a side note, the GA also just approved some new funding rounds, and maybe they should make sure the dates in the Resolution match up with the new funding rounds.

Mr. Kline asked if the Summer Funding Workgroup would make the allocations for Round 1, in the Fall Semester. Ms. Navab said it would. Mr. Kline said that was a tremendous amount of power. Ms. Navab said the decisions come to the Delegates. It's similar to the process they did last summer.

Mr. Quiroga moved to amend the language on line 24, the fourth Resolved Clause, to strike "\$7,000" and amend it to "8,000," the language just approved earlier that evening. The motion to amend was seconded.

As amended, the fourth Resolved Clause would read as follows:

"Resolved, that summer... contingency funding shall not exceed ~~\$7,000~~ \$8,000 in total allocations...."

Mr. Helu asked if the amendment would match things up with previous language. Ms. Navab said it fixes one part, but she believed the time period was still wrong.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Helu moved to adopt the recommendations of the Rules Committee. The motion was seconded.

As amended, the fourth Resolved Clause would read as follows:

"Resolved, ~~that since the Delegate Assembly is not in session over the summer, the Executive Board is directed to review and approve contingency recommendations put forward by the Summer Funding Workgroup. The authority of the Executive Board to act is limited only to summer contingency funding and shall only be valid until September 13, 2012 (date of first GA meeting).~~ that since the Delegate Assembly is not in session over the summer, the Executive Board is authorized to review and approve contingency recommendations put forward by the Summer Funding Workgroup.

THE MOTION TO AMEND, AND ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RULES COMMITTEE, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Davidson said the dates in the fifth Resolved Clause were wrong and moved to amend them, to read as follows:

"Resolved, that summer (~~May-August~~ June 1, 2012 - September 13, 2012) contingency funding shall not exceed \$8,000...."

The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1205c, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SUMMER FUNDING WORKGROUP AND DIRECTED ACTION. [Note: Later in the meeting the bill was reconsidered and further amended.]

Ms. Navab said the next Resolution was 1205g, To Take Back the Tap. People didn't have a copy, but Ms. Cast could post it and people could look at it on their computers.

Mr. Trager said this is an endorsement of the move the student body wanted to take by their vote in a general referendum towards removing bottled water from the campus. The Resolution shows the GA's support for removing bottled water in favor of tap water and the benefits from that.

Mr. Kehoe asked if this would be better as a Directed Action. Usually these types of Resolution have some directed action as part of them, and they're delivered to some University official. But this Resolution didn't have anything like that. Ms. Navab said it was submitted late, and since they didn't have a chance to vet it, people should amend it to have whatever action they'd like.

Mr. Rabkin said it was mostly symbolic and harmless. His research group buys bottled seltzer water, and they would not be happy to be told to use the tap. There are reasons why they buy seltzer water, and the Resolution would be inconvenient for them.

Mr. Trager said passing this would be beneficial. This is a University that was educated about standards. Mr. Rabkin said it would destroy department recruiting to do this.

Ms. Petris-Good said the concern was valid, because as people change habits, there will always be issues with taking things in a different way. But there are solutions and support. The Take Back the Tap initiative is much larger group of people trying to help people move in this direction. They might be able to help department, e.g., develop systems.

Mr. Riffe said the ASUC version of the bill, which the Senate passed by a sizeable majority, included a full, comprehensive, scientific backing of this idea. When the Sustainability Committee drafted this bill, they were asked whether they wanted to simply lift all the research in the ASUC version and place it in the GA's bill, and they decided not to. But research has been done and the benefits of using tap water have been vetted.

Mr. Froehle said the ASUC passed this Resolution in September of last year. It was insulting that so many things in the GA were done in the last minute. They e-mailed the bill the day before the final meeting of the year to discuss something the ASUC did at the beginning of the school year. There's no urgency to passing this and he would suggest tabling the bill until next fall.

Ms. Navab said that for a rules clarification, the GA's MOU with the ASUC states that unless the GA takes an opposing stance on something the ASUC has approved, the ASUC's motion carries for all students. So if people were simply in support of this, there was no reason the GA officially needed to do this. They could do it as a vote of affirmation, but it wasn't required for taking a stance. The GA only needed to take a position if they wanted to modify or oppose the ASUC's stance.

