

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 4, 2004

### SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- 
- [Heard GA and general announcements.](#)
- [Heard reports from the GA Business Manager and the Funding Advisor.](#)
- [Heard and adopted Officers' reports.](#)
- [Heard a report from the Executive Board.](#)
- [Heard and adopted reports from the Academic Affairs Committee; the Funding Committee, for Grad Events funding, Rounds 1 and 2, and Round 2 of Grants; and the Finance Committee, including the Quarterly Report.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's Grad Council representatives.](#)
- [Elected Matt Eckerle as the Alternative GA representative on the Grad Council, as a result of Ms. Molina's resignation.](#)
- [Approved an update to the GA's Advocacy Agenda, dealing with mentorship.](#)
- [Approved a Resolution In Support of a Uniform Health Fee.](#)
- [Approved a Resolution In Support of a Fair and Just Student Code of Conduct.](#)
- [Approved a Resolution In Support of Changes to the ASUC By-Laws.](#)
- [Approved a Resolution In Support of Campus Student Fee Policy.](#)

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Rishi Sharma at 5:37 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Sharma said people should have picked up a copy of the agenda on their way in and asked if there were any problems with it, as presented. As a reminder, if they want to add a Resolution to the agenda, it had to be sponsored by a Delegate and had to be submitted by 5 p.m. the Wednesday the week before the Delegates meeting. A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Sharma called for any changes to the minutes from the October GA meeting. Ms. Levitan said that in her discussion with the ASUC Senate representative, the minutes state that she said she thought the ASUC President had signed the autonomy pledge, and should read she didn't think he signed it. Also, she asked whether he was sincere, rather stating that she thought he was not sincere. Mr. Sharma called for any objection to those changes in the minutes, and seeing none, said those changes would be made.

## Announcements

- 2 -

Mr. Sharma called for a motion to approve the minutes, as amended. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 7, 2004 GA MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### GA Announcements

Mr. Sharma said he would stick to the time limits for Announcements as listed on the agenda since they had a lot of stuff to get through and hopefully will get out early.

Mr. Garcia said this didn't apply to most of them, but as a heads up, if they want to request money from the Finance Committee, the request had to be submitted seven days before the Committee's regularly scheduled meeting, which occurs ten days before the Delegates meeting. So requests have to be submitted 17 days before the Delegates meeting. These dates weren't arbitrary and mad sense. If people have questions, Mr. Garcia said they could e-mail him, at finance.ga. Mr. Sharma said this dealt with internal GA allocations, as distinct from other funding.

Ms. Dugas said the GA will be closed on Veteran's Day, November 11, and the day after, November 12. If people have any questions or concerns, they should contact the office before then. That means that any reimbursements that would fall on those days would not be available until Monday.

### General Announcements

Ms. Weeden said the Berkeley Law Foundation will sponsor an auction extravaganza in Pauley Ballroom, with food, drink, and entertainment, including a Delegate performing. Admission is \$15 beforehand and \$20 at the door. The money goes to the Phoenix Fellowship, through which students of the Law School counter Prop. 209, to get students of color who have been admitted to Boalt to attend the School. Ms. Weeden said two GA Delegates, she and Dan Aguilar, were the two recipients that year.

Nick Rosenstock introduced himself and said he was Chair of the Grad Social Club. He wanted to thank

those who came to their Oktoberfest, and hoped they had a good time. The Grad Social Club is sponsoring a theater outing later that month. If people haven't received word of that, they could send the Club an e-mail at gsc.Berkeley.

## REPORTS

-

-

### Report from the GA Manager

### Report from the GA Manager

- 3 -

Ms. Dugas said her report was included in the agenda packet. In November she'll submit the quarterly budget report, and will have an update when they get to the Finance Committee report. She wanted to alert Delegates to new staff. All their positions are filled, something the office was very excited about. For the record, they have four new staff: Graduate Women's Project Coordinator, B. Christine Arce; Coordinator, Women of Color Initiative, Gabriela Rico, celebrating the 20th annual conference that year; and Web Assistant, Mo Kashmiri, for additional Web support, with an updated Web site in about one day, such things if they log on, they'd see a new page. Mr. Kashmiri is a past GA Officer. In addition, they have a new Outreach Assistant, Hodari Toure. They also interviewed and selected somebody that day for Graduate Support Services Project Coordinator, but that won't be announced until the person accepts the position. So there's a full office, and they're very excited about that.

### Report from the Funding Coordinator

Ms. Moore said that spending allocations were attached to the agenda packet. If people have questions they could e-mail her or the Funding Committee Chairman, Mr. Lanting. The last deadline for the semester for Graduate Events, Rounds 4, and 4A, is November 19. All the information was in the report and people could see the dates. Round 4A is specific to early spring, for January meetings and events, while Round 4 is for one week in December, for holiday events. She would ask people to mark their calendars for the deadline on the 19th. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

### General Announcements (cont'd)

Mr. Sharma said that without objection they would return to General Announcements. They had three guests that evening, Senators from the ASUC, the overall student government, all of whom were undergrads: Jerico Lavarias, Jenn Chon, and Manuel Buenrostro. They were at the meeting to observe how the GA functions and perhaps take some tips back to the Senate on how the GA operates.

Mr. Sharma said reports from Project Coordinators were included in the packet.

### Officer Reports

Mr. Sharma said his GA President's report was pretty basic and was included in the packet. He called for any questions.

Mr. Sharma said that if there were no questions, he would entertain a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE GA PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Reporting as the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said his report was in the agenda packet. One highlight was that they communicated that month with the Administration in support of the

### Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 4 -

ASUC's opposition to proposed changes to the drop deadline for undergrads. An announcement was expected that week from Dean Holub, of Letters & Science. The GA opposes changing the overall drop deadline.

Mr. Daal asked what the change was. Mr. Schechtman said the proposal would shorten the time to drop classes, to two weeks for impacted courses. One problem was that "impacted" classes were not defined. The proposed change was intended to address courses that are required for majors that are routinely over-subscribed but, within a couple of weeks, have open seats. The GA supports the attempt to try to address that problem. The accompanying proposal is to drop the overall drop deadline from eight weeks to four weeks, for undergrads. Mr. Daal asked if the drop deadline for grads hasn't changed. Mr. Schechtman said it hasn't.

Mr. Schechtman said they also communicated their general concerns around the campus Principles of Community Initiative, which grads may or may not have heard about. It proposes principles of community that would govern the Berkeley campus. While the GA said it supports an atmosphere of amicable debate, they don't believe the campus represents a single community, but rather, a community of communities. Attempting to impose one set of values on the all the diverse constituencies, including faculty, staff, grads, undergrads, and administrators, could be naive and potentially politically dangerous, since the Principles were mentioned as a potential basis for the changes in the Code of Conduct.

Mr. Stagi asked how each of these messages the GA conveyed were received, and what the initial reaction was. Mr. Schechtman said he would say the reaction they received from Dean Holub, of L&S, was very harsh, regarding grad concerns on the drop deadline. Dean Holub felt grads had not consulted with him, although the GA's Grad Council reps had actually met with him for the community initiative. Mr.

Schechtman said he would say their concerns were heard productively and revisions were being made to the principles of community. Mr. Stagi said he wanted to note that the Dean was really positive to deal with and discuss issues with.

A motion to accept the report was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Cantor said he wanted to make sure everybody signed the sign-up sheet, and said people should have the name tags. If they don't have a name tag or weren't listed on the sign-up sheet, they should talk to him, because there was a problem.

Reporting as the External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Medina said they were really exhausted after poll watching and getting out the vote for the elections. They registered, with the ASUC and other student organizations, about 6,500 students on campus. There were a lot of glitches during the elections in terms of students not being registered and not being on the rolls. So more than a third of students who were registered had to use provisional ballots. The four propositions that the GA took an official stance on all failed.

In terms of what's going on externally, the Regents meeting will be held at UCLA on the 17th and 18th, Wednesday and Thursday. One issue to be discussed is the Los Alamos Labs bidding, and the Regents will vote whether or not to bid on the Labs again. Another issue was for first-year grads or professional

Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 5 -

students, with additional fee increases. For grads it will be 10%, and the amount for professional students was not yet known. That's coming up, and something the Regents will vote on at the November meeting. If anyone wanted to go and give public comment at the meeting, Ms. Medina said they should contact her and something could be arranged. Going from that, their fees are still increasing under the compact that Pres. Dynes signed with the Governor. Now that elections are over, Ms. Medina said the office will start doing advocacy, which includes in-district lobbying and going to Sacramento. They would really encourage grads to help them out, even if it's just once during the entire academic year. They really need to continue pressuring legislators to not forget that they're a public institution, and that they need to continue to fund the University. She'd pass around a sign-up sheet, and she called for any questions.

A motion to adopt the report was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE REPORT FROM THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

### Committee Reports

Mr. Sharma said the report from the Executive Board was included in the agenda packet. He called for any

questions. A motion to adopt the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE REPORT FROM THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

-----  
Begin written report from the Executive Board

Executive Board  
4 November 2004

The Executive Board has met twice since the last Delegates meeting: Thursday, October 14th and Thursday, October 28th.

The members of the Executive Board are: Nzingha Dugas (GA Manager), David Garcia (Chemistry), Trevor Lanting (Physics), Claudia Medina (Law), Josh Daniels (Law), Lola Odusanya (Chemical Engineering), Romola Sanyal (Architecture), Robert Schechtman (German), Rishi N. Sharma (Law), and Jay Stagi (City and Regional Planning). Members serve by virtue of their official positions in the Graduate Assembly.

The purpose of the Executive Board is to coordinate the advocacy side of the Graduate Assembly between the three Executive Officers, the three standing committees, and the representatives to the Graduate Council.

The Executive Board took the following actions in addition to the general coordination and planning assigned to the Board by the By-laws:

#### Graduate Social Club

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 6 -

-----  
Written report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

The Board reviewed proposals for how best to re-structure the Graduate Social Club within the larger Graduate Assembly structure. Over the summer, the Board voted to treat the GSC as a club for funding purposes, but over the course of the year this proved impracticable in some regards. The Board has decided to maintain GSC as a club unless a proposal is developed that makes more sense.

#### Undergraduate Drop Deadline

In cooperation with the ASUC executives, the Board worked to express its hesitation with a new drop deadline policy through a letter to Undergraduate Dean Robert Holub.

#### Principles of Community Initiative

The Board has developed a response to the proposed Principles of Community, including specific recommendations on substantive changes to the current draft text and procedural innovations in how to develop that text as a true reflection of the community, or communities, on the Berkeley campus.

### Funding Appeals

The Board resolved funding appeals and left-over funding applications not considered as part of the normal funding round because of Graduate Assembly fault.

End written report from the Executive Board

-----

Reporting for the Academic Affairs Committee, Mr. Schechtman said the report was included in the packet. The Committee met and talked about writing a report on affordable housing before the end of the year, and also on getting started with the Faculty Mentoring Award process. They'll meet next week, and he would ask anybody who's interested in either of those to please talk to him after the meeting. Also, he'd pass around copies of a book, which was sent to them for free, "And Don't Call Me Racist," about racism and structural inequality of the United States. Particularly given the political events of that past week, it might be timely. If Delegates' departments have a reading room, or something similar, he would ask them to leave the book out for people to read. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

them to leave the book out for people to read.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions. A motion to adopt the report was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Mr. Lanting said they met on Monday and made Round 3 allocations, as seen in the spreadsheet in the agenda packet. They were able to fully fund every group that had a valid application. Mr. Garcia moved to extend the time for reports by ten minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

### Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 7 -

Mr. Lanting said that to get back to information that Ms. Moore will send out, the deadline for Round 4 and Round 4A applications is November 19. If a student group wants to put on an event in December or January, they have to apply under Rounds 4 and 4A. The November 19 deadline is for both. He would ask Delegates to let student group officers or the people in charge of funding that the deadline was coming up. If people have any questions they could e-mail him or Ms. Moore.

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. Mr. Sharma called for any questions. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, GRADUATE EVENTS ROUNDS 1 AND 2, AND ROUND 2 OF GRANTS, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Ms. Dugas said that to add to the report, they've started the process of applying online for funding. They've done some test runs and they think they'll be able to have this up in the next week. So for Grad Events, people will be able to submit their application online. And shortly thereafter, they'll move to Grad Events 2, and then the rest. The office is pretty excited about this, and it's taken a while to get it going.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Garcia said the Committee's report was in the agenda packet. They had a few monetary allocations. Mr. Schechtman and Mr. Stagi, Grad Council representatives, requested \$5,000 for Faculty Mentoring Award. The Finance Committee wanted to fund this and approved an allocation, but had reservations about the policy for this award. They have to obtain an exception of University policies every year in order to spend GA money on this Award, so they want to try to find a permanent home for this. There are a couple of options. One was to try to make the Academic Senate take over this Award and to make them the fiscal agent for the award, with the GA in charge of administering the award and selecting the recipients. The Committee decided that's what it ultimately wanted to happen, as a matter of fiscal policy. If the GA fronts the money for the award, it should have control over who is selected. The report contains a recommendation that the Delegates charge the Organization and Rules Committee with changing the By-laws so a standing committee is created that's responsible every year for administering the award and budgeting for it.

Mr. Garcia said the Funding Committee also allocated \$2,500 to the Web team, to upgrade the GA server and the computer. This is necessary because the GA Web site was getting hacked a lot, and there were also some problems with having a PC server in an all-Mac office. Hopefully, this expenditure will rectify that problem as well.

Finally, the Business Office and the Empowering Women of Color project provided a justification for an expense that the Committee previously approved money for, but restricted the allocation until a justification was submitted. That justification was submitted and the Committee approved it. So the restrictions on that money were lifted. Finally, the quarterly report was presented by Ms. Dugas, the Business Manager, which Ms. Dugas would go over.

Ms. Dugas said the quarterly report is done three times an academic year, as per the Charter and By-laws, in November, February, and April. In presenting the quarterly report, the office reconciles the records of the GA's fiscal agent, which is the ASUC Auxiliary. The office tries to give the most updated records. Normally, it takes some time to get the current report, and the office usually only gives the GA reports starting with the first quarter, July through September. But they just got the October report from the ASUC on Wednesday, so that was factored in. She wanted to alert the GA about this early reconciliation,

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 8 -

since they usually go through two periods of review of that reconciliation. But the Business Office wanted to give Delegates the most updated numbers. Most of the expenses are typical for the quarter. There were some that are not and she was sure those will come through the Finance Committee.

Ms. Dugas said she would direct their attention to the last page of the sponsorship, page 6 of the agenda packet, which has the most important information, the total for all GA programs in terms of what was budgeted last year, what was budgeted this year, and whether the expenditures were within bounds. The next page outlines the GA's projected revenues. For student fees, they get about \$404,000. The GA also has a beverage contract that yields about \$50,000, and they get a matching grant from the Graduate Division, such as for the Travel Fund program. Other revenue was from carry forward, which is factored in. Most importantly, they're in the process of requesting a grant from the Grad Division, which the GA has been given over the last 15 years. On the sponsorship, the GA has to indicate that this revenue is a request only, because they haven't solidified that particular contract. The spreadsheet outlines how much money would be left in GA surplus with the Grad Division support. Without those funds, there would be a slight deficit. That will look different next time because it will be zero because transfers will be made to adjust for that.

Ms. Dugas said the budget was pretty much where it should be. There are no other important indicators. People should feel free to ask her or Mr. Garcia any questions. Mr. Garcia called for any questions on the quarterly report or the allocations the Finance Committee made.

Ms. Dugas said she just received the numbers that day, so people should feel free to e-mail her or Mr. Garcia if they have questions, comments, or suggestions, and they'll try to incorporate that into the next report.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the report. **THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

-----  
Begin written report from the Finance Committee

Finance Committee Report  
Delegates Meeting, Thursday, November 4, 2004

Presented by David E. Garcia, Finance Committee Chair

New Allocations:

The Finance Committee (FC) made the following allocations based on the priority list passed by the delegates last year.

1. \$5,000.00 was allocated to the Faculty Mentoring Award (FMA) pending proof is submitted to the FC showing the GA has received permission to give faculty members GA money. The FC expressed concern about annually obtaining approval for the exception to spend GA funds on the faculty and finding a permanent home for the FMA. The FC very strongly feels that this award should be kept in the GA so that the GA retains the control over, and prestige of, administering the FMA. The FC, as a matter of fiscal policy, recommends that the delegates charge the Organization and Rules Committee

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 9 -

-----  
Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

with creating a standing committee to administer the FMA beginning in the 2005-2006 academic year by passing this report. This new committee is responsible for all aspects of the award (e.g., budgeting, selection, etc.) and for deciding whether it will annually apply for an exception to the aforementioned rule or find a way for the Academic Senate (AS) to administer GA money for the award. If the latter option is chosen, the AS must be aware that they are only a fiscal agent for the award.

2. \$2,500.00 was allocated to the Web team for an upgrade on the GA server and computer systems.
3. The Business Office and the EWOCC project provided a justification for the request submitted to the FC before the October Delegates' meeting. The FC approved the justification via e-mail vote and lifted the restrictions placed on the allocation in its last report.

Quarter Report:

Nzingha Dugas, the GA Business Manager, presented the quarterly budget report, which the FC approved without revision.

End written report from the Finance Committee  
-----

Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

Mr. Stagi said that unfortunately, due to the confidential nature of Grad Council meetings, there will be a slight lag time in representatives' ability to relay the contents of those meetings. The minutes have to be approved prior to being able to report anything out. So the notes in the packet were from the September meeting. A motion to extend time for reports by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Stagi said he wanted to touch on Dean Holub's presentation and note that because the Dean gave a rather angry reply to the GA's request that he change his policy on the drop deadline. In his reply, Dean Holub stated there was not any way this would affect grads. Yet as noted in the report, that isn't what he said at the Grad Council meeting. Also, Mr. Stagi said he was appointed to the Mentoring Committee. As Mr. Garcia reported for the Finance Committee, there was a request to find a home for the Faculty Mentoring Award. This was supported by the Academic Senate and was already under discussion via that avenue. He was taking care of this on that level, so things were moving forward. He called for any questions. Mr. Schechtman said this report did not need to be approved.

Regarding the report from the Store Operations Board, Mr. Sharma said they'll meet on Tuesday.

## NEW BUSINESS

Election of a GA Grad Council Representative

- 10 -

### Election of a GA Grad Council Representative

With Mr. Sharma chairing the meeting, he said that along with the three GA representatives on the Grad Council, Ms. Molina is the Alternate representative, and has resigned. No one has expressed an interest in advance to serve on the Council. If people were interested, the GA could hold an election that evening, or they could table the election for a month so people can get more information. He asked if anybody was interested in the position. Mr. Eckerle said he was. Mr. Sharma suggested holding the election that evening.

Ms. Ahrendt asked when the meetings are held. Mr. Stagi said they meet once a month, the second Monday of the month, 2:00 to 4:00.

A Delegate asked if the new appointee would need to go through the training that the other Grad Council reps went through. Mr. Sharma said there will probably be a knowledge gap. The alternate, the fourth GA rep on the Grad Council, also becomes a member of the Executive Board, and Board members go through a training in the summer. So the new alternate will have that knowledge gap. There is training in January, so whoever is elected will be part of that. Mr. Schechtman said that for their information, the Executive Board meets two Thursdays a month, the week before and the week after the GA meeting. Mr. Stagi said the Alternate was not required to attend Grad Council meetings unless somebody else doesn't show up, but they could have used him that Monday.

Mr. Sharma called for nominations, and said Delegates could nominate themselves or other grads. Mr. Garcia nominated Matt Eckerle. Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations, and hearing none, called for a motion to close nominations. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Shamsabadi asked Mr. Eckerle to step outside the room for a discussion and a vote. They'd have a secret ballot and he asked people to close their eyes for a hand-vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MATT ECKERLE AS ALTERNATE GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY HAND-VOTE.** (Applause)

### 2004 Advocacy Agenda Update

Mr. Stagi said the update was in the agenda packet. In the interests of getting more participation and to have him and Mr. Schechtman able to work on it together, it was decided it would be best to have the Mentorship Task Force reside where it started, in the Academic Affairs Committee, but as a subgroup. Mr. Stagi said he was charged with bringing information forward to the Ad Hoc Committee on Mentoring that was established in the Grad Council, which he referred to earlier. So everybody knows, the Grad Council is

a subcommittee of the Academic Senate that more or less looks at areas around faculty hiring, tenure, and composition, and reviews departments, as well as to work with other issues pertaining to faculty. The GA has three members on the Grad Council, himself, Lola Odusanya, Romi Sanyal, and now, Mr. Eckerle, as the Alternate. They are the sole grad student representation, so it's important that they interface in that area. The Mentorship Working Group will be more fully discussed, and they have an addition of an ASUC member, as mentorship is on the ASUC's radar as well. So mentorship was being considered in different arenas, and they're trying to align all those. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

2004 Advocacy Agenda Update (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Sharma said that as they recall, in September the GA approved the Advocacy Agenda, and this proposal amends that to reflect the current reality. He called for any questions. A motion to approve the update was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE UPDATE TO THE ADVOCACY AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

-----  
Berkeley Advocacy Agenda Update

2004-2005 Advocacy Agenda Update

At the September 2004 Graduate Assembly meeting, the Delegates approved the 2004-2005 Advocacy Agenda. The Agenda included aspirational goals to accomplish the Agenda, including specific time-lines. Under Mentorship the Delegates were scheduled to receive a resolution in October establishing a Mentorship Task Force, and for more specific steps this meeting.

In light of changed circumstances and the goals of potential members of the Task Force, the Academic Affairs Committee is recommending that it take on the stated goals of the proposed Mentorship Task Force through a Mentorship Working Group and work in collaboration with other campus interest groups as outlined in the following report.

To get the full participation from members of the Academic Affairs Committee with experience on the subject, as well as the participation of the Academic Affairs Vice President, the proposed Task Force will instead function as a working group of the Academic Affairs Committee, with further participation from an ASUC Representative, Committee member, and other graduate students interested in mentorship.

The working group will be chaired by the Academic Affairs Vice President and Grad Council Rep Jay Stagi.

End Advocacy Agenda Update  
-----

## RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Sharma said he would yield the chair to former member of the Executive Board Carmel Levitan. With Ms. Levitan chairing the meeting, the following Resolution was submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee:

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A UNIFORM HEALTH FEE

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has made quality of life a key priority in its advocacy agenda for the 2004-2005 academic year; and

WHEREAS, quality of life includes equitable access to affordable high-quality health care to all members of the campus community, including graduate students; and

Resolution In Support of a Uniform Health Fee (cont'd)

- 12

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A UNIFORM HEALTH FEE (cont'd)

WHEREAS, recent budget cuts of up to twenty-six percent (26%) from Registration-Fee supported programs, including University Health Services, have threatened the quality and affordability of health care on the Berkeley campus; and

WHEREAS, health care costs nationwide, and particularly in the Bay Area, continue to escalate at astronomical rates approaching and in some cases exceeding thirty percent (30%) per year, putting a further drain on otherwise limited resources; and

WHEREAS, University Health Services has made clear that current funding levels are inadequate to fully fund high-quality health care services on the Berkeley campus, and that further fee gathering mechanisms must be imposed to ensure the current level of service; and

WHEREAS, University Health Services has identified office co-payments, additional health insurance payments, or a mandatory health fee as the three options for further revenue; and

WHEREAS, University Health Services projects co-payment costs to vary between ten and twenty dollars (\$10-\$20) per visit, health insurance payment plans to vary between fifteen and twenty dollars (\$15-\$20) per visit, and the mandatory health fee to be a flat thirty-six dollars (\$36) per semester including the one-third mandatory return-to-aid ratio; and

WHEREAS, almost three-fourths of Berkeley students use University Health Services each year; and

WHEREAS, a flat-rate health fee imposed systematically to all students on the campus will ensure continued affordable access because financial aid money will be increased in proportion to the fee to supplement the financial aid of those students who are unable to pay; and

WHEREAS, many graduate students will receive remission from the University in the amount of their health fee as a condition of their employment in a scheduled classification or through the discretionary funds of their research advisor; and

WHEREAS, seventy-four percent (74%) of Berkeley students use the University Health Center at least once per academic year, and the vast majority of students are somewhat or very satisfied with the quality, access, and comfort of the University Health Center; and

WHEREAS, a clear majority of students favor a mandatory fee rather than co-payment or pay-as-you-go options;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly support the imposition of a flat thirty-six dollar (\$36) health fee for all students on the Berkeley campus for the continued support of affordable high-quality health care on campus with the one-third return-to-aid.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly, through its representatives to campus committees and the advocacy of its officers, actively support the selection of the thirty-six dollar (\$36) fee over the co-payment and health insurance payment plan options in recognition of the rationale articulated in this resolution.

Resolution In Support of a Uniform Health Fee (cont'd)

- 13

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A UNIFORM HEALTH FEE (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly supports the placement of a fee referendum for the imposition of the thirty-six dollar (\$36) health fee before students in spring 2005 and urges students to consider the ramifications of rejecting the fee.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the President forward the content of this Resolution to the ASUC Senate in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 1 of the ASUC Constitution so as to allow the contents of this Resolution to be the position of the Senate and the Graduate Assembly as representatives of all UC Berkeley students.

Mr. Sharma said he sits on the Student Fee Referendum Committee on behalf of the GA. Last year, as part of the budget cuts to the Berkeley campus, the University shifted 20% of the money out of the Reg Fees, money that goes to support things like University Health Services, to academic programs. So the University Health Services took a 26% cut in its operating budget that year. Health Services made it clear that it could not operate on that level of cuts and would have to recoup money somehow, and has proposed three options. The first option Health Services proposed was a co-payment. Currently, Berkeley students, regardless of whether they have the Student Health Insurance Plan, can walk into the Tang Center for free, and get an appointment for free, with and other services would have a charge, depending on one's insurance. The proposed fee would apply a co-pay. So there would be a fee for walk-ins, imposed every time they went into the Tang Center. The fee structure would be geared towards recouping the money,

through users, that was lost in Reg Fees. Three-fourths of the students of Berkeley use the Tang Center, so it's a way to recoup service costs. This would involve an additional \$15-20 per visit, which is what they implemented.

The second option was higher health insurance payments. People would continue to pay into SHIP, but even so, every time a student goes to the Tang Center they'd have to pay \$15-20 more, even with SHIP. The third option was a uniform, campus-wide, \$36 health fee, like the Class Pass. With this payment, the Tang Center would have free, open doors.

Mr. Sharma said they drafted the Resolution particularly because the flat-rate health fee includes a one-third return-to-aid, so \$12 of that health fee would go back to financial aid to offset increased costs for students, which isn't part of the co-pay or increased health insurance costs, because there's no way to recoup for financial aid. Secondly, it was drafted because it's a campus-wide fee, and most grads wouldn't have to pay it because it would be covered for GSIs and GSRs, and the Grad Division would pay it for grads. But grads would get the benefits. No matter what happens, fees will be increased for health care, and they're choosing one of three options.

Ms. McElroy asked how it was that while 75% of students go to the Tang Center, and they'd pay \$20 every visit, yet only pay \$36 once. Mr. Sharma said the health fee would be \$36 a semester.

Mr. Daniels asked which of the three options was the most progressive, in that those who can pay do so, and those who would have a difficult time paying wouldn't pay. Mr. Sharma said that by far, the health fee was the most progressive, because there's a return to aid, with \$12 to go back to financial aid. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Stange asked if there was any guarantee that the flat-rate fee wouldn't be cannibalized, like previous funding has been. Mr. Sharma said it could only be designated for health costs. One potential danger

Resolution In Support of a Uniform Health Fee (cont'd)

- 14

they talked about was that if students were to pass this, this money would be used to offset funds University Health Services would get out of Reg Fee money. Several student representatives brought that up. University Health Services didn't feel that was a possibility because health costs have risen so much, and it would be impossible to justify a decrease short of the State ordering it, which is what happened that academic year.

Ms. Ahrendt said that one thing to keep in mind, as a further point the progressive nature of this proposal, is that a lot of grads suffer from chronic ailments, especially related to repetitive stress. The Tang Center has bankrupted a few friends who are grads. So this was definitely the most progressive. It's a sharing of the wealth to help out students who can't really afford continuous co-payments.

Mr. DeWitt said he's been a health care worker in the past, and in looking at this proposal, he wanted to some things clarified. He stopped being part of the student health program because it was too expensive. He doesn't get any fee remissions and was paying for his entire education by loans. He asked if he would

just pay only \$36 and he'd be good to go in for whatever he reason, or if, to go to Health Services, he would have to pay not just \$36, but then for all the care he'd receive. Further, in a Whereas Clause, it says "a clear majority of students" favor a mandatory fee. He asked if a market survey has been done, and said he's never seen anything that asked him what he preferred to do, other than being totally without health care coverage. Mr. Sharma said University Health Services, in developing its proposal, did a survey, and hopefully, many who were present got that survey and completed it. That's where the figure came from. They were given three options, and 51-52% chose the health fee option over the other two options. University Health Services is funded by several pots of money. Whenever their CARS bill is paid, they pay a Reg Fee, and a portion of that, from everyone, goes to the Health Center. And then people buy into the GSHIP and pay \$58 a semester to either the health insurance plan, which reimburses the Tang Center for certain costs. So even if one has insurance, they might pay \$10 for prescription drugs. The proposal for a health fee would add a fourth layer, and everybody would pay a \$36 fee. Mr. DeWitt said he doesn't pay the GSHIP because he's broke, and asked if he could get health care at \$36 a semester. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daal moved to amend the Resolution, to add a clause, "that students who are not getting fee remission are voluntary required to pay this fee." That would give people the option to pay this fee or not if they don't receive a fee remission. He asked to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Schechtman said he sits on the Student Health Advisory Committee, and in response to the question of what they'd receive for the \$72 a year, there are three levels of service at the Tang Center at that time. Emergency and primary care are free. So the idea is if one needs to see a doctor, it's free, for emergency and primary care. Beyond that, there are co-pays for things like prescriptions; and then there are fees for services, like optometry. What the health fee would do is make that first layer remain free. A student going in to get expensive drugs, or an ear exam, would still pay. But they wouldn't pay to see a nurse or doctor the first time.

Mr. Lavarias asked if they would still have to pay for SHIP to get the full insurance. Mr. Sharma said that was the case, and would have to pay SHIP to get tier-two services.

Ms. Levitan said they should move into debate on the Resolution.

Mr. Stagi said if one doesn't have health care and there's an urgent care place down the street, one would have to walk in and pay big bucks. That's what the Tang Center is for, people who aren't on SHIP. But

Resolution In Support of a Uniform Health Fee (cont'd)

15-

they don't have to pay the big bucks. That's the way it works. So it's urgent care for everybody who's on SHIP. SHIP pays for a lot more, but this was for urgent care, and for \$72 a year they'd get urgent care provided. A motion to extend speaking time by one minute was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote. Ms. Levitan said speaking time was up and the question was called.

**THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A UNIFORM HEALTH FEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

The following Resolution was authored by the ASUC Academic Affairs Office and was sponsored by Mr. Stagi (City and Regional Planning):

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A FAIR AND JUST STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

WHEREAS, Chancellor Berdahl approved proposed revisions to the Student Code of Conduct in September 2004 before stepping down as Chancellor; and

WHEREAS, the approved revisions failed to adequately address the issues consistently raised by representatives of the Graduate Assembly and the ASUC; and

WHEREAS, the revised Student Code of Conduct eliminates the right to legal representation during formal conduct hearings in the student conduct process; and

WHEREAS, representatives play an integral and necessary role in the student conduct hearing process as they mediate procedural issues arising during the hearing and assist students in articulating their position; and

WHEREAS, the revised Student Code of Conduct eliminates the right to an open and public hearing before the conduct hearing board; and

WHEREAS, open hearings provide transparency and promote accountability for all parties involved;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly strongly opposes the encroachments on procedural fairness and due process in the revised Student Code of Conduct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly urges the Chancellor to reverse the elimination of student representation and the elimination of fair public hearings, and renew the revision process to adequately respond to student concerns.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly urges the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Academic Affairs Committee, to seek the ends of this Resolution as appropriate in relation to the pursuit of other priorities.

Mr. Stagi said changes proposed to the Student Code of Conduct would eliminate students' right to legal representation, while the Administration has that right to legal representation. As it currently stands, students have that right as well, and are on parity, which the campus wants to eliminate. He thought this was a good Resolution. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

Resolution In Support of a Fair and Just Student Code of Conduct (cont'd)

- 16

A Delegate asked if the GA could see the proposed changes. Mr. Stagi said he believed they're online, probably under the Chancellor's page.

Ms. Ahrendt asked about the issues referred to that have consistently been raised by the GA, and said that was vague. Mr. Sharma said the issues raised last year are in the third and fifth Whereas Clauses.

Mr. Stange asked about the arguments or rationale for putting those clauses in, with the GA saying they disagreed. He asked about Chancellor Berdahl's rationale. Mr. Sharma said the Chancellor and Student Judicial Affairs argued they're moving the judicial process from a disciplinary process to an educational process. Because it's no longer punitive, but pedagogical, they don't have to provide legal counsel or argument. That's why they're making a formal distinction. But functionally, it's the same people who would be expelled or have notations included on their transcripts. For someone applying to a professional school, it could destroy their chances to get a professional license. This is a punitive process, and if so, legal counsel should be required, and an open hearing should be required.

Ms. McElroy said the school would still have its legal counsel, so the process would be very one sided.

Mr. Stange said there must be some rationale for the change. Mr. Stagi said they want to change the paradigm to educational, as opposed to the current situation, where it's more legal.

Mr. Dicano said it's usually a case of how a student performs on something, and if they cheat, it remains very private, between the instructor and the student. Having an open hearing would make this public, and what they're being accused of would be public. That might be an issue, not wanting open hearings for that type of thing. He asked if that was the case. Mr. Sharma said the right to an open hearing is the right of the student, and not the Administration. So a student can choose to not exercise that right and opt for a closed hearing. But the student has the right to demand an open hearing. The Administration has a reciprocal right to an open or closed hearing.

Ms. Weeden asked about the third Whereas Clause, and if the Administration was saying that students couldn't provide their own legal representation, or that the campus wouldn't provide it for students. Mr. Sharma said the Administration never provided legal representation. The old Code of Conduct allowed students to have a representative, someone who could speak on the student's behalf, at every stage of the process. The new Code allows a representative through an informal process, but does not allow for representation in the formal process. It allows an advisor. So students could sit next to a lawyer, who could whisper things into the student's ear, but couldn't speak on the student's behalf. That presents a problem, because informal hearings often involve cheating on an exam, or plagiarism. The formal processes are more intractable, such as civil disobedience, or higher-end issues that end up in the formal process rather than the informal process.

Mr. Dicano asked if this would end up causing more of a time burden on those involved with the process, or whether it would blow up the entire thing into something that would take a lot longer for both the Conduct Committee looking over the student's case and the student. He asked if this was to modify it to have more of a right to representation or just to have things as they were before. Mr. Stagi said it would maintain the status quo.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A FAIR AND JUST STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT**

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution In Support Changes to the ASUC By-laws

- 17 -

The following Resolution was submitted by the Executive Board:

## RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANGES TO THE ASUC BY-LAWS

WHEREAS, it is important for the Graduate Assembly and the Senate to maintain open and clear lines of communication on all areas of common concern; and

WHEREAS, the bi-monthly report of the Graduate Assembly President is an effective channel of communication; and

WHEREAS, clarifying and making predictable the processes of communication between the Senate and the Graduate Assembly will serve the goals of open dialogue;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly encourage of the ASUC Senate to substitute Title 10, Article 4, section 4, subsections 1 through 4 to read:

### 4.1 Reports to the Senate

The President of the Graduate Assembly shall report to the Senate at least twice every month. In the event s/he is unable to make the report, a proxy shall be sent in his/her place. The schedule of reports and the selection of the proxy shall proceed in accordance with the rules of the Graduate Assembly.

### 4.2 Status of Report

Solely for purposes of giving the Graduate Assembly report, the Graduate Assembly shall be considered an Executive Officer of the ASUC with all the privileges pertaining thereto; provided, however, that the Memorandum of Understanding in force between the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly on 23 October 2004 remains in force without substantial modification.

### 4.3 Content of Report

In giving his/her report to the Senate, the Graduate Assembly President shall announce the text of any new resolution passed by the Graduate Assembly since his/her last report. The Graduate Assembly may incorporate by reference into his report the text of resolutions transmitted to the Senate by electronic means. Announcement of the text of a resolution or its incorporation by reference shall constitute actual receipt of the resolution into the Senate minutes.

### 4.4 Graduate Assembly Bills and Resolutions

4.4.1 The Graduate Assembly President may submit to the Senate any bill or resolution fit for the consideration of the Senate with the approval of the Graduate Assembly. The Graduate Assembly President shall be considered the sponsor of record for the submission and no further sponsorship shall be required.

4.4.2 In accordance with Article V, section 1 of the Association Constitution, the Senate may disapprove any resolution of the Graduate Assembly if that resolution does not concern

Resolution In Support Changes to the ASUC By-laws (cont'd)

- 18 -

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANGES TO THE ASUC BY-LAWS (cont'd)

graduate or professional students, or attempts to speak for the entire student body. Main motions to disapprove Graduate Assembly resolutions shall be made during either the Graduate Assembly report or Announcements. Such motion shall be automatically tabled and added to Immediate Consideration for the following week's agenda.

4.4.3 Whenever the Senate takes up consideration of any resolution or bill originating in the Graduate Assembly, the Graduate Assembly President or his/her proxy shall be considered the author and sponsor of record, as appropriate, with all rights pertaining thereto.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly urges the Senate to strike Title 10, Article 4, section 4, subsection 8 and renumber subsection 9 to subsection 8.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President propose the revisions endorsed herein to the ASUC Senate at the soonest possible moment for their consideration, and that the President advocate for the changes herein endorsed.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the President is authorized to negotiate, in good faith, revisions to the text endorsed herein so long as the aims of this Resolution are accomplished.

Mr. Sharma said the ASUC is considering changes in the By-laws that affect the GA, and in order for him to sponsor something from the GA to the ASUC, he needed to have the Assembly approve it. He was hoping the Delegates didn't have a problem with these changes. The proposed changes codify the status quo when he reports to the ASUC.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANGES TO THE ASUC BY-LAWS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was submitted by the Executive Board:

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CAMPUS STUDENT FEE POLICY

WHEREAS, student fees have increased dramatically in recent years, and the Governor's "compact" with the University plans for double-digit annual fee increases for the coming decade; and

WHEREAS, a large number of academic departments and administrative units already impose their own fees or charges on students, and such fees and charges, taken together, dramatically increase the financial burdens on students and their families; and

WHEREAS, such ad hoc departmental fees and charges are neither registered with nor monitored by the University on a uniform basis. Consequently the campus Administration remains unaware of the total size of this burden; and

Resolution In Support of Campus Student Fee Policy (cont'd)

- 19 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CAMPUS STUDENT FEE POLICY (cont'd)

WHEREAS, such fees and charges may be imposed or increased without the type of comprehensive review process necessary to assure worthwhile and efficacious use of student funds; and

WHEREAS, several proposals to increase existing or to impose new campus-wide mandatory fees are currently being prepared; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has made access for students to an affordable public higher education a key priority in its 2004-2005 Advocacy Agenda;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly call for the prompt development and enactment of a comprehensive campus student fee policy that would govern any and all fees and charges, mandatory or optional, imposed on students by any University unit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the comprehensive campus student fee policy require the following:

- a. Publication of a comprehensive list of all student fees and charges imposed by any University unit;
- b. Creation of a broadly representative administrative committee in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, composed of high-level administrators, faculty, staff, and students to review all proposals for new or increased fees or charges;
- c. Substantial documentation that any fee or charge funds services deemed worthwhile and high-quality by students through standardized user-feedback and suggestion processes;
- d. Provision that all fees or charges be billed through the Campus Account Receivables System (CARS), and that no unit charge for said billing;
- e. Prohibition on automatic renewal of service-based charges without the explicit consent each term from subscribing students;
- f. Written explanation of the purpose of all fees and charges; and

g. Uniform mechanisms for waiver or financial assistance for disadvantaged students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President take the recommendations of this Resolution to the Chancellor; the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost; the Vice President for External Affairs to the University of California Students Association; and appropriate graduate representatives to their respective committees as directed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the President forward the content of this Resolution to the ASUC Senate in accordance with the provisions of Article V, section 1 of the ASUC Constitution so as to allow the contents of this Resolution to be the position of the Senate and the Graduate Assembly as representatives of all UC Berkeley students.

Resolution In Support of Campus Student Fee Policy (cont'd)

- 20 -

Mr. Schechtman said the Resolution was drafted in response to the \$40 fee for student group registration proposed by the Office of Student Life. This fee was announced during finals week last year, and was supposed to be implemented in the fall. Through vigorous efforts of Mr. Sharma and Mr. Leybovich, of the ASUC, the fee was repealed that year. But students were tasked with finding an alternative source of revenue, \$30,000. The Resolution is designed to address fees like that, which are imposed by units outside the mandatory fee process. Mandatory fees would include things like the uniform health fee, if it passes, and the Reg Fee. Such fees have a very formal process of review and are voted on by the students. Fees outside that process can be imposed unilaterally. The bill is designed to address that. This proposes a process that would monitor and review any fees imposed by any branch of the University. Mr. Schechtman said they passed around a sheet last month soliciting fees that people have to pay, and Delegates will probably see an e-mail going out to all grads asking once more, because the University does not know how many fees were being applied. So the campus has asked the GA to supply that information. This gives an idea of how much oversight there is of the process. They have encountered problems people pointed out with fees that people don't know about, like the supplemental fee in the Law School. Nobody can really explain that. Or, the modem dial-in fee, which, at \$10 a semester, was reasonable, but continues to be charged each semester even if a student stops using the service, since there's no turnoff clause. So there are obvious problems in the process. He called for any questions.

Mr. Daniels said the Further Resolved Clause, mentions service-based charges, and asked what those were. Mr. Schechtman said the modem dial-in fee would be an example. The RSF is an example of a good fee that's reasonable for the services that are received, where students have to reapply. Mr. Daniels asked if any service-based fee was charged that didn't make sense to be required or removed every semester. He asked if there was any way this could hinder efficiency of what was going on, where it's easier to pay a service-based charge every semester. Mr. Schechtman said they have a three-page list of all the charges. He didn't recall all of them. The modem charge is one they cite as an example. It does reduce bureaucracy to sign up

once and then never again, if they don't mind paying for it even if they don't want it. This would not be the final policy by any means. The GA can't make policy, and this would be a starting recommendation to take to the faculty Senate and the Administration. He's received some pretty constructive feedback from the faculty Senate about ways to make this less bureaucratic, but still achieve their goals. This could be a good starting point in the negotiations.

Ms. Ahrendt said that if they want to get some action, they should aim high. She thought the Resolution was well written and laid out the ultimate goals for a lot of things that could be refined on a point-by-point basis. For their first move, she thought it was a very strong position.

Mr. Garcia said the University itself doesn't know how much it charges students for services. Mr. Schechtman said the campus doesn't know the total fees imposed by individual units. It has a clear idea of mandatory fees, like for the RSF, but was very unaware of departmental fees; and not everyone in the Administration was aware of the Office of Student Life fee.

Mr. Stagi said that in recalling some difficulty in filling various committees, he asked if this was a leverage point, to ask for a committee to give this a higher profile. Having this the sole purview of one committee seemed to be a lot for this type of gathering. Mr. Schechtman said creating another committee might be a bad idea in that feedback from the faculty Senate might be to their existing structures. This was really their aim-high final goal, and they're very willing to negotiate on the details of how this gets implemented.

Resolution In Support of Campus Student Fee Policy (cont'd)

- 21 -

Ms. Levitan said they would end further questions and enter into debate. She called for any speakers against the Resolution, and hearing none, said she'd entertain a motion to call the question. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CAMPUS STUDENT FEE POLICY PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Sharma said that before they adjourn, as they may recall, faculty diversity was one of the issues they're working on that year, and to that end, Ms. Sanyal was heading up their side of things. The Administration has been very helpful and encouraging in terms of this issue, particularly with Chancellor Birgeneau. If people were interested in faculty diversity and hiring issues, they should talk to Ms. Sanyal, and hopefully they can get that going in full swing next semester.

Mr. Sharma said that with no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

This meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary

- 22 -

Present at the November 4, 2004 GA Meeting

German, Robert Schechtman	Law, Rishi Sharma
Chemistry, David Garcia	City & Regional Planning, Jay Stagi
Physics, Trevor lanting	African Diaspora Studies, Zoe Franklin
Architecture, Jason Wright	Bioengineering, Matt Eckerle
Bioengineering, Brian Carnes	Chemistry, Lynn Trahey
City & Environmental Engineering, Geetika Maheshwari	Classics, Nandini Pandey
East Asian Languages and Culture, Patrick Noonan	Economics, Andrew Hayashi
Economics, Kevin Stange	ESPM, Ainsley Seago
ESPM, Josh Fisher	Ethnic Studies, Dorothy Nason
Folklore, Anthony Buccitelli	German, Jenn Zahrt
History of Art, Elizabeth Quarles	IEOR, Stella So
Integrative Biology, Rebecca Lutzy	Italian Studies, Marisa Escolar
Jurisprudence and Social Policy, Anexander Rosas	Law, Bryant Yang
Law, C'Reda Weeden	Law, Daniel Aguilar
Law, Deepika Sharma	Law, Joshua Daniels
Law, Maximo Fuentes	Linguistics, Christian Dicanio
Logic and the Methodology of Science, Johanna Franklin	MCB, Brant Peterson
MCB, Susan Mashiyama	Music, Rebekah Ahrendt
Philosophy, Jeffrey Wolf	Physics, Miguel Daal
Political Science, Darius Ornston	Rhetoric, J. Bradley Rogers
African Diaspora Studies, Edward Davis	Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan
MCB, Kathryn McElroy	City & Regional Planning, Jennifer Susskind
Staff, Business Director, Nzingha Dugas	Staff, COD, Wanda Hasadsri
Staff, Legislative Liaison, Anu Joshi	Logic & Methodology of Sci., John
Goodrick	