

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

September 9, 2004

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

-
- [This meeting commenced the Fall Semester.](#)
- [Heard announcements.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA Manager/Advisor, and heard and approved reports from the President, the Academic Affairs VP, the External Affairs VP, the Executive Board, the Finance Committee, and the Funding Committee.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's representatives on the Graduate Council.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's representatives to the Store Operations Board.](#)
- [Approved the GA's 2004-5 Advocacy Agenda.](#)
- [Heard a statement from ASUC President Leybovich.](#)
- [Approved Resolution to Modify GA Structure.](#)
- [Approved Resolution to Create Social Development Grant](#)
- [Approved Resolution to Reverse the Continuing Drop in Underrepresented Minority Enrollment at UC Berkeley.](#)
- [Approved Resolution Calling for No Re-Appointment of UC Regent Ward Connerly.](#)

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly commencing the Fall Semester, was called to order by Rishi Sharma at 5:38 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Sharma said he wanted to welcome them to the first GA Delegates meeting of the academic year. The GA is the graduate student government at UC Berkeley, housed in Anthony Hall, the Pelican Building, between Sproul Plaza and the creek, and he would ask people to please come by. People are there all the time during the day.

Mr. Sharma said GA meetings proceed according to Robert's Rules of Order, and there will be a lot of that terminology used. At the GA Web site, under Student Government, there's a handy sheet of some motions that are most often made. Robert's Rules really only come into play when contentious issues arise and people go back and forth with debate and amendments.

People should have picked up the agenda packet. The meeting will proceed in the order listed on the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Approval of the Agenda

- 2 -

Mr. Sharma said that if anybody wanted to modify the agenda, this was the time to do it. If not, he would entertain a motion to approve the agenda. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Sharma introduced Steve Litwak, their recording secretary. (Applause) He prepares the minutes, which are available online. They're usually rather long because they contain their dialogue and the text of everything that's passed. He asked if people felt comfortable approving the minutes that evening. A motion to approve the minutes to the May meeting was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MAY 6, 2004 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Sharma said this was the time for people to make announcements about things going on that others should all know about. GA Announcements were first, and he called for any announcements on anything going on around campus, such as in a department, that they'd like to advertise or solicit people for.

Ms. Olorunnipa said she's recently been appointed as the GA's Events Coordinator and would like to welcome all of the new and returning Delegates. They should look forward to many different and exciting events coming up that school year. If people have any suggestions, she would ask them to please feel free to contact her. She wanted to thank them.

Mr. Sharma called for any general announcements.

Mr. Valleé introduced himself and said he was a Delegate from Sociology. On October 6 the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture will be given, co-sponsored by the GA. The speaker will be Molly Ivins, somebody who knows Pres. Bush quite well, from way back. She's written a book, " Shrub: The Short But Happy Political Life of George W. Bush." The lecture is free and is in memory of Mario Savio, who spearheaded the Free Speech Movement in the '60s. Mr. Valleé asked if they could do him a favor, and said he'd really appreciate it if people could prominently post the flier he'd pass around somewhere in their department. He wanted to thank them.

Mr. Cruz introduced himself and said he was a Delegate from the School of Education and was also organizing with BAMN, the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action and Integration and Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary. He would like to circulate two petitions and ask for their signatures. The first petition was

to reverse the continuing drop in underrepresented minority enrollment. There was another severe drop from last year's numbers, which were already appalling, and this year's admitted class for freshmen had only 2.5% black and 11.8% for Latino or Chicano students, while they make up about 42% of the State's high school grads. BAMN is having a forum after the GA meeting, at 7 o'clock, in 110 Wheeler, and Delegates were invited to attend. Mr. Cruz said the second petition calls for no re-appointment of Ward Connerly to the UC Regents. The GA actually came out asking for his removal last year, and they need to make sure he isn't reappointed for another 12 years, to use the UC as a pulpit to

Announcements (cont'd)

- 3 -

campaign against affirmative action. The petitions were coming up that evening for the GA's approval. He called for any questions.

Ms. ElNaggar introduced herself and said she's the interim Projects Coordinator of "The Berkeley Graduate", and said that if Delegates would take some copies of the spring and summer issues, that would be great.

Ms. Gray introduced herself and said she was from Sociology and wanted to announce a talk next week, on Tuesday, at 5 p.m., in the Lipman Room, the 8th floor of Barrows Hall. The talk will be about "Berkeley's Betrayal: Wages and Working Conditions at Cal." This project was carried out by a group of Sociology students, and she would urge Delegates to attend and post fliers, and urge others to attend.

Mr. Sharma called for any other announcements, and said he had one. This year is the 40th anniversary of the Free Speech Movement. The organizers of the effort to celebrate this anniversary are actively looking for grads to get involved in planning the events that will go into the anniversary. Events will occur the first or second week of October. If people were interested in getting involved they should let him know. The organizers are going to drag a police car out on Sproul Plaza to reenact the events of 40 years ago. Mr. Valleé said they might get Michael Moore to speak from the police car.

REPORTS

Mr. Sharma said there are two kinds of reports, information reports and action reports. He could probably note that on future agendas. Information reports are obviously information, and action reports are presented for action and had to be approved for them to come into effect.

Report from the GA Manager/Advisor

Ms. Dugas said that most of them know her, and she would like to welcome them back. Hopefully they're ready for the new year. If they're wondering why it was kind of hot, it was their summer at this time of the year, and they should enjoy it while they can.

Ms. Dugas said she didn't want to bombard Delegates with information, but she'd let them know about

positions available at the GA. If they like to do workshops, including workshops in orals, writing, dissertations, and financial management, there's a great position open for people in the writing stage or who need a little extra cash. It wasn't difficult and was really just putting a round peg in a round hole. People could make it as exciting as they want. The GA has some scripted workshops they people could work from. If people were interested they could go to the GA Web site. The Graduate Women's Project Coordinator position was also open, which promotes activities throughout the year and was a very interesting position.

Ms. Dugas start the GA wanted to welcome Delegates back and hope they stop by the building with the big pelican in front. Staff does their best to serve Delegates well, and that's what staff were there for. Mr. Sharma said the GA Web site is GA.Berkeley.edu.

Officers' Reports

- 4 -

Officers' Reports

Mr. Sharma said that apart from just general planning that summer with the Executive Officers and the Executive Board, there were three main things he worked on. The first was the OSL registration fee. The Office of Student Life is the campus gatekeeper for space for groups, or anything groups need on campus. In the middle of finals last spring, the OSL announced that it was implementing a \$40 registration fee for groups to use their office and thereby get access to all the space on campus. In collaboration between the GA and the ASUC President, and the Dean of Student Life, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Genaro Padilla agreed to waive the fee for this year. However, it will be reinstated next year unless new funding sources are identified. The GA is in the process of exploring that.

Mr. Sharma said the Calendar Task Force is looking at the academic calendar for the next three years and was pretty much in the final stage. Finally, a constant topic for the GA is their relationship to the ASUC, the undergrad/general government of UC Berkeley. That was all in the report, which was included in the agenda packet. He called for any questions.

Ms. Abbaszadeh asked what progress has been made with the relationship between the ASUC and the GA. Mr. Sharma said he met with Misha Leybovich, the President of the ASUC, and he believed that there's a very amicable tone for forging a new relationship between the two organizations. The two groups have been brainstorming a lot of ideas, including revamping the Memorandum of Understanding and how they might better ensure autonomy for the GA within the structure of the ASUC. A big issue for the ASUC is they insist that the GA owes them a lot of money for past ASUC elections, and the GA insists it owes the ASUC nothing. So negotiations were going on in that regard. So far, the relationship has been very positive. However, nothing concrete has come out of it.

A Delegate asked if the GA's goal was still autonomy. Mr. Sharma said that was something the GA gets to decide. An Autonomy Committee was approved by a Resolution at the last meeting of last year, and it was chaired by Vivian Hwa, who was not at the meeting. An autonomy initiative has qualified for the ballot in March, so the question will probably be on the ballot. The GA role in that was up to the Delegates to define.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions, and called for a motion to accept the President's Report. It was so

moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Reporting as the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said he'd like to welcome them back to a new academic year. The Academic Affairs Office at the GA is primarily tasked with organizing and implementing their policy initiatives with the campus, the Administration, and the faculty. They're setting up an Academic Affairs Committee for people who would like to become involved in a number of policy initiative issues. Over the summer they did transitional things, meeting with various campus administrators and with his counterpart in the ASUC undergrad Senate, and also working on the Calendar Task Force. The big thing there was that together with the ASUC, they successfully managed to save dead days. He thought that affects undergrads more than grads, but they managed to save the study time between the end of instruction and the beginning of finals. An addendum to the calendar proposed shortening the academic calendar by reducing or eliminating dead days, and the students managed to save

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 5 -

them. Mr. Schechtman said the big item from his office is that they have placed three dozen grad student representatives to various committees of the faculty Senate and the central Administration. The agenda packet includes a spreadsheet that lists most of the nearly 100 committees on campus. If they were familiar with campus governance, policy and decision making were very decentralized and were done by consensus and by review of a number of committees, after which recommendations are passed to the Chancellor and the Provost for action. These are the areas where policy is debated and decisions are made. Most committees on campus invite one or more grad student representatives. Mr. Schechtman said he would like to ask any of them who might be interested in activism on campus to participate. There are committees dealing with everything from radiation safety, environmental sustainability, new building design, to financial aid committees. They are currently desperately seeking two students for the Student Code of Conduct Judicial Board, which deals with students who are charged with Code of Conduct violations. Mr. Schechtman said he was handing around a flier and would ask Delegates to post it in their departments. Grads do not have to be a member of the GA to be a committee representative, so he would ask them to please spread the word to anyone they know who might be interested. This is a great way to get involved and have their voice heard, and was a great professionalization experience. He wanted to thank them very much and called for any questions.

Mr. Cruz asked about the process of approval if one wants to join a committee, and if grad representatives have a vote on committees. Mr. Schechtman said that on every committee that he knew of, the grad student representative had a vote. On certain committees, that vote doesn't count on matters of personnel policy, e.g., that affect professors. But grads are given full membership. Applications are available at the GA Web site, ga.berkeley.edu/academics. People could apply online. He'd interview them, give them some paperwork to fill out, and then nominate them to the position. It was up to the committee chair, the Vice Provost, or the Vice Chancellor to approve the nomination, although it was extremely rare to turn down an application.

Mr. Valleé asked about getting more information on a committee, and if all that information was available or if they could be contacted. Mr. Schechtman said there are two good places to go to. The academic Web site of the GA has reports from past years from committee representatives. Not all committees had representatives last year, and not all representatives filed reports. But that would be the first place to go. And the second is

berkeley.edu/administration/committees, where they'd see a list with a brief description of all of the committees on campus and what their charges are. They will notice that there could be multiple committees that consider the same topics, for various reasons. He called for any other questions.

A Delegate asked about the time commitment for these committees. Mr. Schechtman said most committees meet once a month for one or two hours at a time, and then there's usually about one hour on either side, for preparation or follow-up. Some of the more active committees might meet twice a month. The Student Code of Conduct Review Committee, which sometimes sounds like the most fun, could potentially meet every week if there are cases to be heard. It doesn't meet in weeks when there is no case to be heard. That was the only committee that could meet on a weekly basis. Mr. Schechtman said he wanted to thank them very much. People could send him an e-mail if they have any questions or names to forward. He wanted to thank them for their help.

Mr. Sharma said he would entertain a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the Executive Board

- 6 -

Mr. Sharma said the External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Medina, was in class, so he would entertain a motion to move her report to the end of reports. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Report from the Executive Board

Mr. Sharma said the Executive Board is composed of nine people, at the moment, including the three Officers; three Committee Chairs, including Trevor Lanting, Chair of the Funding Committee; David Garcia, Chair of the Finance Committee; Chair of the Organization and Rules Committee, which was vacant; and the four GA representatives to the Graduate Council. Each of these people will talk about their jobs later.

The Executive Board met pretty often during the summer. One matter they dealt with was Office of Student Life fee policy. In the GA's By-laws, which are available on the Web site, Sections 16.2.1 and 16.2.2 require that in order for any student group to be funded by the GA, the group must be registered with the Office of Student Life. In response to the imposition of a new fee by OSL, the Executive Board, using an emergency power it has under the By-laws, struck those sections from the By-laws, allowing a group to get GA funding without OSL registration. The OSL fee was waived and the Board rescinded the policy change. The Grad Social Club, which organizes social events for grads across the campus, was slated last year to move into the Events Project of the GA. But due to logistical concerns, it was decided that it would be better to have the GSC as an independent student group that would still retain relationships with the GA, but would get funded through the regular funding process rather than through an internal process. There is a Resolution the GA will consider that evening to create a Social Development Grant to achieve that purpose.

Mr. Sharma said the Executive Board also approved placing an ad in the "Guide to the Good Life" and did

finance and funding stuff that the GA will hear about in those respective reports. He called for any questions. He called for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Begin written report from the Executive Board

Executive Board Report, 9 September 2004

The Executive Board met several times over the summer months to formulate strategy, develop policy, and coordinate the Graduate Assembly's response to ongoing events. The members of the Executive Board are: S. Nzingha Dugas (GA Manager), David Garcia (Chemistry), Trevor Lanting (Physics), Claudia Medina (Law), Cintya Molina (African American Studies), 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 position 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.

Report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

- 7 -

Written report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

1. OSL Fee Policy

In response to the \$40 Office of Student Life (OSL) registration fee announced at the end of the Spring Semester, the Board adopted an interim policy that suspended GA By-laws 16.2.1 and 16.2.2 thereby allowing student groups to qualify for funding and grants regardless of registration status with OSL. The Board rescinded the policy on the announcement of the \$40 fees' waiver for the current academic year.

2. Graduate Social Club.

Because of continued difficulty in integrating the Graduate Social Club (GSC) to the Events Project, the Board decided and now asks that the GSC be formally treated as a student group. Under this model, GSC would have to apply for money through the normal funding and grants process administered by the Funding Committee. GSC would, however, be able to apply for funding from the Social Development Grant.

3. Guide to the Good Life in Berkeley

The Board approved placing an ad in the annual installment of the Guide to the Good Life in Berkeley as the Graduate Assembly has done in past years.

4. Finance

The Board modified the budget as outlined in the Finance Committee report.

End written report from the Executive Board

Report from the Finance Committee

Mr. Garcia introduced himself and said he's the Chair of the Finance Committee. He didn't have a Fi-Comm that summer because the Delegates weren't around, so there were a few things he had the Executive Board do, as interim Finance Committee. People could read in the agenda packet about all the adjustments that were done. The scope and role of the Finance Committee are in the GA's Charter and By-laws. The Committee is basically responsible for preparing recommendations to the Assembly on the allocation of GA funds; formulating policy for the allocation of GA funds; preparing and recommending the annual budget; and monitoring the implementation of that budget. The current state of the budget is that fiscal close has not yet occurred, so they can't actually finish up the budget that was passed last year at the April Delegates meeting. By the time he convenes a Finance Committee that year, fiscal close will have occurred and the GA can finalize its budget.

Mr. Garcia said some slight modifications were made to the proposed budget. The GA had budgeted a Program Advisor position, hoping that the ASUC Auxiliary would fund the other half of that position. However, that didn't happen, and the Executive Board decided to eliminate the funds and benefits that had been allocated to that position, and to use those funds for other things. Also, the GA budget for UCSA

Report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- 8

dues, which is important for the External Affairs team, was under-funded. The amount for those dues was increased, and the amount is the minimum contribution needed to remain a voting member of the UCSA. The Board also did little administrative efficiencies by combining such positions as the Media and Web Coordinators into just Executive Assistants. They also allocated more money to the Empowering Women of Color Conference, increased student group funding, and started allocating money for ASUC elections. The allocation of funds for ASUC elections was accidentally left off the budget last year and the GA had to fund that. So they took the very little money they had and budgeted some money for this purpose. They will have to put more funds into that. The initial allocation was just a start, and when fiscal close occurs, they can put more money into this line item, hopefully.

Mr. Garcia said the Executive Board also made modifications to Grad Events, and modified Ms. Olorunnipa's project to reflect that the Grad Social Club was not internal, but external, and in last year's budget, transferred money from one line item that was under-utilized into another line item. Finally, Mr. Garcia said the Board came up with fiscal policy for a new grant policy, as indicated in his report. Basically, they wanted to create the funds for the Social Development Grant. It's the responsibility of the GA Delegates to pass this. The Board was recommending a policy that 300 or more students must attend an event in order for it to qualify for this grant, or fund. Membership of the group organizing the event must be inclusive of all grads and cannot be exclusive on any basis besides having being grad student status. Events must be equally advertised to all grads and advertising must commence at least two weeks prior to the event. Also, the group's constitution must be on file with the OSL and must state that the only mission of the group was to serve the social needs of all grads equally.

Mr. Garcia said the Executive Board also decided the Funding Committee would be required to devise an application that would make sure that these policies and guidelines are satisfied for any group applying for this grant. Again, the Organization and Rules Committee, or the Executive Board acting in its stead, would put together a Resolution modifying the By-laws so this grant could take place.

Ms. Falkoff asked if reimbursement would only occur for a social event with 300 people in attendance, or if that was the number anticipated when planning was done, and if people would only get the money back from what they spent if only 299 people attended. Mr. Garcia said they decided it would be unique to plan for 300 people, and their idea was that if one builds it, they will come. The Funding Committee will have to work this out because those are the people who are ultimately responsible for that, not the Finance Committee. But he didn't think that they'd have a cut-off. If only 20 people came to an event, that would be something the GA would need to look at, and they'd probably not reimburse that. But if a group plans for 300 people and they're a few people short, that would be okay. Mr. Sharma said these rules operate through the Funding Office. It's how things work for any other fund, such as Grad Events or any other grant. If a group applies for a meeting and projects a certain number of attendees, they can be reimbursed if they don't get the projected number, but limitations apply. If they project and apply for 90 people and 20 show up, they'd be reimbursed for 20. There's a dollar limitation on the expenditure per person.

A Delegate asked what this money was for and how groups know about these funds. Mr. Garcia said the GA we put \$6,000 into this, and students will know about it because it should be going out in The Source when it's created. Mr. Sharma said the GA will advertise this like they do with all funds and grants, and there will be a description on the Web site.

Ms. Dugas said she wanted to emphasize that while the books were closed, it actually took some time for all the accruals or encumbrances to be cleared out, and until those are cleared out and paid, they can't get

Report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- 9

a final number. So the books are closed, but it's up to us the GA to make sure that if student groups have outstanding expenses, that they be closed before Delegates can be given a final number.

Mr. Garcia called for any other question. Mr. Sharma said he would call for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Begin written report from the Finance Committee

Finance Committee Report
Delegate Meeting: Thursday, September 09, 2004

Presented by David E. Garcia, Finance Committee Chair

Role of the Finance Committee:

The exact role and scope of the Finance Committee is stated in several places in the Charter and By-laws. Essentially, the Finance Committee, which consists of at least five (5) and not more than eleven (11) Delegates, is responsible for preparing recommendations to the Assembly on the allocation of Assembly funds, formulating policies for the allocation of Assembly funds, preparing and recommending the annual budget to the Assembly, and monitoring the implementation of the budget throughout the year.

Current State of the Budget:

Fiscal close has not yet occurred due to circumstances outside of our control, thus the proposed budget has not been finalized and the Executive Board necessarily leaves this task to the Finance Committee when it convenes. The Executive Board, acting as the Finance Committee by the Chair's request, has altered the proposed budget as listed below.

Changes to the Proposed 04-05 Budget (at a glance):

- A Program Advisor position was zeroed out because the Auxiliary did not fund the other half of the salary. Benefits for this position were also cut.
- UCSA dues were increased to meet the minimum contribution necessary to remain a member of the organization.
- The position of Media and Web Coordinator was combined into Executive Assistants.
- The stipend and program lines relating to the GSC in the GCAP were zeroed out and the funds were reallocated to a new grant for campus wide social events in the Grants and Funding program.
- The EWOC projected a fiscal shortfall and money was transferred to accommodate this shortfall.
- Student Group Funding was increased.

Report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- 10

 Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- Money was allocated for ASUC elections. This line item was unintentionally omitted from the original proposed budget, but must be included and fully funded by our Charter and By-laws.
- The balance of the GCAP budget from the prior year was transferred to the current budget.

Changes to the 03-04 Budget (at a glance):

- Money was transferred within GCAP to pay the coordinator's salary.

New Grant Policy:

-
The Executive Board, acting as the Finance Committee by the Chair's request, proposed a new grant for social events whose funding guidelines are as follows.

- 300 or more students must attend the event.
- Membership in the group organizing the event must be inclusive of all graduate students and cannot be exclusive on any basis except status as a graduate student.
- Proposed events, and attendance of the proposed event, must be inclusive of all graduate students.
- Events must be equally advertised to all graduate students. Advertisement must commence at least two weeks before the date of the event.
- The group constitution on file with the OSL must state the only mission of the group is to serve the social needs of all graduate students equally.
- Strong preference will be given to groups whose leadership spans colleges and departments.

The Funding committee is required to devise an application that will ensure that money will only be allocated when these guidelines are satisfied. The Executive Board, acting as the Organization and Rules Committee, must draft the necessary changes to the Charter and By-laws for this new grant.

End written report from the Finance Committee

Report from the Funding Committee

-
-
Mr. Lanting introduced himself and said he was the Chair of the Funding Committee. Like the Finance Committee, he didn't have a committee over the summer. They've already gone through one round of Grad Events funding, from August 30 through the first week of October. The allocations that he and the Executive Board enacted in lieu of the Funding Committee were included in the agenda packet. The only types of applications in round 1 were events 1 and 2. Events (1) is series of regular meetings and events and events (2) is a special meeting of a group, a kick-off party, or welcoming event. Allocations are shown. The big change with the Funding Committee from last year is the new grant, the Social

Report from the Funding Committee (cont'd)

- 11

-
Development Grant, which the Funding Committee will allocate and administer. Mr. Garcia moved to extend speaking time by five minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Lanting said he would ask people to join the Funding Committee. It meets once a month, typically the

Monday before the GA meets, which is the first Thursday of the month. The Committee meets every funding round to process grant applications and give out the allocations. Meetings are fun and exciting and there will be food. He would encourage anybody, first-time or returning Delegates, to join. It's a good way to get involved. He called for any questions. If anybody present was representing a student group, the deadline for round 2 was September 24, and they should make sure that's known to whomever in groups was in charge groups of filling out applications. This round will fund events from the first week of October up until that end of the semester. Ms. Moore's report will add something.

Shayla Moore introduced herself and said she was the Funding Advisor, and was a full-time employee, not a grad. She assists Mr. Lanting and the Funding Committee with reading applications. The next deadline is September 24. Her report included a list of funding workshop dates and times. Any group applying for GA funding has to go through a funding workshop. People could apply before attending the workshop, but they must do that before they get reimbursed. There's also a Travel Grant for conferences outside the SF Bay Area. The Travel Grant deadline is October 1 for conferences October 15 through February 14. Applications are available online and at the GA.

Ms. Dugas said the Office of Student Life was interested in possibly having its staff come to Ms. Moore's funding orientation so grads wouldn't have to go to another orientation at the OSL as well. Campus staff would speak at the GA orientation for about ten minutes and groups there would be registered, aside from signing the paperwork. OSL made this suggestion when it was trying to impose a \$40 registration fee for groups, and until that was resolved, Ms. Dugas said she didn't want to respond to their orientation offer. She asked for a show of hands if this was something people were interested in, and said she would pursue it and try to have this arranged with Ms. Moore's workshop. It would mean that people wouldn't have to go to the OSL orientation. So they'll try to work on that and consolidate everything within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Lanting called for any other questions.

Mr. Sharma said that to make a pitch for committee membership, for the Finance Committee and the Funding Committee, members have to go through training. Mr. Lanting a Funding Committee orientation will probably happen probably the week of September 24. They need to have the orientation before the Committee meets. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A motion to approve the Funding Committee report was made and seconded. THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from Graduate Council Representatives

Mr. Sharma said the GA has four representatives on the Graduate Council. Ms. Odusanya, Mr. Stagi, Mr. Sanyal, who wasn't present, and Ms. Molina, who is the alternate. Ms. Molina said they're having their

Report from Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)

- 12 -

first meeting next week, to lay out their agenda for the Grad Council and how to implement stuff they're

planning as a GA within the Grad Council, and advocate for those things. They welcome any kind of interest people have about changes that need to be made on academic policy in their departments and Systemwide. In the agenda packet there should be an e-mail and a link within the Web site for the Grad Council. If Delegates could get that information to Grad Council reps, they could see where the commonalities lie and push for those areas within the Grad Council.

Mr. Stagi said that when they go over their agenda, which they'll do shortly, embedded within the agenda were a number of items they'll take to the Grad Council, which is a committee of the Academic Senate. They'll see the areas of interest and report back to the Delegate. But he'd like to re-emphasize what Ms. Molina said, that they would appreciate Delegates' input in helping to develop the agenda as the year progresses.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions. He said this was a non-action report.

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

Mr. Sharma said that Ms. Felarca is a Senator in the ASUC Senate and is also a grad student and a Delegate. So she was the natural choice to be the liaison. He was sure that in the future she'll have enthralling reports. The Senate meets every Wednesday in the Senate Chamber and she'll report on what they do.

Report from the Store Operations Board

Mr. Sharma said that he and Sunny Lu are the grad student representatives on the Store Operations Board. The Board has met once and its next meeting is not for a week and a half. So there was nothing of substance to report. The SOB oversees the commercial activities of the ASUC, including the Student Store at the MLK Student Union, the commercial side of the operation in the Student Union, in Eshleman Hall, and in Anthony Hall, of the commercial side, and their employees, including Ms. Dugas and Ms. Moore. The Auxiliary is the unit designed to support the commercial activities of the ASUC, and is the policy Board that oversees the Auxiliary, which oversees the Store.

A Delegate asked if Mr. Sharma's nomination to the Board, then, wasn't an issue. Mr. Sharma said he didn't think so. The Commercial Activities Agreement governs the operation of the SOB, and there are six student representatives and five faculty/staff representatives. There are four undergrads and two grad students. Under the Memorandum of Understanding between the GA and the ASUC, the GA nominates two people and there's no need for confirmation, and those people sit on the Board by virtue of the GA electing them as representatives. The way the GA does this internally is by always having the President serve, with the other person serving for a two-year term. Last year the ASUC insisted that the GA's nominees had to be confirmed by the ASUC Senate in order to take their seats on the Board. Mr. Sharma said he has not heard anything of that sort of argument come up again that year, so he was assuming there's no problem. But he'll keep the GA informed if it comes up.

Ms. Molina said that if the Senate was to block a nomination, it should have happened already since there's a time limit. So effectively, the GA's Board reps are confirmed.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 13 -

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

Mr. Valleé asked if anybody present attended the UCSA meetings. Mr. Sharma said they did. Mr. Valleé asked if the GA will get a report on the success of the year's actions. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes to hear Ms. Medina's report was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Reporting as the External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Medina said she's in class until 6:10 or so and would apologize for being late. Her report was in the packet and included what they did that summer. For those who don't know, the External Affairs team is composed of herself, serving as External Affairs VP; Anu Joshi, the Legislative Liaison; and Wanda Hidadri, the Community Organizing Director. Mainly, their job is to be involved with the UCSA, the UC Student Association, which does student advocacy at the State level. Ms. Medina said they did a lot of work around the fee hike and had two meetings that summer, a retreat in July, where the nine campuses met, and had a retreat in preparation for the August Congress, where Mr. Garcia, Mr. Sharma, and Matt joined them. They chose three Action Agenda items for the year at the UCSA. The process was contentious and they were there all day, and people got frustrated, as one could imagine. She thought sometimes it was worse than ASUC meetings.

Ms. Medina said the UCSA chose three items for their Advocacy Agenda that year: prioritizing education to stop funneling money into the prison system, and things like that, because they're moving towards privatizing education. Also, eligibility was included, as the Regents will vote whether or not to increase the GPA requirement from 2.8 to 3.1. So they've been making sure they get student input and to make sure Regents know this will disproportionately impact students in certain populations. That was another Action Agenda item. And the third Action Agenda item was voter registration. A lot of times legislators don't listen to students because students don't vote. If they piss off students, they don't lose re-election. Lonni Hancock wouldn't lose her election. So they want to focus on getting students registered and voting so they have leverage when they go to the Capitol.

Ms. Medina said Ms. Joshi also went to the USSA, and they did some lobbying on that level. Ms. Medina said they're also involved in the National Association of Grad and Professional Students. That was not in her report in the agenda packet.

Ms. Medina asked Ms. Joshi to say a few words about what she does. Ms. Joshi said that in June she went to Washington, D.C. and USSA had a Lobby Day, where they met with over 30 representatives and Senators. They talked about having grads' stipends be tax exempt. There's a bill in the House at that time for that to happen. They also lobbied on the Higher Education Re-Authorization Act. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Joshi said that what they're trying to do is make it so students could consolidate their loans. Loans can't be lock in at a fixed rate, so it's variable, and students lobbied against that. The third item was immigrant visas, such as how only entry visas were being given out. International student applications to UC are down by 30%. That's also because of student fees, but because students were also having problems with immigration. She also went to the USSA Congress and decided on three Action Agendas on the national level. They include immigrants' rights to education, and the Higher Education Re-Authorization Act, which includes federal funding for financial aid and Pell Grants. If that's not re-authorized, a lot of financial aid coming to grads could be cut. The third Action Agenda item was to get out the vote. The USSA managed to get \$5,000 in different grants, so on this campus, they have a

student working 20 hours a week, being paid by the USSA, to do voter registration, education, and mobilization. They're also having Grad and Professional Student Lobby Day.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 14 -

Mr. Valleé asked where they can get details about Action Agenda items. Mr. Sharma said they'll be presented at the next meeting for the GA's approval. Also, they're looking for people to get involved with the External Affairs Committee. Delegates can contact the GA and let them know if they're interested in advocacy on the State or federal level.

Ms. Levitan said the eligibility item was missing things, like low-income students and students of color. Ms. Medina said it concerns impact. Ms. Levitan asked if she could bring that back to the UCSA, that a Delegate would like those specific populations.

Mr. Valleé asked if last year's Action Agenda items were on record and if they could know the results. Ms. Medina said they had two victories, in that outreach funding was cut to zero but was restored to \$25 million, and students who were redirected to community colleges were, at the 25th hour, given slots and were actually accepted into UC. A lot of students had already made a choice and said yes to other schools, so only a small number came to the UC. As for the grad level, advocacy mostly dealt with undergrads, and legislators see undergrad issues on the table than grads don't put on the table far more often than grad issues.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions and said he would like to thank Ms. Medina.

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

Mr. Sharma said the 2004-2005 Advocacy Agenda packet was distributed. He suggested having a three-minute recess for people to look it over. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, Mr. Sharma said he hoped everybody had a chance to look over the Advocacy Agenda. He noted there were a few requests for information.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Kofi-Charu Nat Turner introduced himself and said he was the Graduate Minority Students Project Director. He's a second-year Ph.D. student in the School of Education. Unfortunately, the Ed. School has classes in the evenings, since teachers teach during the day. He had class from 4:00 to 7:00 every Thursday, and while he couldn't attend GA meetings in the future, his heart would be there. Mr. Sharma said Mr. Turner's contact and program information is available at the Web site.

Mr. Sharma said that under New Business, they consider the major action items not coming out of committee, such as Resolutions people have proposed for the GA to take a stand. Any major item requiring action by the Assembly comes in the form of a Resolution or action item under in New Business.

Such items are due a week before the meeting. Meetings are always the first Thursday of the month, except for that month, so these items are due the Wednesday a week before the meeting, by 5 p.m. They can be sent to president@GA.berkeley.edu. If people need help writing these items, they could let him know. They can look at old Resolutions to see the form they take. He called for any questions about Resolutions.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 15 -

Ms. Levitan asked if Resolutions from prior years still apply to the current year. Mr. Sharma said Resolutions generally are only effective for the year in which they're passed, although a Resolution changing the By-laws was permanent, unless they're changed again. Ms. Levitan asked if previous resolutions were therefore null and void. Mr. Sharma said they expire at the conclusion of the year in which they're passed, unless the resolution states otherwise. He called for any other questions.

Mr. Sharma said that Ms. Dugas announced that the GA was hiring for a lot of positions. The Executive Office is looking for executive assistants to hire, so if Delegates know of anyone who was interested in being an assistant at the GA, he would ask them to please let them know. The Officers desperately need people to help them. A Delegate asked if they were paid positions. Mr. Sharma said they were, and they receive stipends, although it's not a lot of money.

Ms. Smith asked if there was a voice for grads who live on campus or in Albany Village, Manville, or Jackson Halls. Mr. Sharma said he thought Manville and Jackson have residential associations. Albany Village may have an official coalition, and the Coalition for Affordable Housing worked there, he believed, on affordable housing in the Village. He said he could find out. Mr. Smith said he meant at the GA. Mr. Sharma said no reps there are appointed by themes. If any residential organization wanted to send a representative, the GA would like to recognize them and give them a spot to make announcements. Mr. Smith said a lot of students live off-campus, but some live on campus, and he lived in Manville Hall, which had unique issues. He asked if there was a way to address those needs through the GA. Mr. Stagi said one item on their Advocacy Agenda was affordable housing, and one issue might be addressed within that rubric. So he might want to ask Ms. Odusanya or be involved. Mr. Sharma said that if Delegates want the GA to consider something, a resolution could be written, such as to ask, e.g., a committee to evaluate something. It's not as though the GA ignores this area and there are Delegates in those groups. Mr. Garcia noted that the GA passed a Resolution on affordable housing that was sponsored by a Delegate and written by residents at Albany Village.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions.

NEW BUSINESS

Advocacy Agenda

Mr. Sharma said the Executive Board every summer develops an Advocacy Agenda for the year. The three items that year are diversity, access, and quality of life. People will introduce the four goals, or sub-themes, of

that agenda. They are affordable housing, budget transparency and fee accountability, faculty diversity and transparency in hiring, and mentorship. Each topic will be introduced briefly and Delegates will have a chance to ask questions, after which they'll have a motion to amend or modify.

Mr. Schechtman said he and Ms. Odusanya will introduce the Advocacy Agenda item on affordable housing. That year they're trying to make sure that at least one representative on the faculty Senate's Grad Council is a strong advocate for these items. He didn't need to say a lot about affordable housing because for all or most of them, housing is their single biggest expense, as they live in the second most expensive

Advocacy Agenda (cont'd)

- 16 -

metropolitan area in the country, a fact that grads' stipends don't reflect. They don't have a whole lot of control over housing prices in Berkeley, but they have influence over rents for University properties. While the University, in the past couple of years, has built new housing, including the College/Durant site, and is making direly needed renovations in Albany Village, and while the Long-Range Development Plan is committed to building additional grad housing, the price of that housing is \$1,300 to \$1,400 a month, which is out of the range of most grads. The University says that because the State does not allow State funding to pay for housing, the only source of income is rent. Grads claim that the second statement does not follow the first, and it just means grads need to be more creative in finding solutions to the housing problem. The Academic Affairs Committee will lead this charge that year, so he would encourage anybody interested in these issues to please join them on the Academic Affairs Committee. Mr. Sharma said they would hear questions at the end of all Advocacy Agenda presentations.

Regarding budget transparency and fee accountability, Mr. Sharma said it's a two-pronged approach. One is internal to the Berkeley campus. They're trying to figure out, as their fees increase and their portion of the University's operating budget grows, where their money was going, who's spending it, introducing a level of transparency and accountability for those who are bankrolling this institution. The other aspect is what Ms. Medina talked about with the UCSA agenda, ensuring that when the State decides where resources should be directed, to higher education rather than other areas of State spending, like prisons.

The next Advocacy Agenda item was faculty diversity and transparency in hiring. Mr. Sanyal introduced herself and said she was a GA representative on the Grad Council and said this topic dealt with faculty hiring and diversity. They've had a number of issues on their campus over the years in terms of diversity. Their campus doesn't have a particularly diverse group of faculty, and there has been growing concern among students to add increase that. There were a number of issues in terms of transparency as well. People who have been there for a few years know some of those cases, which are well known, and there are others go by without being noticed. The GA decided to make this one of its action items that year. They can achieve a number of different things. Some departments allow grad representation in tenure review processes, so one thing they want to do is go through and see which departments have those procedures and which do not. Also, there are other various committees that operate on campus that work on issues of equity and diversity, and they'll try to bring them together. They also want to use the Grad Council as a means to push for greater student voice in terms of the tenure process and encourage greater diversity on campus. They're going to actually put together a working group from the GA and do a lot of research work on this. Depending on the research that comes out, they'll push in the Academic Senate to have a number of these issues implemented. They have a timeline to implement as the year goes on. Mr. Sharma called for any questions on any of the

advocacy items or the process.

Mr. Stagi said the last item the Executive Board chose as an action item, following a very successful Faculty Mentoring Award the GA initiated last year. They'd like to see it become an annual event, since it was a pilot project last year. There wasn't necessarily any provision for it to be made a continuing award. They'll see what they can do. There were issues in terms of getting funding out and developing a jury. Additionally, because it was so successful and so noteworthy, and because it was clear that mentoring was unequally distributed across the campus, where some benefit by great mentoring and others might lack it, the Academic Senate and the Grad Council, the arm of the Academic Senate, asked the GA to provide mentoring guidelines to them. Mr. Stagi said he's been in the process of helping to formulate that over the course of the summer. They were going to present those at the October meeting. Finally, on the third front, it's been brought to everybody's notice that mentoring can be done among themselves, grad-to-grad, and perhaps even foster links with undergrads, which would be the last element. Finally, Mr. Stagi

Advocacy Agenda (cont'd)

- 17 -

said they'll convene a task force in the next month, which he'll head, and look into implementing these issues, and hopefully deliver a report to the GA by the November meeting. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

Mr. Levitan said she noticed that autonomy was not one of the four advocacy items, and asked if that signaled a shift in priorities. Mr. Sharma said the public answer is that autonomy continues to be at the top of the GA's priority. They see that in the single ad hoc committee they approved last year, the Autonomy Committee. They continue to put their resources, both financial and labor, behind autonomy. Again, they see the value of autonomy. At the same time, they recognize from last year's experience that when the Executive Board in particular takes on the issue of autonomy, it removes their ability to do anything else. In developing the Advocacy Agenda, they had this conversation and voted on it, and decided not to include it on the Advocacy Agenda in the hope that they can actually focus on getting these other things done, and that hopefully the Autonomy Committee will do its job. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Sharma called for any other questions.

A Delegate asked if they would approve the agenda and then meet in committees on how to carry it out. Mr. Sharma said that was correct. Under the structure of each item, the narrative that was included shows their motivations, the goals they hope to achieve, how they see its impact. Work will be done through their existing structure, or a task force, and timelines will be developed by the committees with these charges. They'll come back to items at the October or November meeting.

A Delegate asked if the position of international students was considered, and if so, why it wasn't on the list, and if not, why it wasn't. Mr. Schechtman said grad deans asked them to look at the needs of international students. There are new Administration task forces looking at immigration problems. The largest identified need was actually mentoring new grad students, both in terms of getting acclimated to Berkeley and integrated into the social scene, with health services networked. So international students was actually the group that inspired the mentoring item, and it was decided to broaden it to all grads. International students are an important constituency in the mentoring project. Mr. Sharma said several things were discussed extensively, including mental health and a number of other initiatives that were on the GA's plate in the past. It was fair to say the Board felt they couldn't overextend themselves and had to limit the particular things they could

achieve, that were achievable, with measurable goals. That's why there are four, and not eight. Mr. Sharma called for any other questions on the Advocacy Agenda.

Mr. Stagi moved to amend, to change the last line, to develop a timeline, to have it by the November meeting instead of the October meeting. The motion to amend was seconded . THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT ON THE TIMELINE TO THE NOVEMBER MEETING, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

A motion to approve the Advocacy Agenda for the year was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2004-5 ADVOCACY AGENDA FOR THE GA, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Cantor said he counted about 50 people in the room, and only 45 people signed the roster. He needed everybody to sign in for every meeting. This was very important and was probably the most important part of his job. They could help him by signing in. And everybody should sign in, Officers as well as Delegates.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 18 -

ANNOUNCEMENTS (cont'd)

Ms. Odusanya moved to have five minutes to allow ASUC President Leybovich introduce himself. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Leybovich introduced himself and said he was that year's ASUC President. He was hopefully soon to be a grad student, next year, and was applying at that time. He's a fourth-year in Engineering Physics. He was really excited about working with the GA, and so far they've had really great relations with Mr. Sharma and the entire GA Board. They claimed a really good victory with OSL. He wanted to thank the grads, because it when the GA stepped in and passed a Resolution, it gave students the strength they needed to mobilize the rest of the groups on this issue, and had over 100 groups around that. And all of them together really claimed a good victory for free speech. In the coming year, he would imagine that they'll have a lot of common issues.

Mr. Leybovich said he hoped to work closely with the GA on deciding to formalize whatever kind of relationship they desire between the GA and the ASUC, whether it's autonomy or a new Memorandum of Understanding, whatever the GA wanted, because the ASUC had no interest, as they may have had in the past, of trying to lord it over the GA, which he thought was silly. So they won't have any more of that silliness from the ASUC that year. (Applause) Mr. Sharma said that was on the record. Mr. Leybovich said he hoped he could come back later and report what the ASUC was up to, and he hoped the GA felt free and comfortable to, at any time, whenever they want to band together for all students on campus, to approach the ASUC. He thought the GA's Executive Board was doing a wonderful job, and they were really wonderful to work with. He called for any questions.

Mr. Stagi said he wanted to thank Mr. Leybovich, and recalled speaking to him when he was running. At the time, he asked Mr. Leybovich about autonomy and about how he wanted to relate to the GA, and voted for him, hoping he'd keep his word; and he was very glad to hear that Mr. Leybovich was intending to do so. Mr. Leybovich said he appreciated that. He wanted to thank the GA very much and said he'd see them again.

(Applause)

Mr. Sharma said the next Resolution was a modification of GA structure. The Resolution was in the packet.

The following Resolution was submitted by the Executive Board:

RESOLUTION TO MODIFY GA STRUCTURE

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly annually adopts an Advocacy Agenda; and

WHEREAS, the internal organization and structure of Graduate Assembly committees do not reflect the priorities of the Advocacy Agenda and work to channel energy and labor away from the Advocacy Agenda; and

WHEREAS, the advocacy work of the Graduate Assembly should be supported by a logical and coherent internal operating structure;

Resolution to Modify GA Structure (cont'd)

- 19

RESOLUTION TO MODIFY GA STRUCTURE (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Executive Board convene a working group to study and recommend potential modifications to the existing structure of Graduate Assembly committees to better channel energy and labor towards the annual Advocacy Agenda.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Executive Board shall present to the Delegates in the regular November meeting the results of its study and recommendations for the potential modification of the Graduate Assembly's structure.

Mr. Sharma said that when the Executive Board was thinking about the Advocacy Agenda, they realized the GA's structure hadn't been modified in a long time, and the Resolution just gives the Executive Board room to look at their structure and see about consolidating or keeping committees and what to do regarding the internal structure of the GA to better reflect their Advocacy Agenda and what the GA does. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked what was entailed with a "working group." Mr. Sharma said a working group was much more informal than a committee. Committees, under the By-laws, have requirements, such as the number of people needed for a quorum. A working group involves people coming together and thinking about how to make changes. The working group would report to the Executive Board, which has to meet quorum requirements, for instance. So they still have procedural requirements that had to be met. Having a working group makes things much more flexible for two or three people to come together and discuss something, and not have to worry about getting a quorum, or how to do this or that.

A Delegate asked who was intended to be part of the working group. Mr. Sharma said it could be anybody who was interested. The Executive Board convenes it, but like most things in the GA, it's open to Delegates and grads. If people were interested in getting involved in the working group, they should let him know, and they'd take as many people as they could get.

Ms. Mashiyama asked what was meant by "recommend potential modifications to the structure" and asked if there were examples of things that might be proposed. Mr. Sharma said an example might be a committee named in the By-laws, for GSI/GSR Affairs. This committee pre-dates the existence of a Union, and before the Union came around, it did a lot of work related to teaching and research conditions. Last year he didn't believe the Committee convened once. That might be an example for seeing if people feel it's necessary, or if it would divert their energy, now that they have a Union, and whether there was a better structure.

Mr. Hsu asked if that couldn't be accomplished by a single Delegate proposing a Resolution to modify the By-laws to get rid of that Committee. Mr. Sharma said that was correct, although he could see potentially two complications with that. First, when they have a working group look at the whole picture, they can make proposals that make more sense, rather than having a single Resolution that does one thing or another. They'll see that later in the Resolution dealing with the Social Development Grant, because in making that, there were other sections of the By-laws to be considered.

Mr. Garcia said a Delegate can't make a Resolution on the floor to modify the GA, and that would have to go through the Organization and Rules Committee. The Committee wasn't operating at that time, so the matter would go through the Executive Board.

Resolution to Modify GA Structure (cont'd)

- 20

-

Ms. Molina asked if that included revision of the By-laws as a whole, or if they would be impacted by whatever changes are made. Mr. Sharma said he would be the first to welcome a complete By-law revision, but this will be in small bites. He called for any other questions.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO MODIFY GA STRUCTURE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

The following Resolution was submitted by the Executive Board:

RESOLUTION TO CREATE THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT GRANT

WHEREAS, social isolation continues to persist among the graduate and professional student population of UC Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, the decentralized organization of the campus into departments, schools, programs and colleges makes it difficult to coordinate social opportunities across units; and

WHEREAS, social opportunities have a direct bearing on quality of life and academic success; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is keenly interested in promoting graduate student quality of life and academic success through social opportunities:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Title 16 of the Graduate Assembly By-laws are modified to read:

- 16.7.3.4 Social Development: This grant provides funding for student groups whose organization and purpose is to provide social events for all graduate and professional students across departmental, program, school, and college boundaries. In order to qualify for this grant, all the following criteria must be satisfied:
- 16.7.3.4.1 Groups requesting funds under this grant must be inclusive of all graduate students and cannot be exclusive on any basis other than status as graduate student in membership or event attendance.
- 16.7.3.4.2 Events funded under this grant must be advertised across all academic units and advertisement, to the extent possible, should be made at least two weeks prior to the event. The Graduate Assembly must be provided with an e-mail ready flyer for distribution to all graduate students at least two weeks prior to the event.
- 16.7.3.4.3 The constitution of any group requesting funding under this grant must state that the only purpose of the group is to serve all graduate students equally. Constitutions must be on file with the Office of Student Life.
- 16.7.3.4.4 At least three hundred students must attend an event funded by this grant.
- 16.7.3.4.5 Strong preference will be given to groups whose leadership spans academic units and distinct disciplines.

Resolution to Create the Social Development Grant (cont'd)

- 21 -

RESOLUTION TO CREATE THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT GRANT (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Social Development Grant shall be treated on par with other grant opportunities in the Graduate Assembly for purposes of administration and awards.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Social Development Grant shall be awarded beginning Round 2 of the current academic year and thereafter during Round 2 and Round 5, with all the restrictions and rights pertaining thereto as long as the rounds-based structure is retained by the Graduate Assembly.

Mr. Garcia said the Executive Board, acting as the Finance Committee, decided they need to have a Social Development Grant. The Executive Board convened another time and acting as the Organization and Rules Committee, decided to put together an amendment to modify the GA's structure and, with the GA approval, create this grant.

Mr. Garcia moved to amend the Resolution, to re-write 16.8.6, to read as follows:

16.8.6 Purchase of refreshments can be funded only by Grad Events and the other grant programs.

The way the By-laws are written, only events 1 and 2 are allowed to fund refreshments. It was the Board's intent to increase that, and have the Social Development Grant be a third use for refreshments. A motion to approve the amendment was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Falkoff said it generally seems that the language of the Resolution blames the decentralized campus for the lack of social opportunities, and she thought it was more a problem with workload than anything else that keeps grads isolated. That may be something to look at in the future. She thought most of them have enough trouble keeping up with teaching, their own work, and their families. She thought it was ambitious to expect 300 people to really show up at an event in order to receive the grant. She didn't know how much sense it made, but thought it was worth a try.

Mr. Garcia said they were going from past events held by the Grad Social Club, where they had more than 300 people in attendance. A lot of grads found these events really useful because they could meet people across campus disciplines. But he understood the point being raised.

A Delegate said she thought what they were trying to do was very important. Because she was in Social Welfare, she didn't get a chance to meet other grads, such as engineers, e.g. So whatever attempt the GA could make to have some social time would be great.

Mr. Hsu said the proposal would mean the Grad Social Club would not have its own budget. He asked if money the Funding Committee allocates was carried over from last year. He didn't understand how it would work if the GSC was its own student group. Mr. Garcia said they used to be part of the newly renamed Grad Events Project but administratively, that wouldn't work for many reasons. The Executive Board used the that was to be the GSC budget and created this grant. The Grad Social Club, and any other student group that meets the requirements of the grant, could apply for funding. The Grad Social Club potentially isn't the only group on campus that could throw events like this for students. He was currently unaware of any other group that would meet the requirements, such as having a constitution that

Resolution to Create the Social Development Grant (cont'd)

- 22 -

says their only purpose is to serve the social needs of grads. But if another group formed and wanted to do that, it would be eligible to apply for this grant as well.

Ms. Levitan asked if the GSC still had the same limits as other groups do. Mr. Sharma said that was correct, in terms of how much they can apply for. Ms. Levitan asked if that would be the case if the group applied for this grant. Mr. Sharma said that was part. In theory, the Grad Social Club could be awarded the full amount of this grant, which is over and above the normal amount a group could get. The grant is designed to fund grad social groups in the short-term, and potentially other social clubs besides the GSC. Ms. Levitan asked if there were no stipends. Mr. Sharma said there weren't.

Mr. Hsu asked if the money from this grant could not be used to reimburse alcohol. Mr. Sharma said the GA never reimbursed costs for alcohol for the Grad Social Club. Mr. Hsu said he understood they had been reimbursed, but that practice was stopped. Mr. Garcia said that's against University policy. Ms. Levitan said the group had its own funding source and took money at the door, with money from the GA going towards refreshments. Mr. Sharma said the GA is banned, by University policy, from using money for alcohol or cigarettes.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions. A motion to approve the Resolution, as amended, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE, AS AMENDED, RESOLUTION TO CREATE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT GRANT, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION

The following Resolution was submitted by Mr. Cruz (Education):

RESOLUTION TO REVERSE THE CONTINUING DROP IN UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY ENROLLMENT AT UC BERKELEY

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley's latest admissions figures show an alarming decline in underrepresented minority admissions. Whereas underrepresented minority (black, Latina/o, and Native American) students comprise more than 42% of California's high school graduates, they comprise only 14.8% of UCB's fall 2004 freshman admits. Black admits dropped by one-third to only 194, or 2.5% of total admits. This fall's entering freshman class at the School of Engineering has only one black student; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley stands out as the shame of the UC System, with the biggest drop in underrepresented minority freshman admits this year (from 17.3% to 14.8%), to what is now the smallest proportion on any UC campus; and

WHEREAS, these appalling numbers at the State's flagship University severely restrict the pool of black, Latina/o, and Native American students eligible to enter UC's graduate and professional programs; and

WHEREAS, the introduction of a new Chancellor, Robert Birgeneau, gives students an important opportunity to reverse this decline. In leaving office, Birgeneau's predecessor, Robert Berdahl,

Res. to Reverse the Continuing Drop in Underrepresented Minority Enrollment at UCB (cont'd) - 23 -

RESOLUTION TO REVERSE THE CONTINUING DROP IN UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY ENROLLMENT AT UC BERKELEY (cont'd)

acknowledged the inability of his Administration to achieve its goals in increasing underrepresented minority enrollment as a major failure. As UC Berkeley's new Chancellor, Birgeneau has an obligation to put forward a plan to address this crisis *now*; and

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2003, the new civil rights movement won a landmark victory at the US Supreme Court in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, where the nation's highest court established that affirmative action is the law of the land. This victory gives legal, political, and moral sanction for Birgeneau to use aggressive efforts under the law to increase underrepresented minority students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly endorses the following petition:

"Reverse the Continuing Drop in Underrepresented Minority Enrollment at UC-Berkeley."

Whereas, the latest admissions figures of UC Berkeley show an alarming decline in underrepresented minority admissions.

Therefore we the undersigned:

- Deplore the decline in underrepresented minority enrollment at the University of California at Berkeley.
- Stand for full integration of UC Berkeley and all of American society and for transcending the age-old, racist practice of marginalizing black, Chicana/o, Latina/o and Native American people -- UC Berkeley should not be participating in this practice in any way.
- Demand that the UC Berkeley Administration employ all means available under the law, taking into account the pro-affirmative-action U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, to reverse the drop in underrepresented minority enrollment at UC Berkeley, including greatly expanded recruitment, admissions, and retention effort's and the use of meaningful affirmative action policies.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly authorizes the President to write a letter to incoming Chancellor Robert Birgeneau expressing the views of this Resolution.

Mr. Cruz asked for a show of hands of people who didn't get a chance to sign the petition. Seven years ago, in 1997, before the ban on affirmative action was implemented, 25.3% of all UCB admits were black, Latino, and Native American; last year it was 17.3%; and this year it's 14.8%. And there haven't been changes in the law or in formal policy between last year and now. They have a new Chancellor coming in and people are getting support on campus for this petition. It calls on the new Chancellor to use all means available, under the law, to increase underrepresented minority enrollment for next year.

Res. to Reverse the Continuing Drop in Underrepresented Minority Enrollment at UCB (cont'd) - 24 -

That would include a more aggressive comprehensive, holistic review, and encouraging undergrad admissions officers and grad programs to take various steps to increase admissions. For example, at the UCLA Law School, they formed a new program, "Critical Race Theory," increasing black, Latino, and Native American

students applying for admission. There are a variety of measures being discussed among administrators, and the Resolution shores up those discussions to lead to a legal, substantial increase for next year. Also, this directly affects grad programs, and the vast majority of grad programs on campus are very negatively impacted by the lack of integration and diversity. If very few underrepresented minority students get into the freshman class, that means a much more restricted number of students applying to grad programs. So he would encourage Delegates' support. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

Ms. Falkoff said she was disappointed in not seeing on the Resolution anything about another underrepresented group, the economically disadvantaged. She thought a lot of other campuses were starting to look seriously at economic affirmative action and thought that was really important, because they have a very low proportion of low-income students there as well. So perhaps for the future, that could be included. Mr. Sharma said that if she wanted to write a Resolution, that was possible.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO REVERSE THE CONTINUING DROP IN UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY ENROLLMENT AT UC BERKELEY PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

The following Resolution was submitted by Mr. Cruz (Education):

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR NO RE-APPOINTMENT OF UC REGENT WARD CONNERLY

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has been historically committed to equal opportunity, integration, and diversity at the University of California and therefore has consistently supported affirmative action; and

WHEREAS, Ward Connerly has used his position as University of California Regent to establish himself as the principal leader and public spokesperson for the attack on affirmative action in California and across the United States; and

WHEREAS, Ward Connerly is therefore more responsible than any other individual for making it more difficult for underrepresented minority students to gain access to higher education in California; and

WHEREAS, Ward Connerly's continuing presence on the UC Board of Regents sends a "not welcome" message to underrepresented minority students across the country, which makes even harder the already difficult efforts of the UC's flagship campuses to achieve their goals of diversity and equal educational opportunity for all; and

WHEREAS, Ward Connerly is a needlessly provocative, divisive, and polarizing figure whose political exploitation of his position as UC Regent makes uniting our campuses more difficult and increases the aspects of campus life that tend to create a hostile environment for minority students; and

Resolution Calling for No Re-appointment of UC Regent Ward Connerly (cont'd)

- 25 -

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR NO RE-APPOINTMENT OF UC REGENT WARD CONNERLY (cont'd)

WHEREAS, when Connerly's term as Regent expires in March 2005, it would be extraordinary to re-appoint to a 12-year term a Regent who has already been appointed and will have served twelve years; and

WHEREAS, such an extraordinary re-appointment would send a very negative and divisive signal to the people of California and the nation that the Governor and Legislature of this State, and the UC Regents themselves, are insensitive to the concerns of millions of Latino, black, Native American, and other citizens and wish to maintain a politics of racial division and bitterness;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly calls on the Governor and Legislature of the State of California to NOT re-appoint Ward Connerly to the UC Board of Regents.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly calls on the Governor and State Legislature to name to the position currently held by Ward Connerly a qualified candidate committed to diversity whose appointment will not farther the hostility, division, and bitterness Ward Connerly's position on the Regents has fostered.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly endorses the Statewide petition opposing the re-appointment of Ward Connerly to the UC Regents

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly authorizes the GA President to write to Governor Schwarzenegger and to the State Legislature expressing the views of this Resolution.

Mr. Cruz asked if everybody knew who Ward Connerly is. Mr. Cruz said he wanted to underscore the importance of reaffirming the GA's commitment. They just had a victory at the Supreme Court for affirmative action in *Grutter v. Bollinger* in Michigan and there's now something called the "Michigan Civil Rights Initiative," which would end affirmative action in Michigan. It's an attempt to nullify the US Supreme Court's ruling. Ward Connerly donated \$200,000 to that Initiative and put himself forward as a public face in Michigan, and he would have never had ability to raise that kind of money or have the kind of respect he gets from the media if he was not the head of the country's most prestigious public universities, and the Resolution makes sure the Governor and the Legislature not take the very extraordinary step of reappointing a Regent to a full 12-year term. There's a rumor that could happen, and the Resolution makes sure that doesn't occur. He called for any questions.

Mr. Hsu asked if the objection that's raised in the Resolution to the reappointment was based primarily on the reappointment, or if it was because of the position Ward Connerly takes that may be representative of the State of California. The most recent initiative failed. He asked if his idea had failed in the marketplace of ideas. Mr. Cruz said that Connerly's role in the UC System has been counter to the mission of UC. Connerly advocated for Prop. 54, which was opposed by the UC Regents as it would have strangled the ability to do research by people in the UC system on minorities and health care. There's very little positive one could think of that Ward Connerly has done for the UC System, and the Resolution says that

Resolution Calling for No Re-appointment of UC Regent Ward Connerly (cont'd) - 26 -

the extraordinary action of reappointing him not be taken. They know of no one who's be reappointed, and such an action would be very important to the right-wing's efforts to end civil rights.

On a point of information, Mr. Stagi said there are no guarantees in politics, or that past election results would be any indicator that a Republican Administration would respond to previous electoral defeats by Mr. Connerly. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded.

Ms. Gray said they're all there as Delegates representing grads, so they should vote on this bill as representatives of grads, and not of the people of California. It's definitely in grads' interests to not have Ward Connerly be on the Board of Regents. The GA has determined that in the past and should continue that with that determination.

Mr. Hsu said that part of the objection he was raising is that they can't assume that their vote necessarily represents all grads. People don't know, e.g., the views of his Department. He himself may not fully know his Department's views. He was also hesitant to project on to the composition of the UC Regents a certain uniformity of thought. He actually agreed with the vote the GA took last year, but he thought it might be detrimental to show the people of California that the GA doesn't like to even hear a particular view, as opposed to being so certain, and they can debate it in a reasonable discussion.

A motion to extend debate time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Sharma said that people can speak on an issue and move to amend, but the moment they start speaking in debate and giving their opinion, they lose the right to make a motion, so they have to reserve that right in order to speak before making a motion.

Mr. Garcia said he very much supported the Resolution. He was a little uncomfortable with the third and fourth Whereas Clauses. He wasn't really sure they can truly say that he's more responsible than any other individual in the State for something. He also thought that was a little argumentative or hostile, and wasn't sure Ward Connerly's presence itself was a not-welcome message. He moved to strike the third and fourth Whereas Clauses. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Daniels said he agreed striking the third Whereas Clause. As someone who wasn't a minority, he didn't speak for minorities, but the message he sees with Ward Connerly was the UC System was not trying to create a more racially diverse student body. He didn't think it was inaccurate as a Whereas Clause and didn't think it should be cut. For him there was a lot of truth to it.

Ms. Falkoff said she thought the same thing was stated in the fifth Whereas Clause, but in less hostile terms. The fifth says the same thing as the fourth, in a rephrased manner.

Mr. Cruz said it was crucial to keep both Whereas Clauses. The fourth Whereas Clause says that they support sending a welcome message to underrepresented minority students, and one of the chief appeals of the UC

System is its diversity. Many students who choose to not apply to UC because they perceive it as unwelcoming, and Ward Connerly's reappointment would have a real effect. This was a powerful argument to politicians to not reappoint him. The other Whereas Clause was true, and he is the most responsible for decreasing opportunities. Connerly put forward the motions, SP 1 and SP 2, to end

Resolution Calling for No Re-appointment of UC Regent Ward Connerly (cont'd) - 27 -

affirmative action in grad and undergrad admission and in hiring in the UC System, and he chaired the effort for Prop. 209. He is also the chief advocate for ending affirmative action in Florida, Washington, Michigan, Georgia, and other states.

A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate said the fourth Whereas Clause affects UC Berkeley and the fifth affects the entire System, and if that was the case, it seemed they were different. She asked if the author intended it to be two different things or similar points restated. Mr. Cruz said the fourth Whereas Clause makes a point not clearly made in the fifth, that his reappointment for 12 more years on the Board of Regents sends a negative message to underrepresented students to apply to the UC System. Mr. Cruz said he felt it was a very, very important point.

A Delegate said that in the fifth Whereas Clause, it makes it difficult to unite the different campuses of the UC System. Mr. Cruz said that clause is to appeal to both parties, Democrats and Republicans, that this is a majority-minority State and they shouldn't have someone in this position who is divisive and polarizing. The language speaks to their desire to not alienate themselves from that majority-minority.

A motion was made to call the question. Mr. Sharma said that would end debate and would mean an immediate vote. There's no debate on calling the question. The motion to call the question on the amendment passed by voice-vote. The motion to amend the bill by striking the third and fourth Whereas Clauses failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Sharma said that if anybody disagreed with the Chair about the result of a voice-vote, they could call for a division, which would lead to a hand-vote. A division was requested. The motion to approve the amendment, to strike the third and fourth Whereas Clause, failed by hand-vote 11-20-3.

Mr. Daal asked if somebody could summarize the court case, Grutter v. Bollinger. Mr. Sharma said it was decided by the US Supreme Court in July of 2003, and was a challenge to affirmative action programs. A lawsuit was filed by Grutter against the University of Michigan. Grutter was denied a position at the University of Michigan Law School and challenged the school's affirmative action program. By a 5-4- vote of the US Supreme Court, Sandra Day O'Connor affirmed that the School's program was not in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourth Amendment because the State of Michigan had a compelling, governmental interest to promote diversity, and its program was narrowly tailored to further that interest. It was a seminal victory for affirmative action.

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

Ms. Mashiyama asked who appoints the UC Regents and if there was strong support for appointing Mr. Connerly. It sounded like it would be very unusual. Mr. Sharma said the Governor appoints Regents for 12-year terms, and they're confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the State Senate. He didn't know if there was pressure to reappoint Ward Connerly. Mr. Cruz said people have been pressing for information and haven't heard anything. There have been some things the Senate has not split from the Governor on over the last few months.

Mr. Stagi said that to address the point that the GA would be speaking for the whole grad student body, if the GA doesn't do it, he would ask who would. If Delegates' departments did not see fit to hold an

Resolution Calling for No Re-appointment of UC Regent Ward Connerly (cont'd) - 28 -

election because they didn't want to take the time or effort, Delegates were there representing them de facto, and it was incumbent upon them, as the GA, to take a stand one way or another, to support or not support him. Mr. Stagi said he felt Mr. Connerly has done nothing positive, and did all these other things. It's the Governor's responsibility under the State Constitution to appoint members to the Board of Regents. He's a Republican and so is Ward Connerly, and this is politics, and the GA has to acknowledge the way things work. If the GA wants to sit idly by and sit on their hands, they could end up with Ward Connerly for another 12 years.

A Delegate said she would like to vote for this bill but did like number three. She liked number four. She moved to strike the third Whereas Clause, as she found it to be inflammatory. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE BILL BY STRIKING THE THIRD WHEREAS CLAUSE PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 18-14-2.

Mr. Daniels said that unless there were important issues people have with this, it seems they all more or less agree with this. He didn't think anybody reading this would care whether the third paragraph was in there. He asked at what point someone could ask to end debate and go to a vote. Mr. Sharma said a motion could be made to call the question.

A Delegate moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR NO RE-APPOINTMENT OF UC REGENT WARD CONNERLY, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Sharma said that concluded their agenda. He wanted to thank them all for a quick meeting. If people had any questions, they could ask him.

This meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

- 29 -

Present at the GA meeting of September 9, 2004

German, Robert Schechtman	Law, Claudia Medina
Law, Rishi Sharma	African Diaspora Studies, Cintya Molina
Architecture, Romi Sanyal	Chemical Engineering, Lola Odusanya
City & Regional Planning, Jay Stagi	Physics, Trevor Lanting
Chemistry, David Garcia	Sociology, Kristen Gray
Anthropology, David Cohen	Architecture, Sahar Abbaszadeh
Architecture, Aditi Rao	Bioengineering, Matt Eckerle
Business Admin, Simona Langmaier	Chemistry, Lynn Trahey
Civil & Environmental Engineering, Geetika Maheshwari	Comparative Literature, Amelia Borrego
Economics, Kevin Stange	Education, Ronald Cruz
ESPM, Josh Fisher	Geography, Jason Strange
German, Jenn Zahrt	History of Art, Elizabeth Quarles
Italian Studies, Marisa Escolar	Jurisprudence & Social Policy, Alexander Rosas
Law, Daniel Aguilar	Law, Mariyam Cementwala
Law, Joshua Daniels	Law, Maximo Fuentes
Law, Patrick Hem	Law, Yael Livny
Law, Hollie Sawyers	Law, Deepika Sharma
Law, C'Reda Weeden	Logic & Methodology of Science, Johanna
Franklin	
MCB, Andro Hsu	MCB, Susan Mashiyama
MCB, Brant Peterson	Music, Rebekah Ahrendt
Philosophy, Jeffrey Wolf	Physics, Miguel Daal
Political Science, Darius Omston	Social Welfare, Sara Ortega
Social Welfare, Maayan Greene	Plant and Microbial Biology, Jon Penterman
Architecture, Varun Shiv Kapur	Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan
Italian Studies, Rebecca Falkoff	Sociology, Manuel Valleé
City & Regional Planning, Jennifer Susskind	City & Regional Planning, Eliza Johnston
ESPM, Ainsley Seago	MCB, Jennifer Fostel
Mechanical Engineering, Sarah Boyd	Mechanical Engineering, Eugenio Urquiza
Staff-Bus. Director, Nzingha Dugas	Staff-Funding, Shayla Moore
Staff-GMSP, Kofi-Charu Nat Turner	Staff- Leg. Liaison, Anu Joshi
Economics, Peter Fishman	History, Matthew Sargent
Integrative Biology, Christine Petersen	

Resolutions as Amended and Approved

Resolution to Create the Social Development Grant

Whereas, social isolation continues to persist among the graduate and professional student population of UC Berkeley; and

Whereas, the decentralized organization of the campus into departments, schools, programs and colleges makes it difficult to coordinate social opportunities across units; and

Resolutions as Amended (cont'd)

- 30 -

Resolution to Create the Social Development Grant (cont'd)

Whereas, social opportunities have a direct bearing on quality of life and academic success; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly is keenly interested in promoting graduate student quality of life and academic success through social opportunities:

Therefore Be It Resolved, that Title 16 of the Graduate Assembly By-laws are modified to read:

16.7.3.4 Social Development: This grant provides funding for student groups whose organization and purpose is to provide social events for all graduate and professional students across departmental, program, school, and college boundaries. In order to qualify for this grant, all the following criteria must be satisfied:

16.7.3.4.1 Groups requesting funds under this grant must be inclusive of all graduate students and cannot be exclusive on any basis other than status as graduate student in membership or event attendance.

16.7.3.4.2 Events funded under this grant must be advertised across all academic units and advertisement, to the extent possible, should be made at least two weeks prior to the event. The Graduate Assembly must be provided with an e-mail ready flyer for distribution to all graduate students at least two weeks prior to the event.

16.7.3.4.3 The constitution of any group requesting funding under this grant must state that the only purpose of the group is to serve all graduate students equally. Constitutions must be on file with the Office of Student Life.

16.7.3.4.4 At least three hundred students must attend an event funded by this grant.

16.7.3.4.5 Strong preference will be given to groups whose leadership spans academic units and distinct disciplines.

16.8.6 Purchase of refreshments can be funded only by Grad Events and the other grant programs.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Social Development Grant shall be treated on par with other grant opportunities in the Graduate Assembly for purposes of administration and awards.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Social Development Grant shall be awarded beginning Round 2 of the current academic year and thereafter during Round 2 and Round 5, with all the restrictions and rights pertaining thereto as long as the rounds-based structure is retained by the Graduate Assembly.

Resolutions as Amended (cont'd)

- 30 -

Resolution Calling for No Re-Appointment of UC Regent Ward Connerly

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly has been historically committed to equal opportunity, integration, and diversity at the University of California and therefore has consistently supported affirmative action; and

Whereas, Ward Connerly has used his position as University of California Regent to establish himself as the principal leader and public spokesperson for the attack on affirmative action in California and across the United States; and

Whereas, Ward Connerly's continuing presence on the UC Board of Regents sends a "not welcome" message to underrepresented minority students across the country, which makes even harder the already difficult efforts of the UC's flagship campuses to achieve their goals of diversity and equal educational opportunity for all; and

Whereas, Ward Connerly is a needlessly provocative, divisive, and polarizing figure whose political exploitation of his position as UC Regent makes uniting our campuses more difficult and increases the aspects of campus life that tend to create a hostile environment for minority students; and

Whereas, when Connerly's term as Regent expires in March 2005, it would be extraordinary to re-appoint to a 12-year term a Regent who has already been appointed and will have served twelve years; and

Whereas, such an extraordinary re-appointment would send a very negative and divisive signal to the people of California and the nation that the Governor and Legislature of this State, and the UC Regents themselves, are insensitive to the concerns of millions of Latino, black, Native American, and other citizens and wish to maintain a politics of racial division and bitterness;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls on the Governor and Legislature of the State of California to NOT re-appoint Ward Connerly to the UC Board of Regents.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls on the Governor and State Legislature to name to the position currently held by Ward Connerly a qualified candidate committed to diversity whose appointment will not farther the hostility, division, and bitterness Ward Connerly's position on the

Regents has fostered.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly endorses the Statewide petition opposing the re-appointment of Ward Connerly to the UC Regents

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly authorizes the GA President to write to Governor Schwarzenegger and to the State Legislature expressing the views of this Resolution.