Mr. Sehgal said he was in favor of the Take Back the Tap initiative, but he appreciated the urgency in which the bill was submitted. In light of both of those, he moved to table the bill indefinitely. He felt that if they were to propose a Resolution in support of this, they should draft stronger and more reasoned language. With that, he thought this would pass easily. Secondly, it didn't really matter if they were just going to support this because all they'd be doing with the bill was to tell the ASUC that it did a good job. He thought the GA could take a better stab at this at a later date. The motion to table was seconded.

THE MOTION TO TABLE RESOLUTION 1205g INDEFINITELY PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, TO TAKE BACK THE TAP.

Ms. Navab said there were three remaining issues. They just created two Workgroups and needed to appoint people to them. Thirdly, the Funding Guide should have been submitted in April for approval by the GA, but was not. One way to get around that was to grant the Executive Board the power to do that over the summer. However, they couldn't have a Directed Action without a Resolution. So she would recommend that the Assembly reconsider 1205c, Resolution to Establish a Summer Funding Workgroup and Directed Action, and to amend it by adding a Resolved Clause containing a directed action.

Mr. Helu asked what the two Workgroups were that the GA had to staff. Ms. Navab said they were the Summer Funding Workgroup and the Outreach Workgroup that the GA renewed. In order to reconsider this, she believed someone who voted on the winning side had to make that motion.

Mr. Helu moved to reconsider 1205c, to add people to the group and to give it a directed action. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER 1205c PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SUMMER FUNDING WORKGROUP AND DIRECTED ACTION.

Mr. Hoople said he would ask a Delegate to make a motion to add the following language:

“Whereas, the Funding Committee did not deliver a Funding Guide, as required in the By-laws;

“Be it Resolved, that the Summer Funding Workgroup amend the Funding Guide in accordance with the GA’s revised funding procedures and present it to the Executive Board for approval.”

It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Kline asked if there was any money allocated to the Funding Committee that has not been used. Mr. Hoople said they spent all their money. Mr. Kline asked if they did that without complying with all the By-laws. Mr. Hoople said that was correct.

A motion to call the question on the bill as amended was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1205c, AS RECONSIDERED AND AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SUMMER FUNDING WORKGROUP AND DIRECTED ACTION.

Ms. Navab said the Chair would entertain a motion to create a Summer Funding Workgroup. Mr. Kline asked about the minimum amount required. Ms. Navab said it's 4 to 11 people. Mr. Baur is already on the Workgroup, as he is the Chair. Mr. Froehle nominated Mr. Kline. Mr. Herbert nominated himself.

Mr. Helu asked about the time commitment. Ms. Navab said it was based on how many applications there are for contingency and for Round 1, at the end of the summer.

Ms. Navab said that Mr. Niederhut is on the Workgroup. Other Delegates indicating an interest were: Mr. Kline, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Kehoe, and Mr. Baur.

Ms. Navab said that for the Outreach Workgroup, it wasn't a summer commitment, but a year-long commitment.

Mr. Niederhut said that last year the Assembly Affairs VP assigned people to committees. Ms. Navab said that when a workgroup is created, they had to assign people to fill it. They could explore having the AAVP do that, but they need committee members at this point.

The following members indicated an interest: Mr. Kline, Mr. Niederhut, Ms. Arata, and Mr. Onak.

Mr. Kehoe said a directed action to renew a Workgroup does not give a minimum amount of members. Ms. Navab said it would be whatever it was before. The By-laws have a minimum size.

A Delegate asked if they needed to approve the nominations. Ms. Navab said they would take a vote of affirmation.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION:

Summer Funding Workgroup: Mr. Baur, Mr. Kline, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Kehoe, and Mr. Niederhut.

Outreach Workgroup: Mr. Kline, Mr. Niederhut, Ms. Arata, and Mr. Onak.

Ms. Navab said she would like to congratulate the Delegates for the end of the year; and for those who are graduating, would like to congratulate them as well.

This meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary