

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

October 6, 2011

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:43 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Mark Richards, on an Honor Code

A group of teachers convened by the Deans of L&S suggested an academic honor code for UC Berkeley, or at least L&S. It would codify the sense of integrity, especially with regard to plagiarism, an increasing problem. The wording could be very simple. There are honor codes at Haas and Physics.

Seamus Wilmot, Parking and Transportation, on the Class Pass

The Class Pass, which was part of the Reg Fee, will expire in spring 2013. Students were being recruited to push for a student referendum to renew the Pass. It now costs \$68, and will probably be around \$78 per semester.

Marilyn Stager, Acting Director, ASUC Auxiliary

Student fees or money students raise go into a separate ledger for the ASUC, a non-profit, 501(c) 3. The Auxiliary is the business arm, a campus unit. It runs the Auxiliary's commercial businesses. Money left over goes to the students.

Andy Albright, ASUC Senator

Academic Affairs Vice President grants are live and could be found on CalLink. The Senate created ad hoc committees on the Cal Lodge, near Lake Tahoe, and on transition planning. The Executive VP is working with student groups to surge out of Eshleman.

Valerie, on the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture

The Mario Savio Memorial Lecture Foundation has worked with the GA for the last 15 years to put on an annual lecture to keep the spirit of activism alive. The speaker this year will be Robert Reich.

Conference on the Budget Crisis and Higher Education

A conference will be held on the budget crisis and how to organize.

Berkeley Student Food Collective

Food for the meeting was prepared by the Berkeley Student Food Collective, a student-run, democratically-run organization.

Report from the Funding Committee

The Budget Committee's recommendations were approved for contingency funding, \$2,801.251, and for GMER appeals, \$733.25. Funding Appeals Committee's were approved, \$1,125.

Resolution Referral

The following bills were referred to committee:

1110a, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of SB 259

1110b, Directed Action In Support of Having the Graduate Assembly Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series

1110c, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the Refund California Campaign and the Nov. 9-15th Week of Action

Approval of GA Committees and Workgroups

The Assembly Affairs VP's recommendations were approved for membership for the six GA committees and three workgroups.

Election of the Graduate Council Alternate

The GA elected Joanna Hernandez as the Grad Council Letter.

2011-12 Action Agenda Advocacy Items

The E-Board was asked to come up with possible items for the Advocacy Agenda, which would serve as the GA's main priorities for the year. A request for suggestions was sent out and from them, Officers and Project Coordinators were proposing five possible items. The Assembly would choose three. The suggestions were graduate mental health; graduate student equity and inclusion; professional degree supplemental tuition; GSI benefits decentralization; and grad-student specific Career Center support. Delegates voted on their top three priorities.

Announcements (cont'd)

The Empowering Women of Color Conference will be held on March 3.

Oktoberfest will be October 21 at 8 p.m. at Pauley Ballroom, \$5 for a dance party, with beer and food.

Executive Officer Reports

President's report: the ASUC Judicial Council, the judicial arm of the ASUC, has two grad student reps; the new Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator is Matt Goren; referenda were being proposed for the spring ballot, including initiatives from the Daily Cal and the RSF/Tang.

The meeting entered into closed session to discuss the Lower Sproul project.

Campus Affairs Vice President's report: The Grad Social Club will have a speed dating event in November and a Halloween event; a grad rep was needed on the Health Fee Advisory Committee; the Bear's Lair on Tuesdays will have Grad Night (,money from the Bear's Lair goes back to the ASUC/GA); *The Berkeley Graduate* Coordinator position was open.

External Affairs Vice President's report: the Legislative Director for City Affairs has been working to get grad representation on City committees; the new census will result in City Council redistricting; at the State level, they're advocating fees, the California DREAM Act, and policies to guarantee GSR unionization; at the federal level they're working on the tax status of student stipends and fellowships and student loans; a summit on higher education will occur on December 2.

Treasurer's report: the Budget Committee met; non-stipend budgets that have gone over 20% so far got an e-mail

Graduate Council reps: the campus Academic Senate is looking at funding models for dropping non-resident tuition for out-of-State, academic graduate students, to remain competitive.

Assembly Affairs Vice President's report: the two main responsibilities were to organize GA meetings and oversee GA communications; a Web Coordinator was recently hired.

2011-12 Action Agenda Advocacy Items (cont'd)

The results were 48 votes for GSI benefits decentralization; 47 for the professional degree supplemental tuition; 36 for graduate-specific career services; 29 for mental health; and 24 for equity and inclusion.

A motion was made and approved to swap mental health for grad career services.

A motion to swap the equity issue for mental health failed by hand-vote.

A motion to replace equity and inclusion for mental health failed by hand-vote.

By hand-vote, the GA approved the Advocacy Agenda for the year: GSI benefits decentralization, Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition, and mental health.

Resolutions

Consent calendar

The Consent Calendar was approved. Bills approved were:

1109a, Budget Amendment to Allocate Contingency Funds from 2010-2011

1109c, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the UCSA Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities

1109d, Budget Amendment to Restore Funding for External Affairs Legislative Directors

1109e, Budget Amendment to Allocate Contingency Funds from 2010-2011

The GA approved:

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 4 -

As amended, 1109f, To Establish Funding for the Operation Excellence Communications Coordinator.

As amended, 1109g, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of California Senate Bill 185 Endorsing the Council of Deans fora on the future of public universities.

Resolution 1109e

The GA voted to reconsider 1109e, to include amendments out of committee. As amended, the GA approved the bill, On By-law Amendment to Refer Time-Sensitive Resolutions to Committees.

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

End Summary of the meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Philippe Marchand at 5:43 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall. Mr. Marchand introduced himself and said he was the Assembly Affairs VP. They have a bigger room and people might have to project their voice when speaking so everyone could hear them.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Mark Richards, on an Honor Code

Mr. Richards said wanted to note that Saul Perlmutter, who received the Nobel Prize two days ago, was a graduate student at Berkeley when he started, which should be in inspiration to them.

Mr. Richards said a recommendation was just made public in the Daily Cal and was given to the Chancellor by a group of distinguished teachers, convened by the Deans of the College of Letters and Sciences, to suggest, among other recommendations, an academic honor code for UC Berkeley, or at least for the College of Letters and Science.

The campus has a student Code of Conduct that's rather long, covering everything from larceny to plagiarism to murder. It didn't really function very well as a kind of cultural document as to what people felt about the academic honesty of the campus. So an academic honor code has been proposed. It would codify the sense of integrity, especially with regard to plagiarism, which is an increasing problem on campus. Many students, especially GSIs, understand that quite well.

The honor code could be very simple, like many other institutions have around the country. One suggestion was, "As a member of the Berkeley community, I act with honesty, integrity, and respect for others."

Announcements -- Dean Mark Richards, on an honor code (cont'd)

- 5 -

-- Seamus Wilmot, Parking and Transportation, on the Class Pass

That's a statement which no one would dare disagree. The implementation of the honor code could be in all sorts of ways, such as signing statements on exams, which was common at other universities. He asked for a show of hands of people who came from undergraduate institutions with an honor code. Berkeley would be the first UC school to have an honor code, although there already are honor codes on campus, such as at the Haas Business School and the Physics Department.

Mr. Rabkin asked what problem this was supposed to solve, if students were doing things against the honor code they didn't know they weren't supposed to be doing it or if this would sanction them more effectively. Mr. Richards said the intent was more of a cultural thing. It wouldn't change the enforcement of the Code of Conduct or any rules or regulations. It would remind students as a matter of the culture of Berkeley how to behave. He thought that was the spirit of most honor codes on most other universities.

As for the question of what problem this was trying to solve, Mr. Richards said they're pretty certain that a lot of students come to Berkeley not understanding where the lines are with regard to plagiarism. That might be because of where they come from, especially for students who come from outside the United States. Or it might be the high school environment they come from. In teaching his classes, he often finds that students, especially undergraduates, don't really understand where the lines are. In the age of the Internet, it's become even more of a gray area.

Mr. Richards said that in most institutions that adopt honor codes, students, both graduate and undergraduate, play a major role. They would definitely want to have the involvement of the Graduate Assembly. They've also asked the ASUC to provide some representation on what will probably be a small committee of ASUC and GA members, perhaps four to five from each, to help think this through and to consider how it might be implemented. It has been a fairly popular idea with nearly everybody they've talked to so far, which has been heartening.

Ms. Navab said that if people were interested in working on the honor code, they could talk to her after the meeting and she could put them on the committee. Mr. Marchand said they could also send an e-mail to president@ga.berkeley.edu.

Mr. Richards said the entire report, of which the honor code was a part, was on the L&S Web site. There is also an e-mail where people could send comments. He wanted to thank them. Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank him.

Seamus Wilmot, Parking and Transportation, on the Class Pass

Mr. Wilmot asked how many there have picked up and used their Class Pass. The Class Pass is a sticker that allows Cal students to ride AC Transit. It's a fee students pay on their Reg Fee. The Class Pass will expire in the spring of 2013. Mr. Wilmot said he was trying to recruit some students in the GA and the ASUC to push forward a student referendum in the spring of 2012 that would renew the Class Pass.

Students are now charged \$68, although only \$33 goes to AC Transit. A third of the fee goes to financial aid, to help pay it for students on financial aid. Going forward, it looks like AC Transit will charge about \$37. If they add up everything in the current structure, starting in the fall of 2013, the Class Pass will

Announcements -- Seamus Wilmot, Parking and Transportation, on the Class Pass (cont'd) - 6 -
-- Marilyn Stager, Acting Director, ASUC Auxiliary

probably be around \$78 per semester. That includes access to AC Transit and would help fund part of the campus' shuttle system. They're looking for students to carry this forward, see what the Class Pass would look like, and see if they could put it on the ballot in 2012. If people were interested they could contact Ms. Navab and she'd pass their contact information to him. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked if AC Transit allows people to privately buy their own bus pass at a comparable price, or if this deal was just for the University. Mr. Wilmot it was strictly for the University. The comparable price for a similar pass is \$80-100 a month, whereas the Class Pass is for the whole semester.

Ms. Jui asked what percentage of the student body actually gets the sticker. Mr. Wilmot said that past semester was over 31,000 of the 35,000 students picked up their sticker. The Class Pass in the last referendum passed by 78%.

Mr. Klein asked what the effective cost was for fare for UC students. Mr. Wilmot said it depends on how many times people ride. Mr. Klein asked if he knew what that number was across the student body. Mr. Wilmot said they didn't have good numbers for the sticker or for how many people ride the bus. Mr. Klein said that would be a useful statistic in determining whether the student body would want to continue this. Ms. Navab said that when buses are really busy, bus drivers stop clicking how many people get on the bus. Mr. Klein said an estimate could be provided.

Marilyn Stager, Acting Director, ASUC Auxiliary

Marilyn Stager, Acting Director of the ASUC Auxiliary, introduced herself. She was really pleased to be able to come to the meeting. She was there to tell them about the Auxiliary and what it does, and to answer any questions. The Auxiliary is the business arm of the ASUC, for graduates and undergraduates.

Ms. Stager said the Auxiliary runs two sets of books. They're not acting funny, and it just means that all the money from student fees or money that students raise, such as from dances, goes into a separate ledger for the non-profit association, the 501(c)3. That's what the ASUC is. The Auxiliary is the business arm.

The Auxiliary was created in 1998 from an agreement between the campus and the students, as governed by the Commercial Activities Agreement. The Auxiliary is a campus unit, and all employees of the ASUC Auxiliary are campus employees. Those books run through the campus' set of ledgers. So they keep books for the Auxiliary and for the students. Those monies never cross, unless there is, for instance something that's done by the Auxiliary on behalf of the students, something the students have approved, something the Auxiliary does that the students reimburse the Auxiliary for.

Ms. Stager said the purpose of the Auxiliary ledger was to run the Auxiliary's commercial businesses. Expenses to run the Auxiliary come out of commercial revenue. If there's money left over, that goes to the students. That's how the commercial money goes to the ASUC ledger.

Ms. Stager said the Auxiliary was there to serve students. They have business people, accountants, and advisors, and the Auxiliary provides services to students. She called for any questions. Seeing no questions, Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank her.

Announcements -- Andy Albright, ASUC Senator
-- Mario Savio Memorial Lecture
-- Conference on public education and the budget crisis

- 7 -

Andy Albright, ASUC Senator

Andy Albright introduced himself and said he's an ASUC Senator and an undergrad rep to the GA. He had some updates. First, from the Academic Affairs Vice President, grants are live and could be found on CalLink. There's a paper sign-up sheet outside the AAVP's office on the 2nd floor. Also, the Senate created an ad hoc committee on the Cal Lodge. A number of repairs need to be done. It's one of the few pieces of land that the ASUC owns, located near Lake Tahoe. The ASUC Senate recently approved money for a structural engineer to go up and look at it. They also created an ad hoc committee on the transition planning team. It meets at that time, Thursday at 5 p.m. The Executive Vice President's office has been doing work with student groups for surge, to move out of Eshleman. Student groups were split into various sections, to elect representatives to tell architects how best to serve student needs for space when they have to leave Eshleman. Also, there will be a discussion on Friday at 2 p.m. in the Senate Chamber about waivers and about Eshleman Library, and whether it will be turned into a commercial activity space or student space. The Senate passed a motion last week to shut the space down except for existing reservations and all student government operations, pending a discussion. The ASUC Finance Committee will table all Pauley Ballroom waivers next week pending further discussion and a more finalized decision on waivers.

Mr. Albright said he was also a representative of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee of LGBT issues, which is looking for grad students. If people were interested, they could send him an e-mail.

Ms. Navab said the GA is an arm of the ASUC, and the ASUC owns the Cal Lodge, which is available for students to use. People can stay there for quite low prices. Mr. Albright said they'll be looking at a lot of options, including the possibility of tearing down the building and constructing something new.

Mr. Albright said the Student Operational Excellence Committee will meet on Tuesday at 5:00 on the Senate lounge, 2nd floor.

Mario Savio Memorial Lecture

Valerie said she was with the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture Foundation. The Foundation has been working with the GA for the last 15 years to put on an annual lecture where they try to keep the spirit of activism alive on the Berkeley campus. The speaker this year will be Robert Reich. They'll also award two young activists in the Bay Area with the Mario Savio Scholarship. Valerie said they're asking for the

GA's help to make this event successful, and she would ask Delegates to post fliers in their departments and make announcements to classes, organizations, etc.

Conference on public education and the budget crisis

Renee introduced herself and said she was a doctoral student in the School of Education. Judith Florin introduced herself, and said she is a recent graduate at UC Berkeley. Renee said they were there to

Announcements -- Conference on public education and the budget crisis (cont'd)

- 8 -

-- Berkeley Student Food Collective

-- Upcoming GA events

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

talk about the budget crisis. They're working with a big group of graduates and undergraduates on a conference about how the budget crisis affects higher education and their communities as well as its affects on health, education, and environmental issues. People will get educated on the budget crisis and also get tools on how best to organize their communities. Speakers will include the Assistant Secretary of Civil Rights, the President of Community Colleges, and others. They have posters for people to bring back to their departments.

Berkeley Student Food Collective

A speaker said he hoped that people were enjoying the food, prepared by the Berkeley Student Food Collective, a student-run, democratically-run organization. They try to get as much organic, locally raised produce as possible. They're trying to do more catering and feed more events, and provide to as many people as possible organic food that's sustainably raised. He would ask people to please come by the BSFC's store front, on Bancroft.

Mr. Marchand asked people to leave their feedback forms at the front or on the table where they picked up.

Upcoming GA Events

Mr. Marchand said there was a slide show before the meeting about upcoming GA events. He called for any announcements.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

There was a request to move the Funding Report up on the agenda. A motion to approve the amendment was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Marchand called for any other changes, and seeing none, called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Marchand said the minutes were posted and were included in online meeting materials. He called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2011 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the Funding Committee

Report from the Funding Committee

- 9 -

Mr. Sheen said that past month they got eight applications for Contingency funding. Two of them came late, Blacks In Public Policy, and the National Lawyers Guild. The Funding Committee came up with a number based on the trend and on general principles and understanding of the GA's funding structure. Had the groups met the deadline, this was probably what the Funding Committee would have recommended. He'd entertain a motion to add the groups.

Mr. Klein asked how \$300.25 was decided for the ESPM Grad Student Association instead of \$210, which would result from the 40% GMER cut in Round 1. Mr. Sheen said it would have been the maximum had the group applied for the full amount, \$750. The request was for \$525.

Mr. Sheen said the Dead Logicians' Society didn't submit any materials with their application and the recommendation was \$0. The event will occur after the next Delegates meeting, so the group could reapply. Community Legal Outreach also has its event later. The Funding Committee had some policy issues internally to sort out before making a recommendation. For the National Lawyers' Guild, there were concerns about the \$870 request and fully funding food, and how much food they could be funded outside the GMER system.

Mr. Klein said that Queer Grads received \$325.14 in GMER Round 1. He asked what the rationale was to recommend an additional \$251 for essentially GMER purposes. Mr. Sheen said the event didn't ask for GMER. The Committee felt the event, an interdisciplinary group, deserved money. Mr. Klein asked if this was for a general meeting. Mr. Sheen said it's a special event. Mr. Baur said it was inclusive of many departments and reflected well in the supergroup structure. Mr. Herbert said he's on the Funding Committee. The Queer Grads Event is for a coming out day. Mr. Klein said it wasn't a generic GMER event, then.

A motion to approve the funding contingency report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BUDGET COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE CONTINGENCY FUNDING REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Marchand said they would move on to the Appeals Report. Mr. Sheen said there were six appeals. Three appeals were from GMER Round 1, and all were based on small mistakes by either the Funding Committee or the groups, such as a typo in the date. The Funding Committee recommended that the groups receive the same amounts they would have received if their applications were accepted under the GMER formula.

For Grants they had three appeals, one of which was dropped. La Raza Law Journal and La Raza Law Student Association were denied grant funding because the requests were for performers at events. Under grant funding, events need to be funded to the level the event could occur sufficiently. There's no explicit policy to pay for performers. The Appeals Committee recommended funding only part of performers' costs, an allocation totaling \$1,125.00. The Committee suggests that the money not come from the Contingency pool, as most appeals do, but instead, that it come from Grants, because Grants money wasn't fully spent in Round 1. He called for any questions.

Mr. Saxena asked if the same student groups could put in two funding requests and asked if the groups were the same, with two different names. A Delegate said they are two separate organizations with different membership. They adopt "La Raza" in the name to identify their heritage.

Report from the Funding Committee (cont'd)
Resolution Referral

- 10 -

Mr. Klein moved to vote on grants and GMER separately. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Klein moved to approve the recommendation of the Appeals Committee for GMER funding. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING APPEALS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ON GMER APPEALS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, \$733.25.

Mr. Klein said that as per funding policies approved last year, the Funding Committee cannot recommend partial funding of a grant. So these student groups shouldn't be partially funded with grants. He moved that 15% of any approved additional funding not come from the Contingency or Grants, but instead, come from the Funding Committee's line item in the GA budget. The Funding Committee shouldn't have approved partial funding for grants.

Mr. Sheen said that over the summer there was debate about whether they wanted to fund something of this nature and they decided they didn't. Even though this was all or nothing, the policy over the summer had him e-mail leaders of groups to say they'd negotiate the groups' request. Mr. Klein asked why, then, the groups were submitting an appeal. Mr. Sheen said they could still appeal. Mr. Kline said the actual request was met. He asked to retract his motion and instead, move to give the groups no extra money. Mr. Marchand said they could vote on a motion to approve the allocations. Mr. Klein the result of both motions was the same.

Mr. Marchand said the motion was to approve the Funding Appeal Committee's recommendations. Mr. Klein asked if the money was to come from Contingency. Mr. Marchand said that was correct.

Mr. Sheen said that as Funding Officer, he had discretion to change line items.

Mr. Saxena said he thought Delegate Assembly approval was needed to move line items around that were over \$1,000. Mr. Marchand said that wasn't in order. Ms. Navab said line items under the Funding line item are not delineated in the budget. There are no numbers assigned to them. So the Funding Committee has the discretion to move money around between GMER grants and Funding Contingency. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and failed by hand-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING APPEALS COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON LA RAZA LAW JOURNAL, \$375, AND THE LA RAZA LAW STUDENT ASSOCIATION, \$750, FROM CONTINGENCY, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Marchand referred the following bills to committee:

1110a, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of SB 259, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, and the Rules Committees

1110b, Directed Action In Support of Having the Graduate Assembly Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series, to the External Affairs and Rules Committees

Resolution Referral (cont'd)
Approval of GA Committees and Workgroups
Election of Graduate Council Alternate

- 11 -

1110c, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the ReFund California Campaign and the Nov. 9-15th Week of Action, to the External Affairs and the Rules Committees

APPROVAL OF GA COMMITTEES AND WORKGROUPS

Mr. Marchand said he posted GA committee and Workgroup memberships, and sent out an update of changes. The six committees are External Affairs, Campus Affairs, Budget, Rules, Funding, and Sustainability. The Workgroups are Communications, Community Outreach, and Faculty Mentoring Awards.

A motion to approve the memberships was made and seconded.

Mr. Klein asked how many absences were allowed before a committee member was removed from a committee. Mr. Marchand said if they miss two committee meetings a semester and no alternate attended, they could be changed to another committee or removed from the Assembly. Mr. Klein asked if he was on top of attendance. Mr. Marchand said that each Committee and Workgroup takes minutes, with attendance included.

A Delegate asked how many Committee members were necessary for a meeting to go forward. Mr. Marchand said it's 50%, rounded down, plus one.

Mr. Rabkin asked if someone would be out if they missed two meetings, or if the GA was indulgent. Mr. Marchand said he'd talk to the person before removing them from the Assembly and see if there was justification. But they'd be removed from a committee and assigned to another, to make sure committees could meet. He noted that the first meeting wasn't "official" because committee membership was being approved that evening.

A motion to call the question, end debate, and come to a vote was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO ADOPT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE ASSEMBLY AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Marchand said there was a request from the Communications Workgroup to have the Delegate Assembly approve a chair.

Carl Onak was nominated. Mr. Onak said he's a third-year. Mr. Marchand said the Workgroup didn't have an official meeting and therefore couldn't approve him officially. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CARL ONAK AS CHAIR OF THE COMMUNICATIONS WORKGROUP PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Election of Graduate Council Alternate

Mr. Marchand said they would move on to another election, the Graduate Council Alternate. He asked Mr. Saxena to give a brief description of the position. Mr. Saxena said he's been a Grad Council rep for

Election of Graduate Council Alternate (cont'd)

- 12 -

about two years. The Grad Council is the last stop for approving academic affairs items that affect graduate students. That includes things like department and group reviews and commenting on policy issues that might affect grad students, such as on tuition issues. The Council also has input on fees that affect grad students. One thing they recently did was to set up the ability to submit dissertations in electronic format. So even procedural things that affect grad students go through the Council.

Mr. Marchand said there are three current Graduate Council representatives: Sam Saxena, Mechanical Engineering; Liz Boldman, from Materials Science and Engineering, who is out of town; and Tiffany Ng, from Music, who was at the meeting earlier. The Alternate would replace one of them if they couldn't go to a meeting. The Grad Council meets the first Monday of every month in the academic year from 2:00 to 4:30 p.m. There is also a provision in the GA's By-laws that states that ideally, the composition of Grad Council representatives shall reflect the academic diversity of the graduate student community.

Mr. Marchand called for any nominations for the position of Grad Council Alternate. Mr. Saxena nominated Moneer Helu.

Ms. Navab said she would recommend nominating people in the Humanities or in professional programs, so there was a little more representation on the Grad Council. She noted that people could nominate themselves. Mr. Marchand said there were no professional degree students on the Grad Council, which might be a problem when those issues come up.

Ms. Navab said the Grad Council was one of the most important committees on campus with regard to graduates' academics. Mr. Marchand said that people could still be a Delegate and be on the Grad Council.

Monica nominated Joanna Hernandez.

Mr. Helu said that since Ms. Hernandez was in a professional school, he would respectfully withdraw his nomination.

Mr. Marchand called for any other nominations, and seeing none, said they would go to a vote.

Mr. Klein asked if the GA could hear a statement.

Joanna Hernandez introduced herself and said she was a second-year Law student at Berkeley Law. She is the Co-Editor of the *La Raza Law Journal* and was very involved on campus.

Mr. Marchand said the proper protocol for elections was to have the nominee leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. He called for any questions for the nominee.

Mr. Klein asked if she's a Delegate. Ms. Hernandez said she is.

Seeing no further questions, Mr. Marchand asked Ms. Hernandez to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. A Delegate moved to skip that process. Mr. Rabkin asked if the GA had the right to waive that process. Mr. Marchand said he'd say the motion to bypass the procedure was out of order and would ask Ms. Hernandez to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

Election of Graduate Council Alternate (cont'd)
2011-2012 Action Agenda Items

- 13 -

Ms. Bravo asked if there was a possibility for Alternates to take positions on the Grad Council. Mr. Marchand said that anybody could be on the Grad Council. Ms. Bravo asked if the Alternate could be nominated if they weren't present. Ms. Navab said they'd have to be at the meeting. Mr. Saxena will vacate his seat later this year, so should someone else be interested in running, that seat will open up.

Mr. Saxena asked if they could elect two Alternates. Mr. Marchand said they couldn't, per the By-laws.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE JOANNA HERNANDEZ AS THE GA'S GRADUATE COUNCIL ALTERNATE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Marchand asked to have Ms. Hernandez brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate her. (Applause)

2011-12 ACTION AGENDA ADVOCACY ITEMS

Ms. Navab said the GA asked the Executive Board to come up with possible items for the Advocacy Agenda. That evening they'll pick three main Action Agenda Items the E-Board will make sure to work on as the GA's main priorities for the year. They've come up with a list of five, from GA Officers and Project Coordinators. They'll propose the five possible items to the GA. People will be able to ask questions, and then vote on their top three choices. Those will become the Advocacy Agenda for the year.

Ms. Navab asked Mr. Marchand if there were any additional items. Mr. Marchand said there weren't. Ms. Navab said they asked Delegates if there were additional items they wanted the GA to work on, and none were sent.

Ms. Navab said the first proposal in the packet for an Action Agenda Item was to target graduate mental health. They actually have a pretty good service, Counseling and Psychological Services, and there's

even a graduate mental health committee, as well as a Chancellor's Advisory Committees on Mental Health. But they're not doing a great job of targeting grad students in areas they need help in. And they're not really good at targeting grads in different programs. Engineers, e.g., might be most affected before qualifying exams, and Law students might freak out before the bar exam. Additionally, there are barriers from receiving care, such as GSIs who don't want to go to Counseling and Psychological Services because they don't want to run into their students in the waiting area. So there are programs on campus in place to improve these things. But a lot of people weren't aware of them. For instance, she asked how many people were aware that there is a counselor in Evans Hall, or that a Counseling person housed at the Law School. There are already things in place, but people don't know about them.

Additionally, Ms. Navab said the last time a survey was done on graduate mental health was when she was an undergrad. The idea was to put their resources together, do another survey of graduate mental health, and figure out where the changes are. They got the Chancellor last year to put in an extra \$400,000 towards mental health services. And the OP gave another \$150,000, to target where they need to impact grad students and to use for programming and to provide counselors, specifically for grad students. The GA would work with the existing body to put out a survey to do better outreach and to figure out which programs need to target students.

2011-2012 Action Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 14 -

Mr. Klein asked if the \$550,000 was for one year. Ms. Navab said the \$400,000 will continue every year, from Student Services Fees. It's from the surplus that exists in Student Service money. The \$150,000 is a three-grant from the OP.

Mr. Klein asked what the GA's budget is. Ms. Navab said it's \$417,000 or so. Mr. Klein said they would spend as much on mental health as on GA activities. Ms. Navab said it's an additional pot. In reality there's been much more done with this with CPS and mental health.

A Delegate asked if they'd just kind of muddle through if they didn't make this a priority. Ms. Navab said that if the GA didn't select the Action Agenda Items, the E-Board would continue to push for them, but just wouldn't work on them as much. They'd be lower on the E-Board's priority list and would get to them if there was time.

The Delegate asked how they'd target grad students. Ms. Navab said they'd continue what they're currently doing. There's a group called Student Care, a resource that a GSI, instructor, or grad student could go to if they were having a problem with a student and needed to help that student. But there are a lot of barriers to using this board because members include a Conduct Officer, and a police officer; and not a lot of grad students want to report their undergrads to Conduct and to the Police. So fixing those types of problems was also involved in this process.

Ms. Bravo asked if schools ever refer graduate students. Ms. Navab said professors can also go to the Student Care Committee if they have concern about a grad student, as could students. The idea behind this Committee was to see if a student needs help. There are some referrals, but for the most part it's students calling CPS asking to speak to someone.

Ms. Navab said the second possible Action Agenda Item on the list was Graduate Student Equity and Inclusion. Part of the idea for this was that they don't really have a good idea of what's happening within departments on campus, such as who was coming to school there; who was matriculating; who wasn't passing exams. They'll see if there's a trend by gender, race or something else. And they can't target cer-

tain communities if they don't know what's happening because they don't have data; and the data they do have was difficult to use or to access. A really large part of this would be to work with existing campus units and departments to see what they have and to analyze the data, and see the profile of students beyond just the general breakdown that schools give. Once they know what the problems are, they could work on delivering services to help students make it through.

A Delegate asked if the data was centralized somewhere. Ms. Navab said there is some centralized data, but it's hard to use. GSIs or GSR FTEs are simply included in the number of full-time people in a department. It was impossible to tell how many were 25% GSIs or 50%. The GA's projects were really interested in working on this. Ms. De la Torre said this would also help in seeing what data already exist that the GA wasn't getting access to.

Mr. Marchand said the Graduate Women's Project Coordinator was just hired, Ruth McFarlane, and Mr. Marchand said he would like to give her a minute to introduce herself. Ms. McFarlane said she's a first-year in Social Work. She has a law degree as well. She was really excited about this, being brand new to campus. She would ask Delegates to communicate to women in their department that she was there and

2011-2012 Action Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 15 -

would love to know what was needed on campus. She would like to be very relevant to current needs of students on campus. So she would ask Delegates to please take that message back. People could e-mail her at gwpc@berkeley.edu.

Ms. Navab said the next proposed Action Agenda Item was Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition, previously known as "Professional Degree Fees." Professional schools on campus have students pay an additional fee on top of tuition. The way these Professional Fees are set is left to the discretion of the deans in those programs. Until recently, only the Provost looked at the fee proposals, to date, only one has ever been rejected at Berkeley. Costs are going up at a ridiculous rate, and it was now more expensive to go to Boalt Law as an out-of-State student than to go to any other law school in the top 80 schools.

Part of the problem is that every year new fees are being proposed, with three proposals for new fees this year. There isn't a clear policy, just a one and-a-half page policy from the Office of the President. It really leaves this up to deans, and these fees have become kind of a slush fund for deans. The proposal would be to create Berkeley-specific policies around professional fees, including how to establish a new fee, how to raise an existing fee, and how they're spent. These are reported on once every five years and there wasn't really any accounting as to where the money goes. A lot of professional schools don't qualify for GSIs and GSRs and students have to take out loans. This has created an unsustainable situation.

Mr. Klein asked why fees were increased instead of tuition. Ms. Navab said that tuition increases involve a much more rigorous approach, and the money becomes general campus money. But the fees stay in departments and are at the discretion of the dean. Mr. Klein asked who authorized these fees to begin with. Ms. Navab said it's authorized at the OP level and the Regents.

Ms. Navab said that this wasn't just specific to social science and the humanities. Chemistry was proposing to add this Fee next year for its Master's program. And Statistics was adding it as well.

Mr. Rabkin asked what the GA would advocate for. Ms. Navab said they'd create a Berkeley-specific policy on how to set fees, raise them, and report on them. Until last year they never even saw the proposals.

Mr. Tentori asked if only professional programs were allowed to collect fees, and if not, if that could be changed to fees in general. Ms. Navab said that only professional programs were allowed to develop these fees. But non-professional programs are creating professional degrees within them so they can charge them. It's a very separate issue from regular fees because of how they're approved and spent.

Mr. Ortega said he's worked on this issue for the past couple of years, and it's been a little frustrating. The OP's Systemwide Provost has been very supportive of some changes the GA wants to see. But actually making that happen on campus was pretty difficult since oversight was up to each campus. The UC System doesn't usually like to tell each campus what to do, and the campus doesn't like to tell each program what to do. Having oversight on how these funds are actually used, who proposes them, and why, up to now hasn't been scrutinized in a way to see if the fees were needed and whether they made sense or not for the program. They want to make sure there's an enforceable policy and that everything was being written and filled out in a manner to justify the cost and to ensure that any additional funds going towards that fee were being used for what was stated in the proposals. For the first time departments have to report on how they used the money from these fees in the previous year. But there are still very broad categories and there's no true check that, in fact, money was used that way.

2011-2012 Action Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 16 -

Ms. Bravo said that Social Welfare just got an increase on Wednesday. The Dean spoke but didn't really say what they'd allocate the money towards.

Mr. Ortega said another part of the concern was with new fees. An increasing number of pare charging for the first time; and first-time fees were becoming increasingly high. The new programs had fees in the order of \$20,000 a year. And the first-time fee was becoming increasingly high. The new programs had fees in the order of \$20,000 a year. The fee for Law, for instance, is \$11,000. Ms. Navab said that even ones that start out low are projected to increase by 10% a year.

A Delegate asked if an item can be proposed and asked what Delegates would do in selecting these items. Ms. Navab said it was less about what Delegates do and more about what Executives do. It directs what they work on for the year. At some point there would be a Resolution for Delegates to pass, or they might ask about connections in their departments, or have issues to bring up to deans. It's more about directing Execs where to focus their energy.

Mr. Marchand said the Advocacy Agenda indicates what they'd prioritize. It didn't mean Execs or Delegates couldn't work on other things, but it makes the Executive Board accountable as to what they prioritize, such as in meetings with the Chancellor or Vice Chancellor.

Mr. Twet-Vaughn asked if these five were the only options. Ms. Navab said they sent out an e-mail to Delegates and came up with a list of 25 things. They discussed what they thought they could accomplish and what they thought were most important, and came up with the list. People could propose something, but it wouldn't have been reviewed.

Ms. Hernandez said that professional degree fees are \$35,000. Ms. Navab without checks, these Fees could be used irresponsibly.

Ms. Becker said the GA has worked on some of these items for a couple of years, and asked why they thought they'd now be able to do something successfully. Ms. Navab said OP has been downsized significantly. Because of that, and because a lot of time is spent reviewing these processes, it's a good opportunity to go to them and say the campus could take on some of this responsibility. Some professors are also frustrated with the lack of reporting, so it's a good time to have their support.

Ms. Navab said the next possible Action Agenda Item was about GSI Benefits Decentralization. All departments used to pay into a campus pot of benefits and departments would get benefit money for their GSIs. Starting that year, that's been changed so there's no central pot of money for benefits. The departments get benefit money GSIs, lecturers, and faculty, and the department decides the most efficient allocation of that benefits money.

There's concern that this incentivizes departments to have more 50% GSIs, rather than 25% GSIs because benefits would be paid once, rather than twice. And there are rumors about departments trying to wiggle in 24.9% GSIs so they don't get benefits, or to hire part-time lecturers, who don't get benefits. This issue hasn't hit yet because this year the same financial levels were promised as in previous years, but in the future, that level might drop. Mr. Marchand said the "rumors" were from professors and have been to meetings who have reported this.

Ms. Navab said data are clumped by department, so they don't know how many GSIs are included or how many classes they're working for. Mr. Marchand said it was basically the campus passing the burden of

2011-2012 Action Agenda Items (cont'd)
Announcements (cont'd)

- 17 -

making cuts to departments. The point of the Action Agenda Item was to develop policy so that money for GSIs was separate and couldn't be used as benefits for other employees. Being decentralized meant there was no way to implement a standard across campus.

Mr. Rabkin said this is a zero-sum game, and every additional dollar of GSI benefits had to come from somewhere. He didn't think it would look good to want to be fed first. Ms. Navab said grad student enrollment has increased, as have the number of undergrads. There are more students for each GSI.

Ms. Navab said the last Action Agenda Item proposed was Grad Student-Specific Career Center and Support. The Career Center, which is being moved to across the street, really focuses on undergrads and wasn't really tailored for grad student needs. Some departments have great career services staff, but that wasn't true for most departments. The idea was to have career staff who worked just on grad student issues. Additionally, it would include help in writing grants or fellowship applications. UCSF has a free course on applying for NIH grants and there's nothing like that at Cal. Ms. Navab said that was the least fleshed out proposal, and she wasn't sure if there would be funding for this, but the GA could advocate for this more.

Ms. Navab said Delegates would vote for the top three among the proposed Action Agenda items. It wasn't ranked and the order in which they vote didn't matter. Mr. Klein asked if the E-Board would advocate equally for all three that are selected. Mr. Marchand said that was correct.

Ms. Navab said she could try and push all five at every meeting with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, but all the feedback she's gotten has been to push for three.

Mr. Marchand said he would entertain a motion to hear an announcement from the Grad Social Club because they had to leave soon. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. De la Torre said the new EWOC Coordinator was present and had to leave as well.

Announcements (cont'd)

Veronica Garcia introduced herself and said she is the Empowering Women of Color Conference Coordinator. The Conference will be on March 3. It's a space for women of color, the campus community, and the Bay Area community at-large to talk about issues that affect them. If people would like more information or were interested in working on this, they could send her an e-mail. She works closely with Ms. Penington, who's putting on the Women of Color Initiative.

Ms. Gonzalez said she and Mr. Welch are the Grad Social Club Chairs. For Oktoberfest they'll have posters ready to post by Tuesday. If Delegates could pick them up to post that would be great. It will be October 21 at 8 p.m. at Pauley Ballroom. Mr. Welch said tickets were on sale, \$5 for beer and food. It's a dance party. They sent Delegates an e-mail to volunteer. They're also having the third Ph.D. comics movie screening on the 11th, at 2050 VLSB. They wanted feedback on more screenings and on charging \$2, as screenings cost \$300. If people have comments or suggestions they should send them an e-mail.

Mr. Rabkin asked about using restricted money to run an event, taking the proceeds, and spending it on alcohol. Ms. Navab said they can't spend ASUC fee money on alcohol. They can spend commercial

Announcements (cont'd)

- 18 -

2011-2012 Action Agenda Items (cont'd)

Executive Officer Reports

money on alcohol. Ticket revenue was a kind of commercial money. Mr. Rabkin asked if ASUC money could be used to cover start-up costs of a commercial enterprise. Ms. Navab said they weren't, and ticket sales would cover the costs. Mr. Klein asked where the initial \$300 came from. Ms. Navab said the GSC would have a fourth screening if there were enough ticket sales to pay for it. Mr. Marchand said the fourth screening would come from the GSC budget.

2011-12 ACTION AGENDA ADVOCACY ITEMS (cont'd)

Mr. Marchand said that people should write down their three preferences for Action Agenda Items. The results will be compiled and announced before the end of the meeting, when they'll ask for a formal motion to adopt them.

Mr. Klein asked if the Executive Board gets to vote on this. Mr. Marchand said they couldn't.

REPORTS

Executive Officer Reports

Giving the President's report, Ms. Navab said the ASUC Judicial Council has two grad student reps. The J-Council is the judicial arm of the ASUC that settles dispute or internal suits. The GA reps are Abe Escarino and Scott Lara. People could send them any questions about judicial issues.

Ms. Navab said she wanted to introduce the new Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator, Matt Goren. He's a Delegate from Psychology and will replace Badr Albanna, who is graduating that semester. They'll both attend to OE meetings and OE Program Office meetings. People will decide on Mr. Goren's stipend that evening.

Ms. Navab said that people heard from Mr. Wilmot earlier that evening about the upcoming Class Pass referendum. There are other potential referenda that might be coming up. The Daily Cal is proposing to put a referendum on the spring ballot. It's unclear how much the paper would charge, but it would be between \$5-10 a semester. Nothing has been approved yet to go on the ballot. There could also be a health and wellness referendum that would go towards building a new facility to supplement Recreational Sports and have the Tang Center more focused on the sports side than the health side.

Ms. Navab said she was bringing potential referenda up because they're looking for grads interested in working on these campaigns or sitting on advisory committees.

Lastly, Ms. Navab said she would ask to go into closed session to discuss the Lower Sproul project. While in closed session, no minutes would be taken, and only Delegates, Officers, Alternates, and staff could remain. She would ask all others to please leave the room. It was so moved and seconded and

Executive Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 19 -

passed with no objection. This meeting entered into closed session to talk about the Lower Sproul project.

Back in open session, giving the Campus Affairs Vice President's report, Ms. De la Torre said the Grad Social Club had another event, speed dating in November. There will also be a Halloween event, co-sponsored by BEC's Bar and the Bear's Lair. If people would like to volunteer, they should send the GSC an e-mail at gsc@ga.berkeley.edu. They really need help, especially at the door, such as checking ID's. Ms. De la Torre said she wanted to show the Web site. All the GA events are listed there.

Ms. De la Torre said she needed somebody to be on the Health Fee Advisory Committee. It meets every week, 11:00 to noon on Wednesdays. Ms. Navab said this Committee decides how the Health Fee is spent. Ms. De la Torre said that if they knew anybody who would be good for the position, they should send her an e-mail, cavp@berkeley.edu, which was the format for all GA e-mails.

Ms. De la Torre said she also wanted to plug the Bear's Lair and its activities. The GSC also wanted to focus on that as well. On Tuesdays they'll have Grad Night, trivia on Wednesdays, open mic on Thursdays, and Beat the Clock on Fridays. Whenever people spend money at the Bear's Lair, the ASUC, which means the GA, gets part of that money back. Ms. Navab said the Bear's Lair also shows Cal football and is one of the only bars that shows all NFL games on Sunday, with discounts on beer.

Ms. De la Torre said *The Berkeley Graduate* Coordinator quit. Ms. Navab said he found a full-time job and went back to work. Mr. Marchand said a job description was included in the packet. Ms. De la Torre said she would like a motion to open up the editor position for another two weeks. It was so moved and

seconded. The motion to open up the Coordinator position for two weeks passed with no objection. Ms. De la Torre said she needed to set up a hiring committee. If people were interested, they should let her know. The person will be approved by the E-Board. If no grad wants to take it, they'll open it up to other people.

A speaker asked if anybody else was supporting this periodical. Ms. De la Torre said the GA had to have this publication in order to maintain their use of Anthony Hall. Without a publication, they'd lose the building.

Giving the External Affairs Vice President, Mr. Ortega said that the position was allowed to work on anything relevant to grad students beyond the confines of the campus. It includes the City, OP, and the State and national levels.

On the City level, Clara Botstein, the Legislative Director for City Affairs, has been working on getting representation of grads on different committees that exist within the City to make sure the grad voice was heard. A number of things were happening regarding the City. They're moving towards reshaping Telegraph and downtown Berkeley. They want grad input to see what they'd like in those areas, such as later hours, more bars, what stores to have, etc. They're also looking at how students are represented within the City. The new census calls for redistricting for City Council seats. So there's an opportunity to have more students either voting for a certain Councilmember or to have a student Councilmember.

At the State level, they're advocating on policy that affects all students. That often relates to fees, but also to passing the California DREAM Act and looking at policies like guaranteeing the unionization of GSRs,

Executive Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 20 -

an ongoing discussion at Berkeley. They advocate through OP and at the Regents on OP policy such as professional degree fees, mental health, Systemwide issues, or campus practices at large. At the federal level they're working on issues dealing with taxability of student stipends and fellowships, provisions of student loans, and student fellowships, and how those are given out, what fees are implemented with loans, and forgiveness programs for loans. He called for any questions.

Ms. Navab said the presidents of all the undergrad and grad student governments will meet with UC Systemwide Pres. Yudof on October 22 in his offices in Oakland. They'll talk about upcoming fee proposals. There is a four-year plan to increase tuition by 81%. If there's anything people want to bring up to her before that meeting with Pres. Yudof, they should let her know.

Mr. Ortega said that on December 2 they're putting together a summit of higher education. They have the support of the Chancellor and the Graduate Division. The purpose was to bring in experts to speak on two topics, the role of public, state universities in stimulating the economy and creating jobs, and current UC policies that promote or hinder jobs. The second topic was the federalization of the public university.

Giving the Treasurer's report, Ms. Epstein said the Budget Committee met. All Executive Officers, Project Coordinators, anybody who's gone over 20% of their non-stipend budget so far, got an e-mail from her. They need to talk about what this means for the rest of their annual budget and how that will be allocated. Every semester students pay \$23 to the Life Safety Committee, which does renovations, mostly seismic or adding sprinkler system, etc. This fee was re-approved for the next four years. At the

first meeting they pretty much just talked about the improvements they already approved for the next couple of years, and additional projects. One thing she suggested was the Anthony Hall windows, which may or may not be included in Lower Sproul renovation. If people want to talk about the meeting or health and safety hazards, they should send her an e-mail.

Ms. Epstein said the Studio hire was almost finished. Also, the Grad Social Club Coordinators can charge entry fees for different events where alcohol is served. That was a big deal because previously, they couldn't do that. As a result, the GSC can hold a lot more events. So if people go to an event and there's a small door charge, they should not get angry, since that will help the GSC hold more events.

Mr. Marchand said that Ms. Epstein and Ms. Navab sit on the Store Operations Board. If people have issues about the ASUC Auxiliary, they could bring them to those reps.

Giving the Graduate Council report, Mr. Saxena said the update he had was posted online, and people could contact him about it. The Academic Senate of UC has been looking at funding models for dropping non-resident tuition for out-of-State, academic graduate students. There's an in-depth report from the Academic Senate that overwhelmingly supports the dropping of non-resident tuition. People could send him an e-mail and he could forward people to the report.

A Delegate asked what dropping non-resident tuition meant. Mr. Saxena said they're making the argument that academic graduate students should not have to pay the out-of-State tuition. The main rationale is to be competitiveness. Non-resident tuition was causing the campus to not accept many top-notch international students. And the existence of that non-resident tuition creates an almost unspoken higher requirement on an international grad student.

Executive Officer Reports (cont'd)
2011-2012 Action Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 21 -

Mr. Marchand said they would now move to the question period, ten minutes for questions on any of the reports that were submitted. Seeing no questions, Mr. Marchand said he would give his report.

Giving the Assembly Affairs VP report, Mr. Marchand said he had two main responsibilities: to organize GA meetings and to make sure Delegates were up to speed on what was going on and that the Delegate Assembly and its committees run smoothly. If people had any problem, issue, or suggestion to make the meetings better, they should feel free to talk to him.

Mr. Marchand said his other main responsibility was to oversee communications for the GA. They recently hired a Web Coordinator, who will improve some pages on the Web site and make sure the GA's Web site and social media pages are updated more frequently. Both this person and he will attend meetings of the communications workgroup to get feedback.

2011-12 ACTION AGENDA ADVOCACY ITEMS (cont'd)

Mr. Marchand said he just got the results from the Advocacy Agenda. They had 48 preference votes for GSI benefits de-centralization; 47 for the professional degree supplemental tuition; 36 for graduate-spe-

cific career services; 29 for mental health; and 24 for equity and inclusion. The top three are Professional Degree Fees, GSI Benefits Decentralization, and Grad-Specific Career Services.

Mr. Marchand called for a motion to approve, to direct the Executive Board to consider these three their top Action Agenda Items. It was so moved and seconded.

Mr. Twet-Vaughn said they talk about resources they'd collect rather than resources the University needs to support them. He supported that, but would suggest that they also try and advocate for more State funds. Specifically, they're trying to get a proposal together for ways to increase tax revenue, and use the connection with the Administration to advocate for that, and to use their connection with the Administration to advocate and to take a more political role to try and unify students.

Ms. Navab said they're working on fee issues and funding issues in general. That wasn't included on here, but the GA was working on those issues as well. There are grants that Mr. Ortega was working on externally, as well as things they're working on internally.

The Council of Deans is putting together forums about issues related to privatization.

Ms. Epstein said there are already resources for mental health. So if the GA doesn't have someone advocate for grad student mental health services, resources would just go towards mental services not targeted towards graduate students.

Ms. Epstein moved to advocate for the top four. Mr. Marchand said that would add a mental health item. The motion was seconded. A Delegate said that Ms. Navab stated that she could really only do three things at a time. So he would recommend sticking with three.

Ms. Becker said she thought it was a good idea to have the funding secured, and they should use it as effectively as possible. Ms. Navab mentioned that she could really only do three things at a time. So the

2011-2012 Action Agenda Items (cont'd)
Consent Calendar

- 22 -

recommendation was to stick with three. They already have some funding secured and they should use that funding as effectively as possible. They haven't heard an outcome on the Career Center. She would like to advocate issues where there's money already allocated. Ms. Navab said the GA would also potentially decide to swap one of the items if people want.

A Delegate asked about the first time these items were presented. Mr. Marchand said they were presented at the last meeting and were proposed the week before the meeting that evening in meeting material. The Delegate asked if the President thought they could successfully advocate for the top four. Ms. Navab said that in her opinion, grad career services was least feasible. It would require staff time and someone to be hired, and there wasn't a lot of funding available. But they'll all be a fight.

A Delegate moved to swap mental health for the grad career services item, if resources were available. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Klein said that in the past there's been a graduate mental health workgroup, and he thought the GA should consider possibly forming one, so Delegates most interested in that issue could coordinate it independently from the E-Board and could advocate for it, with the full support of the GA, just like they have outreach as a workgroup.

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

THE MOTION TO MOVE MENTAL HEALTH TO THE ADVOCACY AGENDA PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

Mr. Baur moved to swap the equity issue for mental health. The motion was seconded. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and failed by hand-vote.

The motion to replace equity and inclusion for mental health in the Advocacy Agenda failed by hand-vote.

Mr. Marchand said they were now voting on the Advocacy Agenda, as amended. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ADVOCACY AGENDA PASSED BY HAND-VOTE: GSI BENEFITS DECENTRALIZATION, PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION, AND MENTAL HEALTH.

RESOLUTIONS

CONSENT CALENDAR

Ms. Navab said a Consent Calendar was being proposed for Resolutions. The idea was to save time. All the Resolutions would be under the Consent Calendar. If somebody wanted to amend or debate a Resolution, they should pull it off the Consent Calendar. Otherwise, everything that remaining under the Consent Calendar would automatically pass once the Consent Calendar was approved, without any discussion. Things that are not controversial could be approved quickly.

Consent Calendar -- 1109a, Budget Amendment to Allocate Contingency Funds from 2010-2011 - 23 -

Mr. Marchand asked if people wanted pull any bills from the Consent Calendar. He said there was a friendly amendment on 1109b.

The following bill was removed from the Consent Calendar: 1109b.

Mr. Marchand called for any other changes to the Consent Calendar, and seeing none, said the Consent Calendar was approved.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION:

1109a, Budget Amendment to Allocate Contingency Funds from 2010-2011

1109c, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the UCSA Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities

1109d, Budget Amendment to Restore Funding for External Affairs Legislative Directors

1109e, By-law Amendment to Refer Time-Sensitive Resolutions to Committees

The following Resolution, 1109a, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Mollie Epstein:

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ALLOCATE CONTINGENCY FUNDS FROM 2010-2011

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly ended the fiscal year with additional contingency funds leftover for the 2010-2011 fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, these funds can be carried forward and allocated towards events in the 2011-2012 fiscal year without negatively impacting the current budget; and

WHEREAS, leftover contingency funds are returned to the GA general funding pool at the end of the year to be reallocated in next year's budget unless otherwise specified;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that \$7,000 of these 2010-2011 contingency funds will be carried forward to the 2011-2012 contingency fund and allocated as follows:

- a. \$2000 will be allocated toward the hosting of the Graduate Student Affairs Officers reception – crucial to building relationships with the different departments across campus and increasing delegate representation;
- b. \$1,000 will be allocated to the reception for Auxiliary staff to show them our appreciation and build better relationships with our accounting and operations staff;
- c. \$4000 will be allocated to a new line item in the budget, “non-Pauley ballroom room rentals,” which will help to provide funding for room rentals for projects and student groups holding on-campus events in rooms that charge for their use over the course of the year.

Consent Calendar -- 1109c, Standing Policy and Directed Action to Approve the UCSA Graduate - 24 - Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities

The following Resolution, 1109c, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Alberto M. Ortega Hinojosa:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION TO APPROVE THE UCSA GRADUATE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

WHEREAS, the University of California Student Association (UCSA) is the recognized voice of all UC students; and

WHEREAS, the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly is a member of UCSA; and

WHEREAS, the 2010-2011 Graduate Student Campaign was to create a UC-wide document that outlined the rights of graduate students with the purpose of creating UC policy that guaranteed these rights; and

WHEREAS, in the 2010-2011 academic year, UC Berkeley's GA in collaboration with all the other member graduate student governments of UCSA gathered the opinion and concerns of graduate students through the system through a UC-wide survey and personal student outreach to inform the creation of the Bill of Rights and Responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, after multiple drafts and input from all the UC Graduate Student Governments, the UCSA Graduate and Professional Student Committee unanimously approved a final draft of the Graduate Students Bill of Rights and Responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, the UCSA Board approved the Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, UCSA's member Graduate Student Associations need to approve the Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities to be officially recognized as an all-UC graduate student document;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly approves the Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the External Affairs VP is directed to communicate this resolution to UCSA.

The following Resolution, 1109d, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Alberto M. Ortega Hinojosa:

**RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO RESTORE FUNDING FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
LEGISLATIVE DIRECTORS**

WHEREAS, for the 2010-2011 academic year, the External Affairs office was restructured to form three legislative director positions for each of the three levels of government, city, state and federal; and

Consent Calendar -- 1109d, Budget Amendment to Restore Funding for External Affairs - 25 -
Legislative Directors (cont'd)
-- 1109e, By-law Amendment to Refer Time-Sensitive Resolutions to Cmtes.
1109b, On Updating the GA Charter

**RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO RESTORE FUNDING FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
LEGISLATIVE DIRECTORS (cont'd)**

WHEREAS, each legislative director position receives a stipend of \$2,400; and

WHEREAS, the stipends for the legislative directors are paid from the staff budget line item of the External Affairs budget; and

WHEREAS the original budget requested for the External Affairs staff considered the total stipend amount of the three legislative directors and was part of the original budget proposal for the 2011-2012 academic year presented to the delegates at the May 2011 GA Delegates' Meeting; and

WHEREAS, in the absence of the External Affairs Vice President who was traveling for official Graduate Assembly responsibilities to UCLA during this meeting, the External Affairs staff budget line item was cut to \$6,500 during the May 2011 Delegates' Meeting; and

WHEREAS, this budget amendment was incorrectly made to give equal amounts of staff funding to the External Affairs VP and Campus Affairs VP offices, not realizing that the External Affairs staff is composed of three directors with broad responsibilities and the campus affairs staff is one administrative staff person; and

WHEREAS, as a consequence to the budget amendment, the External Affairs Staff budget line item is underfunded by \$700 to for the three Legislative Director positions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Staff budget line item will be increased by \$700 taken from the General Contingency budget line, to correct the May 2011 amendment.

Resolution 1109e, By-law Amendment to Refer Time-Sensitive Resolutions to Committees, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was each reconsidered later in the meeting.

Resolution 1109b

The following Resolution, 1109b, was authored by Ms. Navab and was co-sponsored by the 2010-2011 Rules Committee

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly (GA) Charter was last updated in 2002 and is based on an outdated version of the ASUC Constitution; and

WHEREAS, a new GA structure was established in the By-laws, effective July 1, 2011; and

1109b, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 26 -

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

WHEREAS, much of the current Charter is out of date or no longer applicable to the current MOU between the ASUC and the GA;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following changes be made to the existing GA Charter, effective July 1, 2011:

- 1.1. The Graduate Assembly of the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC), Berkeley, is constituted under the authority of ~~Article V~~ *Title X* of the Constitution of the ASUC.
- 1.2. The Graduate Assembly is the official representative body of the graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley. The fundamental principles of the Graduate Assembly are the promotion of a vibrant student social life, inclusiveness, activism, community service, educa-

tional improvement, and professional development. In service to these principles the Graduate Assembly advocates for students, funds student groups on campus, and directly manages a variety of projects.

[...]

- 2.1.1. Each department, school, or college within the Graduate Division shall be entitled in the Graduate Assembly to one (1) Delegate for each one hundred (100) graduate students or fraction thereof enrolled within, except that within those schools, colleges, or departments which are functionally subdivided into two or more semi-autonomous academic units or divisions, each unit or division shall be entitled to Delegates in accordance with the above rule. Determination of subdivisions shall be made by the ~~Organization~~ *Academic Affairs Vice President (AAVP from here on)* and *the Rules Committee*. Delegates shall be chosen in one of the following ways:
 - 2.1.1.1. Selected by graduate students in their unit participating in a publicized meeting or responding to a mail ballot.
 - 2.1.1.2. Selected by the representative student body of their unit.
 - 2.1.1.3. Appointed by their department, school, or college with the concurrence of the representative student body of their unit, if any.
- 2.1.2. Students in other graduate degree programs, such as interdisciplinary groups and individual Ph.D. programs, are entitled to Delegates as determined by the ~~Organization~~ *AAVP* and *the Rules Committee*, subject to the approval of the Assembly.
- 2.1.3. The ~~Graduate Assembly~~ *Delegate Assembly* shall be the final judge of each Delegate's right to be seated.

[...]

- 2.2.2. Alternate Delegates from departments, schools, or colleges within the Graduate Division shall be selected in one of the ways specified in paragraph 2.1.1. The ~~Organization~~ *AAVP* and *the Rules*

1109b, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 27 -

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

Committee shall determine selection procedures for Alternate Delegates from other graduate programs. While Alternate Delegates should attend as many meetings as possible, no unit shall be entitled to cast more votes than its number of Delegates allowed by section 2.1.1.

3. Officers and Elected Representatives

- 3.1. The Graduate Assembly shall annually elect a President, ~~who shall head the Assembly~~, an *External Affairs Vice President for External Affairs*, an *Assembly Affairs Vice President*, a *Campus Affairs Vice President*, and a *Treasurer (section 5.6 below)*. ~~and a Vice President for Academic Affairs.~~ Election shall be by a majority of Delegates voting at a scheduled and publicized meeting of the Assembly.

[...]

3.4.1. The Graduate Assembly shall establish committees as needed, except that there shall be a ~~Finance Budget and Funding~~ Committees as specified in section 5.5 below.

[...]

4.1. The Graduate Assembly shall establish staff positions and hire staff as needed, ~~except that there must be a Finance Funding Officer (Section 5.6 below) and that ASUC and Graduate Assembly personnel policies and procedures must be followed (Section 5.9 below).~~

[...]

[...]
5.2 The Graduate Assembly shall receive funding from the ASUC *as specified in the most recent Memorandum Of Understanding between the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly.* ~~of an amount equal to at least thirteen fourteenths (13/14) in the year 2001 and at least seven sevenths (7/7) each year thereafter of the total amount of ASUC discretionary fees (mandatory student activity fees) paid by graduate student members of the Association, including those enrolled in the Schools of Law and Business.~~

5.3. ~~In addition to monies derived from ASUC discretionary fees (mandatory student activities fees), the Graduate Assembly shall receive funding from the ASUC of an amount equal to at least thirteen fourteenths (13/14) in the year 2001 and at least seven sevenths (7/7) each year thereafter of the percentage of graduate students in the total University of California at Berkeley student population of the income, if any, allocated to ASUC governmental activities and student groups which derive from ASUC student side rental profits and any other mutually agreed upon sources.~~

[Renumber the following parts of the charter in section 5 appropriately. For example 5.4 becomes 5.3. The following sections in this text have already been renumbered as appropriate.]

[...]

5.45. The Graduate Assembly shall establish a ~~Finance Funding Committee and a Budget Committee,~~ each consisting of at least five (5) and not more than eleven (11) Delegates. ~~to be responsible for~~

1109b, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 28 -

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

~~preparing recommendations to the Assembly on the allocation of Assembly funds. The Finance Committee shall also be responsible for formulating policies for the allocation of Assembly funds, subject to the approval of the Assembly.~~

5.5.1 *The Funding Committee is responsible for preparing recommendations to the Delegate Assembly on the allocation of Graduate Student Group funding. The Committee will also be responsible for formulating policies for the allocation of such funding, subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly.*

5.5.2 *The Budget Committee is responsible for preparing annual recommendations to the Assembly on the allocation of Assembly funds. The Funding Committee shall also be responsible for formulating policies for the allocation of Assembly funds, subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly.*

5.56. The Graduate Assembly shall ~~select~~ *elect* a ~~Finance Officer~~ *Treasurer* and a ~~Funding Chair~~ *to be responsible for*:

~~5.6.1. overseeing the expenditure of Assembly funds;~~

~~5.6.2. assisting the Finance Committee in exercising its responsibilities; and~~

~~5.6.3. other financial matters delegated by the Assembly.~~

5.5.1 *The Treasurer is responsible for:*

5.5.1.1 *overseeing the expenditure of Assembly funds;*

5.5.1.2 *assisting the Budget Committee in exercising its responsibilities; and*

5.5.1.3 *other financial matters delegated by the Assembly.*

5.5.2 *The Funding Chair is responsible for:*

5.5.2.1 *overseeing the allocation of Graduate Student Group funding;*

5.5.2.2 *assisting the Funding Committee in exercising its responsibilities; and*

5.5.2.3 *other financial matters delegated by the Assembly.*

~~5.7. The Finance Officer must be confirmed by a two thirds (2/3) vote of the Assembly and shall be considered a member of the Graduate Assembly staff.~~

[With the removal of the old 5.7, sections 5.8-5.12 must be correctly renumbered.]

[...]

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

6.3. At least one (1) week notice shall be given of any Assembly meeting.

6.4. A quorum of the Graduate Assembly for the purpose of doing business shall consist of twenty-five (25) percent of the voting members, being the Delegates or their Alternates ~~and the Elected Representatives~~, plus one (1) voting member.

6.5. All meetings of the Graduate Assembly s 152 hall be open to all members of the University community, except that a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegates present and voting may close a meeting., ~~subject to the provisions of Article IX of the ASUC Constitution.~~

[...]

6.7. All meeting announcements and agendas, and all motions and resolutions passed by the Graduate Assembly shall be forwarded to the Chair of the ASUC Senate according to ~~Article V, Section 1 Title X, Article IV, Section 1~~ of the ASUC Constitution.

[...]

8. Changes to the Charter and By-Laws

8.1. This Charter may be amended by mail *or email* ballot by a two-thirds (2/3) or greater vote of the Delegates responding, providing that the total affirmative vote constitutes no less than a majority of the current Delegates., *except that changes in Part 6, Funding and Budgets, also require the approval of two-thirds (2/3) of the ASUC Senate, according to Article V Section 2 of the ASUC Constitution.*

[...]

9. Definition of voting percentages

9.1. *In the Charter and By-laws, whenever a fraction of the relevant number of delegates is required, the minimum number of delegates satisfying this requirement is that percent of the relevant number of delegates, rounded down, plus one.*

Ms. Navab said this was left over from last year. The Charter, the GA's main governing document, hasn't been updated in years. It refers, for instance, to clauses in the ASUC Constitution that are no longer there. Because it's a Charter amendment, it will go to an electronic vote of the Delegates and would require a two-thirds vote. The changes aren't substantial and just update the Charter so it's current.

Ms. Navab said there's a friendly amendment to correct a word that was mistyped.

Ms. Pymer moved to adopt the Rules Committee's analysis. The motion was seconded. The amendment adds to 8.1 "or email" to read "This Charter may be amended by mail *or email* ballot...." Also, section "9. Definition of Voting Percentages" and 9.1 were added.

1109b, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 30 -

1109f, To Establish Funding for the Operation Excellence Communications Coordinator

A Delegate asked if only Charter updates were subject to e-mail votes. Mr. Marchand said that was correct.

THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE RULES COMMITTEE'S AMENDMENTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Seeing no speakers, Mr. Marchand said they would go directly to a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1109b, RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution 1109f

The following Resolution, 1109f, was authored by Bahar Navab:

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING FOR THE OPERATION EXCELLENCE COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR

WHEREAS, last year, the delegates approved of Badr Albanna to serve as the Operation Excellence Communications Coordinator (OECC); and

WHEREAS, the delegates approved a \$500/month stipend for the OECC last year; and

WHEREAS, Operational Excellence is quite a large project on campus and we need a dedicated staff person to manage communications with all the different OE teams, undergraduate and grad students (including the GA and ASUC) for this project; and

WHEREAS as it was unclear whether Badr would continue as OECC, we did not allocate funding to the OECC position during the budget cycle; and

WHEREAS, we have a couple of graduate students interested in serving as the OECC for the 2011-2012 school year; and

WHEREAS, we would like to be able to offer the OECC a stipend so that they can afford to put in the over 10 hours per week required of this position;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Delegate Assembly allocate \$3000 (which is less than \$500/month) from the general contingency fund to provide a stipend to the OECC for 10 months.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA President be in charge of hiring the OECC and will present the name of the top candidate at the October or November delegates meeting.

Ms. Navab said they had a similar position last year. The Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator is a position that takes at least ten hours a week, and the GA tries to provide a stipend for this

1109f, To Establish Funding for the Operation Excellence Communications Coordinator (cont'd) - 31 -

person so the time they give up can be supplemented. Matt Goren was introduced earlier as the Communications Coordinator. The bill would approve his stipend, with the money to come from the Contingency Fund. She believed an amendment was being proposed by the Campus Affairs Committee.

Ms. De la Torre said the Committee looked at the numbers and was worried that the position would get paid a very low amount, compared to what other GA staff got paid and wanted to increase the stipend to \$500 per month.

A motion to adopt the amendment out of committee was made and seconded, to have the first Resolved Clause read as follows:

"Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Delegate Assembly allocate \$4,000 from the general contingency fund to provide a stipend to the OECC for 10 months."

A Delegate said the motion dealt with a salary for Mr. Goren and asked if they should discuss this with Mr. Goren in the room. Mr. Marchand said the GA has a conflict of interest policy. If someone has a material interest in something, they should not vote or speak on the motion, other than to answer questions. So Mr. Goren would just answer questions addressed to him.

Mr. Rabkin requested the person concerned to leave the room for the discussion. Mr. Marchand said that he should be able to answer any questions anyway.

Mr. Baur asked Mr. Goren for any comment. Mr. Goren said the Project Coordinator position that was open, which was discussed earlier, comes out to about \$20 an hour; and the GA was discussing raising what would become his pay, which would be \$12.50 an hour.

Mr. Froehle asked if Ms. Navab thought the candidate would decline the job if the GA didn't raise the salary. Ms. Navab said he didn't think he would. She thought the job will take a lot more than ten hours a week. She believed Badr Albanna, who held the position last year, worked about 15 hours a week. It was quite time consuming. A stipend of \$500 was more in line with other stipends the GA gives for a similar workload. Most GSRs make more than that for 10 hours a week.

Ms. De la Torre said the GA should set a precedent that it wasn't going to underpay its staff. This was an important message they're sending to people about staffing. They also have money in the Contingency Fund. The Project Coordinators don't make \$20 an hour, and this person will work more than what was stated in the job description.

Mr. Rabkin said he was sympathetic about not nickel and diming people, but the GA shouldn't spend its entire treasury to pay staff. A third or a half of the GA budget goes to pay staff. And there's also inflation, so 50% becomes two-thirds, and then there's no money. Student group leaders don't get stipends and manage as much per student as the GA. Maybe \$12.50 was too low, but the goal should not be to throw the money out the window.

Ms. Navab said that in case people were really on the fence with this, if this fails she'd see if she could free up some of her staff stipend for other staff who were supposed to be hired and supplement this position to be up to \$500. So she'd pay the extra \$120 a month out of her stipend staff.

1109f, To Establish Funding for the Operation Excellence Communications Coordinator (cont'd) - 32 -

Mr. Asriyan right asked what salaries generally paid. Ms. Navab said they could see that in the budget. Most Executive Officers make over \$1,000 a month. She's working almost a 40-hour week on the GA, so per hour, it didn't come out to very much. The Project Coordinators make a little less than \$900 a month.

Staff make between \$2,000 and \$5,000 a year. Mr. Asriyan said it seemed to make sense to raise this salary.

A Delegate asked what the philosophy was behind paying staff. Ms. Navab said that OE and Lower Sproul are the two staff positions that are big time commitments, and were really important seats for the GA. Those staff vote on really important OE decisions, and these reps are the only people in the room who speak for grads, besides her, especially when she's not there. OE is making significant changes to campus structure and staffing. So it was a really important position. It wasn't someone just going to a committee and voicing their opinion. People actually have to negotiate behind the scenes and meet with high-level administrators, and try to sway votes on budget proposals. Mr. Albanna was amazing last year, and put in so much time and energy. It's a huge time commitment.

Mr. Helu said he supported raising the stipend to \$500 a month. OE was really important, and it was important to have someone to focus on this. The difference in cost was not substantial. The amount was \$3,000, and the amendment would increase it to \$4,000.

Mr. Sehgal said the President indicated she could find additional funds to pay for this position. Ms. Navab said the proposal was to pay the difference. Mr. Sehgal asked where that money would come from. Ms. Navab said she had money in the budget to hire staff, such as a chief-of-staff, which she still hasn't hired, because no grads applied. Those funds haven't been used for the last three or four months, and that could cover the gap.

Mr. Sehgal asked if that would be sustainable in future years. Ms. Navab said the budget is reallocated every year, so in April they could decide to give more money to this line item, or not.

A Delegate said he agreed with the point to keep salaries low. But it wasn't fair to take it out on this position.

A motion to call the question, end debate, and come to a vote, was made and seconded passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO AMEND THE FIRST RESOLVED CLAUSE, FROM \$3,000 TO \$4,000.

Mr. Marchand called for discussion on the main motion. A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1109f, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING FOR THE OPERATION EXCELLENCE COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR.

Mr. Marchand said that for 1109e, which was passed under the Consent Calendar, there was an amendment from the Rules Committee that wasn't approved by the GA. So they would reconsider it.

Ms. Navab said they got this Resolution from undergrad student government, which passed a similar Resolution. The ASUC could speak on behalf of all grads, but they asked the GA to have its own vote on this, and it was nice of them to offer the GA that opportunity.

Mr. Marchand said that SB185 is awaiting the signature of Gov. Brown. It would allow the UC and CSU Systems to use information about race in the admissions process. The rationale that this is not meant to supersede Prop. 209, which was passed by California voters, to prevent affirmative action in university admissions. Rather, the goal was to allow the University to do a holistic review. So it wasn't necessarily to make race the factor, but to include race as a factor to be considered by people doing admissions.

Mr. Rabkin said he wanted to make a motion on behalf of Ben Kehoe, who had to leave, to delete on page 2, the eighth original Whereas Clause, on legacy admissions, lines 37-40. It wasn't clear that because Princeton did X, Berkeley should do Y. The motion to amend was seconded.

A Delegate asked why External Affairs didn't leave that in. Mr. Goren said this is his research area. The idea was that legacy admissions are like affirmative action, or affirmative action for white men.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. RABAKIN'S AMENDMENT PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Niederhut said the idea of ASUC Senators submitting Resolutions to the GA made him uncomfortable. In the future, he would like Delegates or Officers do that. Ms. Navab said the ASUC is the GA's overarching arm and technically can make policy decisions on behalf of the GA. The fact that they came to the GA allows the GA to speak for themselves. Unless the GA takes its own stance, ASUC policy stands for GA policy. The GA gets its money from the ASUC, so the GA doesn't want to start creating rifts.

Mr. Marchand said there's nothing that prevents a committee from rewriting a Resolution, but he understood the point. Ms. Navab said she'd be happy to send out surcharge Resolutions and ask if Delegates wanted to rewrite it.

Mr. Marchand said that the External Affairs Committee proposed amendments.

On a point of personal privilege, Crab said the Chair of the External Affairs Committee wasn't actually able to move the External Affairs Committee recommendations, and if the GA wanted to discuss them, somebody should make a motion to adopt them.

Mr. Helu moved to adopt all the External Affairs Committee's proposed amendments. The recommendation includes deleting lines 37 - 40, which the GA just did. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Marchand called for discussion on the amendment.

Mr. Froehle asked if the quotations were taken from the SB185. Mr. Ortega said they were.

Mr. Ortega said the Committee report notes that the Chancellor does not technically have the authority to take official stances on bills, which is something only UCOP had authority to do.

A motion to call the question, to end debate and come to a vote, was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

**THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE'S AMENDMENTS
PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Klein said the Astronomy Department feels lukewarm on this issue, but in general, the sentiment is that any racism was wrong in that supporting this type of legislation encourages inconsequential factors for admission and lowers the overall quality of the student body's academic merits. The Department urges other Delegates to join them in voting down this Resolution.

Mr. Niederhut yielded time to Mr. Goren, who an expert on this issue. Mr. Goren said he agreed with Chris in the general principle that they want to end racism. He thought being color blind and trying to ignore these issues that come up in this Resolution was not the way to end racism. This was his body of research, and the overwhelming body of psychological, sociological, and other evidence, suggests that trying to be color blind basically increases racial bias and all sorts of biases, both on an individual level and an organizational level. He supports the sentiment that they should try to end racism, and they hope for a day, as Dr. Martin Luther King said, where people could judge people not by the color of their skin, but by the content of our character. They're not there yet. In trying to pre-emptively get to that point will only make it longer before they reach that point.

A Delegate said the Agricultural Resources Department discussed this and it mostly came down to questions where there is a history of discrimination and to what extent current policy could be used to right those wrongs, as it were. The other side of the Department felt on the side of asking to what extent it was legitimate to ask current generations to take it upon themselves to make amends for that, and to what extent an admissions committee take race into consideration, but not use it to form a preference. Also, to what extent are admissions committees already considering this without being compelled to do so. People were on the fence.

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

Mr. Marchand said they would come to a vote on 1109g. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1109g, AS AMENDED PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL 185.**

The following Resolution, 1109g, was approved as amended above, and was authored by Sydney Fang and Brisa Diaz, and was co-sponsored by Ms. Navab and Mr. Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL 185

WHEREAS, underprivileged and historically excluded groups, such as people of color, women, and queer people, are underrepresented in higher education and in the workplace, resulting in class stratification by gender, race, and sexual orientation; and

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL 185 (cont'd)

WHEREAS, prior to the 1960s and the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court case, institutions such as the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) had admissions policies that blatantly excluded people of color, women, and discriminated based on religious affiliation; and

WHEREAS, such history created a need for policies that take into account factors such as, race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation or national origin, in order to benefit an underrepresented group; and

WHEREAS, affirmative action fulfills the State's promise to make higher education accessible to students from diverse backgrounds by ensuring that diversity on CSU and UC campuses is representative of the diversity of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, when California passed the anti-affirmative action initiative, Proposition 209, in 1996, the following freshmen class of 1998 at University of California, Berkeley saw a 50% decline in African American, Latino, and Pilipino students compared to the prior year, according to the American Bar Association; and

WHEREAS, without the ability to consider all relevant factors in admission policies, underrepresented groups will continue to gain admission at rates that are disparate from the demographics of the State; and

WHEREAS, SB 185, authored by California State Senator Hernandez, allows CSU and UC schools to consider "race, gender, ethnicity, and national origin, along with other relevant factors, in undergraduate and graduate admissions, to the maximum extent permitted by the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution, Section 31 of Article I of the California Constitution, and relevant case law"; and

WHEREAS, SB 185 authorizes UC and CSU institutions to consider the previously stated factors, it does not *mandate* such considerations; and

WHEREAS, SB 185 has passed in both the California State Assembly and Senate and awaits the Governor's signature; and

WHEREAS, SB 185 encourages similar policies of comprehensive review, by promoting a more complete and informed experience of an applicant; and

WHEREAS, SB 185 would allow the University to "consider the use of criteria and procedures that allow students to enroll who are otherwise fully eligible and admissible"; and

WHEREAS, SB 185 states "the University of California and California State University... seek to enroll a student body that meets high academic standards and reflects the cultural, racial, geographic, economic, and social diversity of California"; and

GA Endorsement of the Council of Deans Fora on the Future of Public Universities
1109e, By-law Amendment to Refer Time-Sensitive Resolutions to Committees

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL 185 (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the passage of SB 185 will increase access to higher education for those who have been historically excluded, therefore ensuring individual autonomy, enfranchisement in society, and promoting institutions where innovation, creativity, and heterogeneity are valued;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly stands in support SB 185.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA Executive Officers are directed to raise this issue with Chancellor Birgeneau, asking him to publicly support SB 185 and write a letter to Governor Brown urging him to sign the bill into law.

GA ENDORSEMENT OF THE COUNCIL OF DEANS FORA ON THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Ms. Navab said there was no policy about how the GA sponsors things short of that they wanted to propose a floor vote on something they'd like to have the GA sponsor. The Council of Deans is putting together four fora on issues of equity and inclusion, privatization of the UC System, with it meant to be public versus private. These for a are being done with legislators, faculty, administrators, and students. They would like the GA to sponsor it. People thought it was a great idea to increase dialogue and get information out there, and take a proactive approach instead of reacting to the State. She would like to ask the Delegates if the GA could officially sponsor it, since there's no policy about how to sponsor such things.

It was so moved and seconded. It's for the GA to sponsor the fora that the Council of Deans is putting on. They haven't decided the speakers. It's being co-sponsored by all the Deans on campus.

Mr. Marchand said people looked at this from the rules perspective. It seems that the President can speak on behalf of the Delegates, but it doesn't empower a formal Resolution. However, he thought this vote would be sufficient. There's no formal Resolution, but they think this vote would be sufficient. Since the event is in October, they couldn't have a Resolution in time for the October meeting. If there's consent in the room, it would be good for the GA to endorse it. Ms. Navab said that she could have said that she sponsored this as GA President, but she wanted to come to the Delegates first.

THE MOTION TO ENDORSE THE COUNCIL OF DEANS FORA ON THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES_PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution 1109e

Mr. Marchand said Resolution 1109e was approved under the Consent Calendar. However, a friendly amendment from the Rules Committee was not approved. He would therefore like to have a motion to

reconsider the bill. The Rules Committee proposed a small amendment and the bill was passed under CC without the amendment. If the GA wanted to consider that, the bill would have to be reconsidered. A motion to reconsider 1109e was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER 1109e PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Marchand said the Resolution says that Delegates need to bring a Resolution two weeks in advance in time for the next meeting. The Rules Committee thought the burden should be on the E-Board to refer it two weeks in advance and didn't want the E-Board to wait until the last moment to refer a bill, even if Delegates submitted the bill two weeks in advance. This is something the Committee wanted for the process because the E-Board will meet two weeks before every Delegate meeting.

A motion to adopt the amendment out of committee was made and seconded. Seeing no discussion, Mr. Marchand said they would come to a vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Seeing no discussion on the Resolution as amended, Mr. Marchand said they would come to a vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1109e, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution, 1109e, was approved as amended above, and was authored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO REFER TIME-SENSITIVE RESOLUTIONS TO COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, according to current By-laws, resolutions must be presented a month in advance (at the previous Assembly meeting) to be referred to committee for review; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly Exception ('fast-track') process for urgent resolutions bypasses committee referral; and

WHEREAS, if a time-sensitive resolution is submitted after an Assembly meeting, but early enough for committees to review it, there should be a process to refer it to the pertinent committees;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following section be added as By-law 6.4.2.4:

6.4.2.4. Referral by the Executive Board. Resolutions of a time sensitive nature may be referred by the Executive Board no later than two weeks in advance of the Delegate Assembly meeting, allowing them to be discussed and voted on at the following Delegate Assembly meeting. Any resolution referred by the Executive Board, along with the list of committees it is referred to, must be communicated to the Delegates as soon as possible. Resolutions of this nature may be submitted to the Assembly Affairs Vice President for consideration under this process.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the following sections be renumbered accordingly.

Mr. Marchand said that there was no other business. People were invited to a Delegates' social at the Bear's Lair. He wanted to thank them for their patience. Ms. Navab said the GA pays for the first round at the Bear's Lair.

Mr. Marchand said that if people wanted to rearrange the room back to the way it was, that help would be appreciated.

This meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary