

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 3, 2005

### SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- [Heard a presentation by University Health Services on the Health Fee Referendum, to be held in March.](#)
- [Heard general and GA Announcements.](#)
- [Heard reports from GA Officers.](#)
- [Heard a report from the Executive Board.](#)
- [Heard committee reports. Approved the report from the Finance Committee and approved the report from the Funding Committee, approving Round 5 of Graduate Events, Round 3 of Grants funding, and Round 2 of Projects and Services.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's Graduate Council representatives.](#)
- [Approved the following Resolutions:Resolution in Support of Funding RSF Facility Repairs Resolution in Support of NextBus Technology, as amended; Resolution in Support of the Claremont Hotel Boycott ; and Resolution Supporting the Movement to Reverse the Drop in Underrepresented Minority Enrollment in the UC System.](#)

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing Spring Semester, was called to order by Rishi Sharma at 5:36 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Sharma said he would like to welcome people back to the first meeting of the GA for the Spring Semester. It was nice to see some new Delegates there, and to see so many people at the meeting. Some people from University Health Services will be present to talk about the Health Fee, and the GA would try to get some business done before the speakers arrive.

### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Sharma said there was one change, and they should delete item 6.A. under New Business, since they wouldn't elect a new Academic Affairs VP. He called for any other changes to the agenda people would like to make. A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Sharma called for any corrections to the minutes from the December meeting. A motion to approve was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 2, 2004 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

-

-  
GA Announcements

- 2 -

-

-  
ANNOUNCEMENTS

GA Announcements

Nick said the GA Social Club was having its annual Mardi Gras next Tuesday at Blake's, starting at 8 p.m. There will be drink specials all night and prizes for the best costume, and plenty of good music to dance to. Sara asked if people could indicate their Department name if they didn't get an e-mail about this event. They were trying to see which departments don't get these announcements and trying to determine whether GSAs were forwarding them out. Departments that didn't receive a notice included Music, History of Art, Bioengineering, Chemistry, East Asian Languages and Cultures.

A speaker said she was the grad student representative from the Diversity Project, a coalition of faculty, staff, and students. They're hosting a campus-wide forum all day on March 3, from 10-5. People could stop in when they'd like. There will be a keynote speaker, Chris Edley, Dean of Boalt, as well as visitors from UCLA and Stanford. The forum will talk about where diversity is on the campus and where they want to go, as well as forming a research center on diversity. They want grad input on what they want this center to look like, and what they can do to get grads to get this going. She would ask them to please forward the e-mail to everybody they knew. She'd pass out fliers. She hoped to see them there.

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services

Mr. Sharma said their guests had arrived and he would ask for a motion to go to the Special Order. It was so moved and seconded passed with no objection.

Mr. Sharma said he would introduce Emeritus Academic Affairs Vice President Temina Madon, an illustrious grad of UC Berkeley, who will introduce their other guests. Ms. Madon said there may be some who recognize her from last year. She was present that evening to talk about a project that in some ways, started at the GA, in discussion with other students. It's now been brought to fruition, and she was helping to organize students. Mr. Sharma has played a big role in giving feedback. This involves a referendum in a student election that was coming up in March. If approved, the referendum would levy a new fee on students to support health care on campus. They've prepared a presentation and they also have a hand out that she would distribute. They'd go through the hand out.

Ms. Madon said she first wanted to introduce Claudia Covello, from the UC Health Center. Ms. Covello

said she's Clinical Services Director at the Tang Center. Presenters will walk the GA through the hand-out. She would start by giving a little context of why a student health fee referendum was being proposed and give some basic facts about how Berkeley students utilize health care. As they could see from the hand-out, about 74% of all students visit the Tang Center at least once a year and, in fact, the average student who comes to the Tang Center visits about 2.5 times a year. So it's well utilized, and actively utilized, and she thought it was an important resource for students on campus. Ninety-one percent of all grads are enrolled in the Student Health Insurance Plan (SHIP) and use the Tang Center as their primary providers for health care. But they always like to put in this reminder, that even someone who doesn't enroll in the SHIP plan also has access to the Tang Center since Registration Fees, in part, fund services. So that was a little about Tang.

-  
-  
Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services (cont'd)

- 3 -

-  
Ms. Covello said that as for the bigger picture, the next slide was about health care in general. As she was sure they've regularly seen in the news, there's been extraordinary inflation in health care, averaging 10-15%. In response to that, what a lot of campuses have done is actually put forward student fee referendums to vote on health insurance fees on their campuses. So four of the ten UC campuses already have a health fee that exclusively funds health care, and another three campuses actually build in access to basic health care into their SHIP plan. So different campuses are handling this in different ways. Berkeley hasn't done either one of those things, so momentum has been building. Also, as they could see, Tang is a well-utilized service. Even though the Tang Center has been hit by budget cuts in the past couple of years, that doesn't mean demand has gone down. Demand, or utilization, was higher than ever, so Health Services was very busy.

Ms. Covello said they're at the point where they're very concerned that the basic funding for health care was eroding, and they're trying to address that now, before they get on the slippery slope any further.

Ms. Madon said she would talk about how students have been involved so far. Talk about a health fee began about two years ago, when she was a Delegate in the GA. Most of them have seen Steve Lustig at a previous meeting. Mr. Lustig also attended a meeting of the Executive Board, talked about some problems, and discussed the idea of a fee that was tied to enrollment, so that when the campus population grows, health services also grow and could accommodate an increase in usage. They also wanted something that would not be pulled away in tough budget times. So the idea was to have a firewall to protect health care, so even though when the State stops UC at the same level it used to, and health care in the community becomes really expensive, students will still have access to health care, even though students are generally lower income than the rest of the Bay Area. So that's where this started. Ms. Madon said she became much more actively involved at the end of last Spring Semester, and then that past fall. She started doing research and found a lot of people in health economics devoted to health care on campus interested in preserving access to students. More recently, SHAC, the Student Health Advocacy Committee, has been involved. The Committee on Student Fees has also been helping, involved as the independent voice on campus for student fees and policy issues around student fees. So students have been quite involved this past semester. They developed a Health Fee Advocacy Committee to put together this proposal for the referendum, and that's what Ben will talk about. Ben is a first-year grad in the Goldman School of Public Policy.

Ben said he would talk about the fee and what it would cost. It would cost \$43.50 per semester, as well as

\$33 for the summer session. What they'd get were mainly more hours, more services, and more appointments, as well as greater ease in making appointments. To start with the hours, there will be more mental clinics available, longer urgent care hours, as well as having lab X-ray access available during those hours. Pharmacy hours would be open on Saturdays and there would be a shorter wait time for urgent care, and more evening hours. And it will be easier to get in. For mental health, it will be easier to get same day, drop-in appointments if students have something urgent, as well as to see psychiatry or counseling. Lastly, for information technology, there will be a system where students can make appointments online instead of standing on line and waiting. They've all tried to make appointments and had to wait.

Ben said he would next look at why they chose the \$43.50 fee as opposed to having greater co-pays. It's because they felt that the community as a whole would benefit from paying upfront, specifically those on financial aid. Thirty-three percent of the fee goes to financial aid, to help those students who would otherwise be left out if they had to pay out-of-pocket fees. If they had a chronic condition or something

-

-

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services (cont'd)

- 4 -

-

urgent, there would be greater equity if those people were covered. And then as for value, whatever one pays upfront, they get greater value for the services they get, as opposed to paying piecemeal along the way. So everybody would get better services if the money was upfront, and they could buy the IT system, e.g., and have risk sharing and risk pooling. Everybody who participates gets insurance if something bad happens, and this would be beneficial if they have to use a lot of these services. As for community health, everybody in the community would benefit from this. Twenty-five percent of all withdrawals from the University system are due to medical concerns, and even if it's not themselves, everybody knows someone who has medical conditions, and it's a hardship. It's one less hardship if fees are paid upfront and people have access to these services. Also, as for accountability, this money will go directly to services and wouldn't go towards funding Athletics, or any other area. Health Service got cut recently in the University budget and this money that's paid, along with the other money they pay, would go directly to health care and protection. Everybody gets sick and this model for health care would protect them.

Ms. Covello said they lastly want to talk about the inverse, what would happen if the Health Fee Referendum fails. The Tang Center would have to institute more fees. There are already user fees, and the cost for visits for primary care and urgent care would have to go up. Obviously, they'll have less appointments available because they wouldn't be able to staff up and may have to reduce operating hours. More services would get billed to SHIP, and that would cause the health premiums to go up. So those would be the problems if the Fee doesn't pass the Referendum. What the GA needed to know, lastly, is that fees at the door, such as co-pays, are not covered by financial aid, versus a campus fee that's built-in at the beginning of the semester, which would be covered by financial aid. Without this Fee the kinds of issues students have experienced around scheduling delays and how long it takes would continue. Those were the main points.

Ms. Madon said they would like to open the discussion up to questions, if people have particular questions about the Fee, what it would support, the process for bringing the Referendum, or the roll of grads in the process.

Mr. DeWitt said he works in health care, as a respiration therapist, and visited Tang, which was a very nice facility. But it didn't seem to be overwhelmed right now, so he was curious as to why there was such a push for the Health Fee at that time, and asked what created this concern. Ms. Covello said that he was saying that in his experience in using Tang, he didn't experience the kinds of things they're talking about, such as delays in getting scheduled, or long waits. Mr. DeWitt said that was correct. He goes by there most of the time and it seemed empty. Ms. Covello said that's the pretty atrium that he sees, and the Tang Center has 100,000 patient visits, so it's very, very busy. Architecturally, it was designed to pull patients to the back of the clinic. When people first walked through Tang, they would ask where the patients were. It's an interesting architectural factor, and the patients were just behind the doors. The student advisory groups did extensive surveying about students' experiences with Tang, so the kinds of things they're talking about were based on survey work that was done on students. Many of them do have very good experiences at Tang, but question was to help with access in getting in, the ease of making appointments, how long one waits, and urgent care. Mr. DeWitt asked if increased funding would guarantee that situation would remain. Ms. Covello said that was correct, and this would go a long way towards that.

Ben said there were three reasons why this was coming out at that time. One is that health care costs were rising 10-15% a year, while at the same time, the State budget has been shrinking, as has the share of the UC budget going towards health care. Those two things can't go together. Ms. Madon said a lot of

-

-

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services (cont'd)

- 5 -

-

students were being referred off campus because they can't be accommodated out of the Tang Center, and going off campus was really expensive. Rates off campus were really high compared to the Tang Center. If they have to go to a clinic, they could pay \$100-200 for a half hour and get reimbursed perhaps 80%, or 60%, depending, and it gets really costly. So being able to bring more people back to campus would benefit students with fewer out-of-pocket expenses.

Mr. Smith asked if there could be a trial period for the Fee, such as for three or five years, while they fight for more funding in the budget. He thought they had to be optimistic. They always institute these fees and assume the pendulum won't swing the other way, and that in a few years the State may meet its obligations. Ms. Covello said that was a good question, and the question was whether they will see better times, and if the University would restore some funding back to Health Services. She used to be more optimistic about that. It's very clear that when money is restored, the highest priority is always the academic and teaching program, and the campus has not shown any evidence of ever restoring student services. It's not something people could count on. It didn't feel like the model was going in that direction. Mr. Smith said the fee would let the campus off the hook by having students permanently pay everything for themselves, and they wouldn't have to fight for that. Ms. Madon said there was also another aspect. The Fee would be a way for students to protect themselves against not just State cuts, but also health care inflation that occurs nationally. It will probably be at least 20 years before people start talking about nationalized health care again in Washington, and the Referendum was about securing health care in the wake of the State's problems and increasing demand. She agreed with him in that she didn't want to let anybody off the hook in the Legislature for not funding student services for Californians, but in part, this was a more complex picture. In answer to the question as to why not sunset this, the Advocacy Committee recommended that some advisory board look at the fee in ten years and decide if it should go back to a referendum, and

possibly change, and expand and support more services if needed, or reduce it.

Ms. Ahrendt said it was mentioned what would happen if they don't implement the Fee. She asked if things would get better or if the fee would make up for the losses of funding. Ms. Covello said the students who have been designing it have thought about that and built in some protection, a small inflation factor. So while the fee was \$43.50, it would be indexed to medical inflation. A portion of the Fee will have a little inflation quotient, so the Fee always supports what it's intend to support. The inflation factor wouldn't be at the rates they quoted earlier, not at those high levels, but a percent, like 50% or 70% of medical inflation. So it just ensures things. Also, to tie the comment with the earlier question about Referendum language, which Delegates didn't have in front of them, this actually doesn't let the campus off the hook. It says the Fee is intended to supplement, but not supplant, campus Registration Fees, it's current funding source. So the campus would have to continue that funding source. So it's always an add-on, not the whole thing.

Mr. Schechtman said it was important to also note that one major reason this need has arisen is that the campus has been siphoning funds out of Registration Fees, which used to go to Tang at a higher rate, for other uses in the University. It's important that they, as Delegates, e-mail the Chancellor about this, since he has ultimate discretion over a lot of the budget at Berkeley, and state that cuts should not continually be made on the back of student services. A lot of Reg Fee funds have been diverted, leaving holes, such as at the Tang Center.

Mr. Schechtman said he had a question. They discussed this at the December meeting and voted in support of a uniform health fee instead of a co-pay model because it would be more equitable and would, for many grads, be covered by financial aid. However, at the time the model was proposed to them, the fee

-

-  
Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services (cont'd)

- 6 -

-

was \$36, so there's been a 20% increase already. He asked if the Committee could talk about what has changed since that \$36 fee was proposed, and what increases were projected for the future. Certainly, while educational cost increase, medical cost seem to increase even more quickly. They have some feedback that students were worried that the health fee has increased 20%, even before students voted on it, raising the question as to what would happen in the future. Mr. Sharma said he could answer the first part of the question, and said it was his fault. The \$36 fee was something he took from the first discussion at the Student Fee Referendum Committee. He didn't know if they wanted him to know. So it wasn't Tang that updated it, but he ran with a number that was given to him at a very early stage. Ms. Covello said that was a number that was put out too prematurely, and now it didn't look good. They haven't completed the math on it, but increments of inflation would not be anywhere near real medical inflation, and would basically keep up with salary costs. A lot of what this money will go to towards is to increase staffing to pay for increasing service; so it's just to keep up with staff salaries. The University doesn't increase their salaries at those levels. Ben said a lot of technology was involved as well, and the Committee looked at numbers in the \$30 dollar range, up to nearly \$50, and looked at what they could get for each fee amount, and decided on the \$43.50 amount after looking at what services it would buy for them.

Ms. Ahrendt said the document says that it's "draft only," and asked if this will change before it goes to a vote. Ms. Madon said the sheet was distributed just to give background information and was not the Ref-

erendum language. They put that in there to let people know that they could share this with colleagues, but it wasn't official. Ms. Ahrendt said that it also says the Grad Division will cover fees for GSIs and GSRs, and asked if that applies to 25% GSIs. Mr. Sharma said it doesn't, and said it applies to those at 50%. Ms. Ahrendt asked if they would need a referendum every time the fee had to be increased. Ms. Madon said that beyond inflation, that was the case. An inflation factor was built in. If people wanted to increase the fee beyond that, such as to offer greater orthopedic services, they would have to go back to a referendum.

Ms. Ahrendt said the one thing she's noticed in the Tang Center is a lack of specialists. She asked if the Referendum would mean more specialists. Ms. Covello said that was not necessarily the case. That's an effort they make any way, regardless. They'd welcome more specialists at Tang. The shortages at Tang reflect the shortages in the medical community. They can't get an allergist in Oakland-Berkeley-Alameda. So the issue was one of combing the medical community for new people and bringing them in. The Referendum was directed to primary care, urgent care, basic health care services, and specialty care.

Mr. Sharma said that to remind people, if they recalled the discussion the GA had in December, the two prongs they supported was that out of \$43.50, \$14.50 is returned to the Financial Aid Office, and that for GSIs and GSRs, a 50% appointment meant the Grad Division covered the full cost.

Mr. Stagi said it ostensibly sounds like this was a good idea, but he asked what kind of teeth the language would have. He had a concern that invariably, this will become a more privatized system, and on the surface, this looked like one more step in that process. He asked how the funds would be committed in a fashion where they could not be undercut by an administrator pulling the rug out. Ms. Madon said they still have to be vigilant. The word they have from the OP is that for the Chancellor, who sets allocations on the campus for budgeting, this was sort of like a social contract. But as they know with Social Security, social contracts can be broken. So they still need to fight for services they expect and rely upon. They can't get health care in the community, for the most part, and they rely on Tang. So they'll have to continue to fight for the Chancellor to keep being honest with the way their Reg Fees are used on campus.

-

-  
Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services (cont'd)

- 7 -

-

Mr. Stagi asked if they've had a conversation with the Chancellor about this matter, and asked what the Chancellor envisions for the future, and indications about being honorable. He asked if they've had that conversation. Ms. Medina said she's never met the man. Ms. Covello said that Steve Lustig has had that conversation, and the Chancellor was very supportive of this Fee. It's an excellent comment to bring back to Mr. Lustig and perhaps have the Chancellor speak to them, and get him to comment on this. Ultimately, the Chancellor does have full authority, and needs to speak to that. He supports the Fee and the Fee was dedicated to health.

Mr. Stagi said it sounds like bias putting money into the information technology system, which will benefit students, but will actually be infrastructure it would behoove the University to put money into. It sounds like eventually there will be cost savings. He asked if they have determined where that money would be applied and if there was latitude students would have it, or that money would be recaptured and used elsewhere. Ms. Madon said the referendum language sets up an advisory committee of students. Every year

they would recommend to the campus how funds should be allocated. Something like technology, which is more or less a one-time cost, could be put into more preventive, specialty, or urgent care. So there would be an advisory committee to watchdog the funds. That's where they get accountability built in.

Mr. Stagi said that by installing this information technology, ostensibly he could see it benefiting by having cost savings beyond maintenance. He asked if there have been some assertions of where that money would end up, and if they would be able to capture that, or have latitude in reprogramming. Ms. Covello said the job of the Advocacy Committee was to advise if there are savings where the priorities would be for the next year.

A Delegate said she imagined there are students who seldom go to Tang, or go once a year. When they pay \$120 a year, she asked if they expect students to start using services more, and if they've accounted for that with faster phone systems and more education, since people might want to use the services since they're paying for them. She asked if that's been taken into account, given the projected benefits to the students who use it 2.5 times a year. Ms. Covello said the Fee might cause that effect. One thing medicine has to do is triage. It assesses the severity of a problem, and when people, in fact, don't need to see a doctor, or if it was appropriate to be seen, and where to staff up. She thought they could accommodate that. But if people use it more frivolously, there's infrastructure built in that assesses how serious a problem is. That's something they have to do that in health care.

Mr. DeWitt said he was concerned about the methods of overseeing these improvements, and he hoped there's a way to show the success of the improvements, or else to rescind the fee, if need be. It was stated that with the fee, there would be faster appointments, shorter waits, and faster access to services. But unless they have a benchmark and a measurement over time, they wouldn't know if that effectiveness has occurred. Fees are rarely rescinded, and frequently, money gets redirected to other places. For health care, the fee should just go towards the health care of students, and information technology, communication systems, and things like that, should come from other pots of money on campus. The school wasn't broke and had a very large pool of money in an investment structure. So he got the feeling that going forward, they need this Fee now, and they have to go for the Cadillac. It's like the bum's rush, when one goes to a car lot and looks at one car, and the salesman says they just have to get another one. So he would caution people. He have a up his Student Health Insurance Policy after three and a half years, after paying \$4,000 for it. The only time he used the Tang Center, besides going in to look around, was for an exam for education abroad; and he had to pay for that himself. So he gave up that money at thing and felt

-

-  
Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services (cont'd)

- 8 -

-

he spent \$4,000 to help other students, and now he's gone elsewhere for health care. So he would have to look at this and ask them to please not give students the bum's rush, and make sure they have an oversight system that looks to see if there are actual changes for what was purchased, should they get the Fee Referendum passed. He for one will vote against it.

A Delegate asked if there was a background link. If he paid a flat fee instead of per visit, he would use the services more. He'd be interested in knowing, over the past five years, what has happened to the average length of delay for people trying to make schedules, or what affect was expected from the imposition of this

Fee, and if it delays, e.g., were significantly larger now than two years ago. He asked where he could find the numbers for that. Ms. Madon said there was information on back of the sheet. The links were listed. There is a Web site by committees that developed the fee and they have facts and figures that they'll put up on the site under the link, "facts and figures." That will be in the next week or so. Ms. Covello said she thought when they see it, they'd see there have been significant changes that happened in the last five years. Students are waiting longer, and they've written up a case on it. It will be on the Web. The Delegate said that regarding the question about usage, he wouldn't look at it as a bad thing if students use Tang more, such as when debating whether they were sick enough to go. It wasn't as though someone was lonely and wanted to make an appointment just to see a doctor. Students have more important things to do, and if they wouldn't otherwise go to a doctor because of a co-pay, this Fee would help them do that.

Mr. Sharma said that to remind people, they're asking questions of their guests for more information on the Fee rather than debating the efficacy of the Fee itself. As they recall, the GA in December endorsed the fee. So if people have questions about the fee as Ms. Madon outlined it, he would ask them to please state those questions. But to save their guests' time, he would ask them to refrain from debate, which they'll have later.

Mr. Daniels said that as someone who's in school fall and spring, he asked if he would also have to pay an extra \$33 to be covered in the summer. Ms. Covello said he wouldn't. They'd only pay that if they're enrolled in summer session. Mr. Daniels said one of his concerns about health care was not just rising costs, but the way it's administered impersonally and not very thoroughly. For example, he heard a story that Kaiser wanted to implement an e-therapy program, where people talked to therapists through e-mail. Tang wouldn't do that, but things can be impersonal like that, and the doctor don't get to know patients. He asked if they would be throwing their money at the problem, and that maybe this wasn't a problem that this particular referendum would fix. He asked if there was any mechanism or wording in the Referendum or in the oversight committee, or otherwise, that would address the way health care is delivered, not just the cost. Ms. Madon said she thinks about that a lot, and a lot of people feel the same concern, the way the clinics respond, or the time they take to listen to people's problems. She thought money helps to the extent that staff wouldn't be as overburdened. If they have 15-minute appointments, that's a lot of patients. Speaking as a former grad student and former GA Delegate, she thought they need to be good health care consumers, which means they ask questions, they say "slow down, I have more questions, I need to come back, we need to talk more," and are engaged with the health care system itself. Showing interest improves it. She was a member of SHAC and thought that was a great venue; and there were a lot of great venues for giving more feedback. They want personal care, a clinician who listens and who is sensitive to these issues. She knew the question was not asking about money, but about a mechanism.

Mr. Daniels asked if all this dealt with was money, and said the only thing it does is provide more money. Ms. Madon said it also creates an oversight committee. Mr. Daniels said that committee, though, focuses on the money. One concern was mental health. He's heard various things that when one sees a counselor,

-

-  
Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by University Health Services (cont'd)

- 9 -

-

therapist, or psychiatrist, they'll be funneled in various directions based on a check sheet they fill out. For him, that doesn't necessarily get at the situation that needed to be dealt with, and was pretty impersonal.

While more money might increase the pool of psychiatrists available, it may not address the fact that they have an impersonal questionnaire. He asked if the Referendum addresses those aspects. If not, he still liked it, but asked if the oversight committee had any power to suggest those types of changes. Ms. Madon said that last year one of the GA's issues was mental health. They set up a grad student committee within Counseling and Psychological Services, with the director of CPS, to talk about these services. At their last meeting, they looked at the check sheet, and most of the boxes that were listed were not applicable to most grads. So she thought there were some mechanisms, and it's a matter of getting people plugged in. Mr. Daniels said that concern, however, was not on this Referendum.

Mr. Daniels said that if they pass the Referendum, they'd keep services and expand services. He asked what dollar figure would not expand services, but keep them at the current level. Ms. Covello asked if he meant the equivalent of this per-student dollar figure. Mr. Daniels said they have current services that they'd lose, and a certain dollar figure would bring them back up, and \$43.50 would bring them higher. He asked what the dollar amount would maintain them where they are. Ms. Covello said the question was being framed in a way she was struggling with. The way they view it is that over the last two to three years, budget cuts have eliminated \$2.2 million in Registration Fees, and if the Referendum passes, it will be go a long way to restoring most of that. So they still would not have caught up to where they were three years ago. That's why she was having trouble with the way he framed the question. They don't surpass where they are with this Referendum, and they barely keep up. The difference is they're not going to use this money in the way they used it three years ago, and they'd use the money more tailored to input from students about where they want it versus where the Tang Center missed it before. So they're catching up. Mr. Daniels said that catching up meant buying new computer systems. Ms. Covello said it used to be tied up in things like night advisors, and they won't reinstate all the things they had and would put money in other areas.

Mr. Schechtman said this had to be approved by students, and given voting patterns on campus, they need to encourage grads to vote. But they also need to encourage undergrads to vote, because that's the vote that will decide this election. If Delegates are GSIs, it might be worthwhile to talk about this with their classes briefly before the election and definitely take a look at what they can do to get involved. Also, in response to Mr. Daniel's points, the GA debated student fees in November, he believed, and the way that increasing numbers of department were laying fees on top of students. They formulated a policy recommendation based on the GA Resolution and took that to the Provost, the Chancellor, and faculty. One recommendation was that any unit that charges fees to students should have a customer satisfaction feedback system. They're trying to recommend a central campus Web site so if students pay for a service, whether it's the library, the Tang Center, or keys for their department, and they're not pleased with that service, there's a way for them to express that and to have a response. It's a minimum that students should expect for something they pay for. So they're trying to push that with the Administration, and so far, there's a reasonable response to that suggestion.

Mr. Sharma said they were out of time and called for any other questions. He would like to thank Ms. Covello. Ms. Covello said she would like to thank them. (Applause)

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

-

-  
GA Announcements (cont'd)  
-

- 10 -

Mr. Cantor said there were a lot of new faces in the room, so he wanted to recap a little about how meetings should go. There's a sign-up sheet at the front of the room, and they should all sign in on that sheet when they come in, whether they're a Delegate or an Alternate. If their name is not on it, that could be for a number of reasons. They should write their name and contact information, and if they have not been certified, they should do that. They could talk to him as to how that works. Mr. Cantor said he's the Departmental Liaison, and they'll see him running around during meetings, and they shouldn't let him distract them from the meeting. It was his job to run around and get people things, and make sure food was available. The sign-up sheet had space for Delegates, Alternates, staff, and miscellaneous. Delegates should be on the list. There were a number of alphabetical sections, organized by department, and people should look through it thoroughly before they determine they're not included in the list. They should use their name tag if they one, and if they don't, they should talk to him and he'd make them one. He was supposed to remind Delegates that they were supposed to be involved in a committee. If they were not so involved, and there's a committee that no one else in their department was delegated responsibility for, as Alternate or Delegate, then they should be involved in one. They need one person in every department doing committee work. It's pretty easy stuff, just an extra meeting, and there's usually food. It's not even a monthly meeting for some. There will be call-outs on the e-mail list for involvement in committees, and people could talk to him if they'd like.

Mr. Cruz asked if there was somewhere on the Web site about committees, so he could find out if his School had a representative. Mr. Cantor said he could put that up.

Chrissy Arce introduced herself and said she was the new Graduate Women's Project Coordinator, and she had a few events to announce. The Empowering Women of Color Conference will occur March 3 - 5. Most of them should have gotten e-mails about this. If they could get the word out and talk about this, it would be great. Also, it's important to get the Grad Women's Caucus together. She sent an e-mail out, and if people have it, hopefully they can disseminate it to their network. That meeting will be February 16 at 12:00, at the GA. Finally, they'll have a power lunch with Dean Mary Ann Mason about managing grad studies and parenting, and that will most likely occur in the Women's Studies Conference Room at noon on February 28. She'd send out e-mails for that and would appreciate it if Delegates could get the word out.

A Delegate asked how they could change things if they weren't getting e-mails. Ms. Arce said they haven't transferred the listserv to her so she was stressed as to how to get the word out. She'd leave her e-mail with the GA. Mr. Sharma said that if she was sending messages to the Delegates list, she should talk to Mr. Cantor, who could add people.

Anna Berg introduced herself and said she's the new Grad Student Services Coordinator. She wanted to introduce herself. She wrote a little report in the packet. The next event is Monday, a workshop on "Surviving Oral Exams." It will be held in the Tilden Room, in the MLK Student Union. People should check the Web site. Her contact information was included in the agenda packet.

Ms. Medina asked if there will be a tax workshop. Ms. Berg said a bunch of people have asked her that, and there would be, but she wasn't sure she could get that going for that semester. Part of the problem was

with Consumer Counseling, who wants her to contract with them. As soon as she could get a response, she was sure it would be on the Web site.

-

-  
General Announcements

- 11 -

-

Mr. Schechtman asked Delegates to please take fliers and post them in their department. The fliers were by the agenda packets.

### General Announcements

Mr. Cruz said he's from BAMN, the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action By Any Means Necessary. Ward Connerly was out of the UC Board of Regents, and Mr. Cruz said he would like to congratulate everybody who supported that campaign. This was a real turning point for the UC System and they have an opportunity to reverse the damage Connerly has done. The new figures for enrollment that year came out, and 2.9% of the freshmen class is black, and 6.8% are Chicano students, whereas they make up half the population of the State. Some Delegates have signed the petition to reverse the drop of minority enrollment. The Supreme Court upheld affirmative action in Grutter v. Bollinger, and the campus Administration has not acted. On March 3 there will be a discussion on how to support diversity on the campus. That's the day of the Day of Action and a noon rally. He would ask people to please take a flier and distribute it to their departments, and to take the petition as well. They need a lot more signatures, thousands more. The collection site for the petition is Moffitt Library.

Ainsley ?? qblnd bufl said she was representing Insect Biology, a part of the Environmental Science Department. Next week, on February 8, they'll celebrate Darwin Day, something they do every year, their little celebration of Charles Darwin. February 8 is his birthday and they'll have cake and toast to Darwin, and there will be tours of the Etymology Museum on campus. This is the only time people get to see these exhibits because it's a working museum and not public, other than the afternoon of February 8. There will be talks presented that evening, sponsored by Bay Area people who study evolution. In light of the political climate regarding evolution, where intelligent design is a mandatory part of science curriculum in certain high schools, they'll have a series of short talks from evolutionary biologists whose evolutionary findings have been used by creationists as proof of the intelligent design. She wasn't trying to introduce anything that was anti-religious, but it was troubling if that was part of a scientific curriculum,. If they want to hear talks on this, they should show up on February 8 at the Essig Museum. The tours of the museum will be from 1:00 to 5 p.m. At 5:00 they'll have Darwin's birthday cake. The Bay Area BioSystematists will commence from 7:00 to 7:30 in 145 Dwinelle. People should be seeing posters up around campus for Darwin Day.

Mr. Sharma said that for those who were not at the November GA meeting, Ms. Dugas, GA Manager for the last 12 years, resigned, effective early January, to become Academic Coordinator for African American Student Development. Lavonia Wade is Acting Manage until the GA finds a permanent hire. They may

have a few reports on that, but not at that time.

Mr. Sharma said Ms. Moore's Funding Advisor's report was included in the agenda packet.

### Officers' Reports

Reporting as the GA President, Mr. Sharma said he would like to draw people's attention to Elaine Kim, an Assistant Dean in the Graduate Division, who asked that they find grads who are interested in serving

-

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 12 -

-

on the Graduate Affirmative Action Advocacy Committee. They're working on several projects at that time, around increasing diversity awareness. Mr. Sharma said they were shocked to learn how much, e.g., the Dean of a college that will go unnamed felt that affirmative action was social engineering, and that none would happen at that college, and that perhaps diversity was not simply something they put in grant applications. If people were interested, he would ask them to please let him know. They have one person on this Committee, but they need more.

Secondly, Mr. Sharma said that as many of them may recall, that summer the GA dealt with the issue of the Office of Student Life wanting to impose a \$40 registration fee on student groups in order for the groups to use campus space. The OSL agreed to rescind the fee once money opened up from the Vice Chancellor. When the money was released, it was stated that this was a one-time fix; and the OSL was holding to that. The OSL was planning to re-impose the fee as part of the budget process, so that's something the GA will work on again. Other than that, Mr. Sharma said his report was in the packet.

Mr. Smith asked how, legally, the OSL can charge students to meet together as a group if just go into an empty classroom, and have an organization that's registered. Mr. Sharma said the OSL's argument is that in order to use campus resources, including money from the GA, groups have to be registered and recognized by the OSL, and that the OSL was entitled to charge a reasonable fee for that recognition. They can't stop students from associating together and groups can meet in the Bear's Lair. But the hook for OSL is "campus resources." Mr. Smith asked if that was legal. Mr. Sharma said it was.

Mr. Cantor said he wanted to clarify something on the OSL fee, and said it wasn't a question of legality. The OSL actually does have jurisdiction over students on campus, and there's an extra set of rules that apply to students on campus. So they have a \$40 fee that buys students less privileges than a person from outside would have, because it's a public campus. It was ironic. As students, e.g., they can't theoretically table on Sproul without having permission from OSL. But a person from outside could, because students were bound by the Student Code of Conduct, as well as the Constitution of the US. So there's an extra little code that the OSL has, an institution that operates independently of the law, and students were bound to it.

Mr. Daal asked if the Affirmative Action Committee was also going to be responsible for the issue of minority faculty hiring. Mr. Sharma said it would be. One project they're working on at that time is putting on a panel series to bring in underrepresented minorities who got their Ph.Ds. at Berkeley to come back and

give academic talks. It would be an opportunity to mentor students here, looking towards that path, to see people who completed that path. And it would give an opportunity for those people who came here to put something on their CV, to give an academic talk and meet with faculty. Their focus is both on recruiting faculty and grads, and they go hand-in-hand.

Reporting as the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said he wanted to thank his Department for deferring his oral exams and the Executive Board for coming through additional resources. As a result, he's withdrawn his resignation. He wanted to thank them very much. (Applause) Mr. Schechtman said he would encourage people to get involved in the Academic Affairs Committee. They'll talk about this during the Committee's report. If they're going to get things done that semester, they need Delegates' participation. It could be an hour a month, but it makes a big difference. In his report, he mentioned he and Mr. Sharma met with the head of the RSF and another fee was being proposed to pay to fix the facade on the RSF, which has suffered water damage over the last 20 years. The campus wasn't going to repair

-

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 13 -

-

the roof. Since the roof that caused the water damage is a deferred maintenance issue, student fees would be used to fix the facade, but not the problem that caused it. So they're trying to speak with the Provost and Chancellor to upgrade this as a priority again. This might be something to e-mail the Chancellor about, or have people in their departments send them, saying the roof of the RSF had to be repaired and that students' money should not be used to repair damage that will be undone by more water damage to the roof. They talked to also talked to Mike Weinberger, head of Rec Sports, about putting solar panels on top of the RSF. That might be an incentive for the campus to re-do the roof. There's also the possibility of discussing the opening of a childcare facility in Strawberry Canyon. If people were interested in getting together to talk about those two projects, or either one, he would ask them to please see him after the meeting. They would like to set up an informal group to talk to Mr. Weinberger about that.

Mr. Schechtman said he was also looking for committee representatives for a couple of campus committees. If anybody was interested in the Grad Affirmative Action Advocacy Committee they should let him know. The next meeting is February 9, next week. It's very important they have representation. They also have a request for a grad student on the Registration Fee Assessment Working Group that was going to review campus registration policies and practices and make recommendations to reduce or eliminate administrative impediments and streamline regulation. The dates of the meeting were listed in the report. There are four meetings this semester, and they need to have one representative. He asked if anybody would be interested in representing grads.

Mr. DeWitt asked if that also includes reducing fees. Mr. Schechtman said at this point they're looking at not increasing fees.

Mr. Schechtman said he would send out an e-mail about openings to Delegates. It was very important they have grad representatives to these two meetings. Otherwise the only voice would be that of undergrads. If Delegates are a GSI, or had friends who were GSIs, there's an opening the GSI Affairs Committee. Also, the campus Bicycle Safety Committee was looking for someone.

Reporting as the External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Medina said that one highlight of her report was the January Regents meeting, the last one for Ward Connerly. He looked kind of sad to go. The most important thing is that there seems to be a new focus by the Regents on grad issues. So almost all of the entire day was spent on talking about the importance of, and the status of, graduate education. It just seemed that they're now just beginning to realize how important it is to keep the academic excellence. So hopefully something was going on. Ms. Medina said she got to white line

She got to "white line," meaning she got to interact with the Regents and got to do some advocacy for grad issues. They also met with the student government representatives of UC Merced.

Ms. Medina start the other thing she wanted to mention was that they're collecting testimonials for the weekend of February 17. They'll have a Lobby Conference in Washington, D.C., focusing on visa reform. A lot of visa issues were keeping international students away, and they've seen a drop of international enrollment. They have links for people to send in testimonials to the UCSA, or problems they've had, and for people interested in external affairs, it would be good to look at the Web site. There were a lot of great links. That week they'll have the Statewide Lobby Conference, and they'll be in Sacramento lobbying their State legislators. If anybody wanted to join them, they'll meet at the GA on Monday at 7:30 a.m. They'll have breakfast, and will be back around 4:00. If anybody wanted to join them, Ms.

-

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 14 -

-

Joshi's e-mail was included in the report. They'll have a conference, with workshops and speakers over the weekend. She was leaving on Thursday and Mr. Sharma was leaving on Saturday, and the actual Lobby Day was Monday. It would be great to have people go with them.

### Report from the Executive Board

Mr. Sharma said the report from the Executive Board was included in the agenda packet, and most of it has been discussed. Mr. Stagi called for any questions about the report.

-----

Begin written report from the Executive Board

Executive Board Report

3 February 2005

The Executive Board met twice since the last Delegates meeting and held a retreat to assess our progress mid-year.

The members of the Executive Board are: Lavonia Wade (GA Manager), Matt Eckerle (Bioengineering),

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

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

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

#### Funding and Grants Reform

Trevor Lanting, Chair of the Funding Committee, presented concrete proposals for reform in the funding process through changes in the funding guidelines. Trevor will present more detailed information in the Funding Committee report.

#### Academic Affairs Vice President

Because of Jessica Preciado's resignation on the heels of her election to this Vice President position, the Executive Board met and agreed to delay Rob Schechtman's resignation until February 5th, and if he so desires, to reject the resignation.

-

-  
Report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

- 15 -

-

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

#### Graduate Council Representative

The Executive Board initially accepted, then rescinded, the resignation of Jay Stagi as GA Representative to the Graduate Council. The Board, however, did agree to swap Jay and Matt Eckerle, making Jay the alternate and Matt one of the voting members.

#### Finance

The Board discussed ongoing problems with recruitment and retention, and began a conversation about whether or not the Graduate Assembly should attempt to make its salaries more competitive by offering a fee remission and higher wages to those serving positions at the Assembly.

#### Organization and Rules

The Board also discussed potential changes to GA structure.

End written report from the Executive Board  
-----

### Committee Reports

-

Reporting for the Academic Affairs Committee, Mr. Stagi said that as they know, one of the really amazing achievements last year was the Faculty Mentoring Award, which Ms. Madon spearheaded, in her role as Academic Affairs VP last year. Mr. Stagi said he, and a number of other people, worked really hard on that. It was one of the most successful things and there was quite a bit of excellent feedback from the Academic Senate. He's on the Grad Council and sits on a committee that just met that day, and they're devising guidelines for appropriate faculty mentoring, hoping to implement it campus-wide. It was really important for the GA, as an organization, to keep the profile high on this and keep the pressure on, by continuing the Faculty Mentoring Award and awarding it on an annual basis. This would be its second year. Unfortunately, they haven't had enough input from rank-and-file Delegates. They really need assistance, and need to get a committee rolling soon. This really was of importance, and has made a profound impact. He wanted to put a plea out. He didn't think it was possible for the Executive Board to put this on without the assistance of Delegates. A minimum of one Delegate per department must sit on a committee, but that's a minimum, and they could always have more than one person, and Delegates could serve on more than one committee. This committee was extremely important and will meet next Wednesday, February 9, at 5:30. They really need to have a minimum of six Delegates attending. So he would ask people to volunteer that evening. They might be able to revise the meeting time if they get enough people who want a change. If they have more people, it wouldn't be a lot of work. This was part of the GA's Advocacy Agenda that they established at the beginning of the year, and it's actually had a large impact. It would be sad if they didn't keep the momentum going and make sure this was an annual award. As they may have seen in the report, Mr. Sharma met with Dean Mary Ann Mason, and the Grad Division may take over the Faculty Mentoring Award. So it's important for the GA to come the

-

-

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 16 -

-

momentum going, to at least make it to next year, and hopefully it can reside with the campus after that point. People would enjoy themselves working on this.

Mr. Schechtman said for those who have been involved, in the Academic Affairs Committee, they're still waiting for information from the Grad Division and Housing to complete a draft of the housing report. They've been promised that information that month. They'll circulate it to Delegates before taking it to the Administration.

Reporting for the External Affairs Committee, Ms. Medina said they met in January and voted to recommend that Delegates support two Resolutions, which will be on next month's agenda. Also she would like to thank the Committee members who helped collect postcards for the Lobby Conference.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Hayashi said they met two weeks ago, and in the future, they'll hold meetings on Friday, six days before the GA meeting, from 11:30 to 1:30. Mr. Garcia would want him to petition Delegates to get involved. They're coming up on budgeting season, so they'll meet more regularly for the next little while, and if Delegates would like, they could get involved. There was only one piece of business the Committee approved, a request from the Executive office for an increase in the GSHIP remission line item. There were two parts to this. The first half requests that the line item be increased by \$1,080 so the Executive office could meet its contractual obligations to Executive Officers who were contracted to pay their GSHIP, and there was an increase that wasn't budgeted. That was approved without question. The second part of the question asked that an additional \$3,664 be added so the Executive Office can reimburse the Legislative Liaison, Campus Organizing Director, Advocacy Director, and Campus Administrative Liaison for their GSHIP costs. The Committee talked about this and decided to approve the requests. So the new total for the line item is \$6,412. As part of the request, they ask Mr. Garcia, the Chair, to speak to the Executive Board about four points. They want the Executive Board to look into actively recruiting undergrads for GA positions. Secondly, to evaluate the policy of providing health insurance compensation for non-student contract employees, because these people have, in the past, not been reimbursed for health insurance. Third, they want the Executive Board to consider equity of not extending GSHIP remission to Executive Assistants, given that now most Executive Office staff will receive GSHIPS, but others will not, and to look into any needed or existing procedures to guard against waste, e.g., being careful about having to pay benefits twice if staff leave and are replaced.

Mr. Sharma said this was an action report that required approval by the Delegates. A motion to approve was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

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

-  
Announcements:

The Finance Committee will now hold meetings on Fridays, six days prior to the regularly scheduled Assembly meetings, from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. In addition, all budgeting meetings will take place on Fridays at the same time. Anyone interested in serving on the Finance Committee should e-mail [finance@ga.berkeley.edu](mailto:finance@ga.berkeley.edu).

-  
Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 17 -

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

-  
Business:

The Committee approved a request from the Executive Office (EO) for an increase in the Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan (GSHIP) remission line item. The request was a two-part request:

1. The first half of the request asked for the line item to be increased by \$1,080.00 so that the EO could meet contractual obligations to the three Executive Officers. This was approved without question.
2. The second half of the request asked that an additional \$3,664.00 be added to the line item so that the EO could reimburse the Legislative Liaison, Campus Organizing Director, Advocacy Director, and Campus Administrative Liaison for their GSHIP costs. After much discussion the Finance Committee agreed to approve this request as well, bringing the new total of the line item to \$6,412.00. As part of their agreement to approve the request, the Finance Committee ordered David Garcia, the Finance Committee Chair, to ask the Executive Board to discuss the following:
  - a. The level of undergraduate recruitment for GA positions.
  - b. The policy on providing health insurance compensation for non-student contract employees, including offering different benefit support for the same position based on the contract employee's status as a student.
  - c. The perceived inequity of not extending GSHIP remission to the Executive Assistants (EAs) given that most EO staff will now receive GSHIP benefits, but the EAs will not.
  - d. Any existing or needed procedures that will guard against waste, e.g., having to pay benefits twice if staff vacate and are then replaced.

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

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Mr. Lanting said February 18 is the funding deadline if people want to apply for funding for the regular semester. The Funding Committee met on Monday to go through Round 5 allocations, and following Ms. Moore's report in the agenda packet were the funding allocations for Grad Events, Grants, and for Projects and Services. The honeymoon in funding was over, and the Funding Committee had to cut a little more harshly than they had to in the Fall Semester, and cut 65% of what people asked for. They fully funded Grad Events. They cut some grant categories, namely Campus Diversity and Educational Improvement, which were oversubscribed, to 65% of what was requested. All other line items were fully funded. He called for any questions about Round 5 funding or funding for the rest of the semester.

A Delegate asked about the status of the Social Grant created last semester, which was stalled for administrative reasons. Mr. Lanting said they're working on a restructuring of grants and Grad Events. Starting in the New Year, they're going to subsume the Social Grant as an exception of Grad Events 2. The Funding Committee has a standing rule, that they can't fund more than \$1,000 for Grad Events 2. But a group that follows the guidelines in the Social Development Grant can have that \$1,000 per semester waiver. So this will be a change in the standing rules of the Funding Committee, to take place in the fall of next year. They had some problems with oversight of the Social Development Grant, so they made it part of Grad Events. He'll present a By-law change in March that will move the Social Development Grant into Grad Events.

-

-

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 18 -

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, APPROVING ROUND 5 OF GRADUATE

## EVENTS, ROUND 3 OF GRANTS FUNDING, AND ROUND 2 OF PROJECTS AND SERVICES.

### Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

Ms. Sanyal said the last few meetings of the Grad Council have been short, and mostly considering approval of departmental evaluations and name changes. The "Women's Studies Department" is now the "Grad and Women's Studies Department," or a combination thereof. The Grad Council has requested, a number of times, that grads to bring any concerns they have to the its attention. The reason they say that is because it feels like the concerns the GA has were never voiced there because they don't really hear from Delegates what they're concerned about. They now have the Affirmative Action Committee. Some of them got the e-mail, and they're having a meeting on Monday at 5:00. She didn't know if she made that clear. It will be in the GA building, and there will be with food. The Affirmative Action Committee from the ASUC Senate is also working on the same issues as the GA. So hopefully they'll be able to bring something to the Grad Council, as it's one of the strongest forums to discuss any concerns grads have. As of that point, the things being targeted in terms of student issues were the drop in enrollment for foreign students, concern from faculty about the fact that grad fees were going up. They want to do something about that. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

Reporting as the GA representative to the Store Operations Board, Mr. Sharma said they'll meet next Tuesday and discuss potential new vendors in the Student Union mall, particularly in the Bearcade. He asked if anybody there has been to the Bearcade, and noted that no one had been. So obviously, they need to put something new in there.

### RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolution was submitted by the Executive Board:

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING RSF FACILITY REPAIRS

WHEREAS, the Recreational Sports Facility (RSF) building was constructed with student funding; and

WHEREAS, the facility is among the most widely-used on campus, serving over 20,000 students annually;  
and

WHEREAS, the facility also serves faculty, staff, and members of the Berkeley community, making it one of the most active "community centers" on campus; and

WHEREAS, water damage to the exterior facade and to the structure of the building has been identified by the campus as a Life Safety issue, necessitating current repair work; and

## Resolution In Support of Funding RSF Facility Repairs (cont'd)

- 19 -

## RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING RSF FACILITY REPAIRS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the campus Life Safety Committee has proposed to the Chancellor that the mandatory campus fee for such project be renewed for four years, including a 20% increase in each of the next two years; and

WHEREAS, the campus Administration has been notified that existing roof damage to the RSF facility is a major cause of this existing damage; and

WHEREAS, the campus has not announced plans to repair the roof of the RSF, deeming it an issue of deferred maintenance; and

WHEREAS, deferring roofing repairs dramatically increases the likelihood that water damage to the structure and the facade will reoccur:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly of the University of California at Berkeley urge the campus to make promptly available sufficient and appropriate funds to complete the current repair work.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the campus prioritize roof repairs to the RSF facility, so that the structural integrity of the building is ensured and that student funds being used for repairs are not wasted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Executive Officers of the Graduate Assembly work with the Administration to encourage use of the RSF roof for solar power generation, based upon the sustainable energy policy of the UC Regents.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Academic Affairs Vice President and the President communicate this resolution to the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, the Chancellor, and appropriate committees of the Academic Senate.

Mr. Schechtman said the Resolution addresses what he mentioned earlier that evening. It would have the force of the GA behind their recommendations on the RSF to the Chancellor and the Provost.

With Ms. Medina chairing the meeting, she called for any questions on the Resolution. A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING RSF FACILITY REPAIRS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was submitted by Mr. Stagi (City and Regional Planning):

## RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NextBus TECHNOLOGY

WHEREAS, an important element in high-caliber transit service is providing surety of ride through adherence to established schedules; and

Resolution in Support of NextBus Technology (cont'd)

- 20 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NextBus TECHNOLOGY (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the amount of traffic and other impediments in Berkeley and adjacent areas often limit the ability of buses on routes serving UC Berkeley to adhere to their schedules; and

WHEREAS, many students access the AC Transit system at key bus stops serving the campus and are thus impacted by these limits; and

WHEREAS, these key bus stops include: Euclid at Hearst, Shattuck at Alston, Telegraph at Bancroft, Telegraph at Durant, and University Village; and

WHEREAS, the technology known as NextBus addresses concerns of surety of ride through accurate and updated information on bus arrivals; and

WHEREAS, AC Transit currently employs NextBus technology with success on several routes in its service area; and

WHEREAS, negotiations are currently underway between UC Berkeley and AC Transit for the renewal of the Class Pass;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly of the University of California at Berkeley urge that the negotiations currently underway between UC Berkeley and AC Transit include implementation of NextBus technology at key stops adjacent to the UC Berkeley campus.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Executive Board support the negotiating team in working towards an agreement with AC Transit to provide NextBus technology at the key stops.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Graduate Assembly representatives to the Class Pass Advisory Committee and the Chancellor's Parking and Transportation Committee communicate the Graduate Assembly's support of implementing NextBus technology at key bus stops.

Mr. Stagi said that if people take the Rapid Bus, or the bus along San Pablo, they have information telling them when the next bus was coming.

Mr. Schechtman said this came from the Executive Board, through direct feedback from grads, so they can take action if grads bring items to them. Two international students who live in San Francisco and commute on the F Bus said it would be nice to know when the next bus would arrive, and NextBus technology does that.

A Delegate Joyce ?? asked how that's communicated. Mr. Stagi said it's on a digital readout, such as is seen at BART.

Ms. ElNaggar moved to amend the language in the Resolved Clause, "and that NextBus technology meet non-visual accessibility standards," to read, "...implementing NextBus technology at key bus stops, and that NextBus technology meet non-visual accessibility standards." The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Resolution in Support of NextBus Technology (cont'd)

- 21 -

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NextBus TECHNOLOGY, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was authored by Christopher Cantor (Departmental Liaison) and was sponsored by the External Affairs Committee:

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CLAREMONT HOTEL BOYCOTT

WHEREAS, the Claremont Hotel is one of the most luxurious, expensive, and beautiful hotels in the East Bay, and is heavily patronized by people affiliated with UC Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, the Claremont workers, who have been struggling for over three years, are demanding that their employer provide them with a living wage, affordable health care coverage, and respect for their right to organize; and

WHEREAS, the Claremont Hotel managers have waged an anti-union campaign against all of these workers and targeted several union activists who are hotel employees by unfairly firing them on trumped up charges; and

WHEREAS, an overwhelming majority of Claremont workers authorized a boycott of the hotel on May 1, 2002, asking the community to show solidarity by not crossing their picket lines to patronize the Claremont Hotel; and

WHEREAS, many leaders of our community have publicly spoken out against the treatment of workers at the Claremont Hotel and in support of Claremont workers and their boycott, including the City of Berkeley, Oakland Mayor Jerry Brown, and Oakland City Council President Ignacio De La Fuente; and

WHEREAS, members of the UC Berkeley community, such as the School of Public Health, the Haas School of Business, the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, and Cal Athletics, continue to patronize the Claremont Hotel and cross the picket-lines;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly continue to recognize and support the Claremont Hotel boycott.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly condemn the actions of campus units such as the School of Public Health, the Haas School of Business, the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, and Cal Athletics, insofar as they continue to patronize the hotel with knowledge of the worker strike and the public boycott of the Claremont Hotel.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President write a letter to the Chancellor requesting that the Chancellor issue a public statement in support of the Boycott.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President write a letter to the Dean of the School of Public Health, the Acting Dean of the Haas School of Business, the Chair of the

Resolution in Support of the Claremont Hotel Boycott (cont'd)

- 22 -

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CLAREMONT HOTEL BOYCOTT (cont'd)

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, and the Cal Athletics Director, expressing the disappointment of the graduate student body for their decisions not to respect the boycott at the Claremont Hotel.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that Graduate Assembly delegates be encouraged to participate in the efforts of the Claremont Hotel Workers Boycott Committee to promote awareness and observance of the boycott on the UC Berkeley campus.

Mr. Cantor said the Resolution supports a boycott that's been called at the Claremont Hotel for about two years. The Hotel is on Claremont Avenue, in the Berkeley hills. It's a really nice hotel and has a history of being very closely involved with UC Berkeley. Up until recently, it's been run by a very anti-union management group. There's a union there, but the workers in the Hotel's spa have been trying to unionize, and have been faced with all sorts of repercussions from management. For example, people trying to organize have been fired, which is a violation of their civil rights. The Claremont has spent half a million dollars bringing in consultants to figure out how to intimidate employees into not having a union. Two years ago, employees voted to call a boycott and asked people doing business with the Claremont to boycott the Hotel. A large amount of the focus of that boycott has been on campus. The ASUC approved a Resolution on this and the GA was considering a companion Resolution. Supporting the boycott meant they ask their departments to boycott the Claremont, and the Resolution would also have the GA President write a letter to the Chancellor asking to have the boycott respected, and to write letters to units asking them to respect the boycott.

A Delegate asked in what way campus units patronize the Claremont. Mr. Cantor said a large amount of the money that goes to the Claremont comes from UC conferences and meetings held there. The Cal Athletics Department boycotted the Claremont, but now has a new Director, so the process had to be repeated. The

Haas School of Business has refused to honor the boycott, and does a lot of business with the Hotel. The Cal Athletics Department keeps entire wings of the hotel open, sometimes with no occupants in them, in order to have the rooms available if they need to put somebody up. Athletic teams, before away games, stay there. So there's a lot of involvement with the Claremont. Cal is one of its biggest clients.

Joyce ?? said the boycott was called in 2002, and it was now 2005. It was mentioned that there have been recent changes in management, and she asked if they could consider looking at ways to address the problem more effectively than writing a letter about the boycott. That didn't seem to have any teeth. Mr. Cantor said it has had teeth, and has had a big impact. It's one reason management companies switched. It's been taking a very long time, but it's having a drastic impact. Campus units and public figures decided to boycott the Claremont, so there's a lot of momentum behind this. It's not as though these things weren't having an effect. That's according to the people in the Union and the workers. It's having a very big effect.

A Delegate asked if there's been a change in the conditions of the negotiations and if there was an end in sight. Mr. Cantor said there was, because the management company has changed. The boycott was still on because there's still no contract. The management company was not as anti-union as KSL, the former company.

Resolution in Support of the Claremont Hotel Boycott (cont'd)

- 23 -

Mr. Stagi said he was a shop steward for many years in Local 2, a hotel workers union in San Francisco, and for a long time it was the policy of the City and the union that the Marriott become unionized. That was part of the deal when they became part of the Moscone Center. The Marriott refused to unionize and it took over ten years. It was a long process, with boycotts and people out there with signs and bullhorns. But they're now unionized. So sometimes these do take an effort, but they can be successful if people stick to their guns. So it was important that the GA do so.

Mr. Sharma asked if the boycott only applied to the Hotel, or if it included the bar. Mr. Cantor said the boycott applies to the whole thing, the Hotel, bar, restaurant, and spa.

Ms. Ahrendt said she would be behind this one hundred percent if she hadn't been told that the new management company was more favorable, in which case she would suggest waiting on the Resolution until they know their actual stance is how negotiations were going.

Mr. Smith said he didn't think they should let up on the pressure in order to see how the company responds.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to table debate. The motion was seconded.

A Delegate said that it seemed that the GA should keep the pressure on, and if the Hotel changes and makes a decision, the GA's stance could be changed. It was unclear what would be accomplished by changing the boycott.

Mr. Fisher said they could change the language of the Resolution to encourage the new management to agree to the union.

Mr. Cantor said he's a staffmember and therefore couldn't participate in debate or vote. If people phrase things as questions, he could answer them.

A Delegate asked when the new management company came in. Mr. Cantor said there the Hotel will be turned over, and the boycott was on. The company that's in charge has turned over a number of properties along the same lines. When they settled the contract, the boycott came off. The old company was still in charge, and the new company hasn't come on, and there's no new contract.

Mr. Smith said that since they had clarification, they should stick to the facts they know, which is the people they're in solidarity with were still boycotting. Until the GA knows officially there's new management in place, which has shifted course, then the GA could revise its stance. But until then, they should stay the course they originally set.

Mr. Stagi said the way these things are resolved was not whether a company gets better management input, but when a contract was signed; and a contract has not been signed.

Hearing no other debate, Mr. Sharma said the question was automatically called. The motion to table the Resolution failed unanimously by voice-vote.

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

Resolution Supporting the Movement to Reverse the Drop in Underrepresented Minority  
24 -  
Enrollment in the UC System

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

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE MOVEMENT TO REVERSE THE DROP IN  
UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY ENROLLMENT IN THE UC SYSTEM**

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has long been on record supporting affirmative action policies as essential to realizing integration, diversity, and equal opportunity in higher education; and

WHEREAS, Ward Connerly has left the University of California Board of Regents, a victory that presents the opportunity of reversing the resegregation his policies have brought to the UC system; and

WHEREAS, Connerly's Proposition 209 has been devastating for the University: In UC Berkeley's Fall 2004 enrolled freshmen class, there were only 2.9% black students, 6.8% Chicano students, 2.5% Latino students, and 0.4% Native American students. At the same time, these groups make up a majority of California's K-12 public school students; and

WHEREAS, the Supreme Court in 2003 upheld and endorsed race-conscious affirmative action policies as

the only effective means to integrate higher education in their historic ruling, *Grutter v. Bollinger*. This legal ruling from the highest court in the land gives the UC Berkeley Administration the opportunity to reverse the drop in underrepresented minority enrollment now; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Birgeneau and the UC Berkeley Administration are making admissions decisions over the next several weeks; and

WHEREAS, the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration, & Immigrant Rights and Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary (BAMN) is organizing a series of forums titled "Affirmative Action 101" to advance the campus discussion on reversing the drop in underrepresented minority enrollment. This symposium will bring scholars from across the nation, including possibly Jared Diamond, Shanta Driver, Jonathan Kozol, and Claude Steele, to tell the truth about the discriminatory impact of UC's admissions criteria and the segregation and inequality that structure American society that necessitate affirmative action; and

WHEREAS, BAMN will hold a Day of Action to Reverse the Drop in Underrepresented Minority Enrollment on Thursday, March 3. This rally and march will provide an opportunity for the entire campus community to unite and express its support for diversity and integration in higher education; and

WHEREAS, reversing the drop in underrepresented minority enrollment at UC Berkeley would create an opportunity to challenge and defeat Proposition 209. This Spring Semester can be a turning point in the fight for equality in California;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly endorse the "Affirmative Action 101" educational series.

Resolution Supporting the Movement to Reverse the Drop in Underrepresented Minority  
25 -  
Enrollment in the UC System (cont'd)

#### RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE MOVEMENT TO REVERSE THE DROP IN UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY ENROLLMENT IN THE UC SYSTEM (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Graduate Assembly endorse the March 3 Day of Action to Reverse the Drop in Underrepresented Minority Enrollment at UC Berkeley.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly send an e-mail to its Delegates to forward to campus departments encouraging the campus community to participate in this series of events.

Mr. Fisher asked about endorsing the forum and Day of Action. Mr. Sharma said approving the Resolution would mean the GA would support the forum and march.

Mr. Sharma said that seeing no questions or debate, the question was automatically called. A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE MOVEMENT TO REVERSE THE DROP IN UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY ENROLLMENT IN THE UC SYSTEM PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary

#### Resolution in Support of NextBus Technology (as amended on the floor)

Whereas, an important element in high-caliber transit service is providing surety of ride through adherence to established schedules; and

Whereas, the amount of traffic and other impediments in Berkeley and adjacent areas often limit the ability of buses on routes serving UC Berkeley to adhere to their schedules; and

Whereas, many students access the AC Transit system at key bus stops serving the campus and are thus impacted by these limits; and

Whereas, these key bus stops include: Euclid at Hearst, Shattuck at Alston, Telegraph at Bancroft, Telegraph at Durant, and University Village; and

Whereas, the technology known as NextBus addresses concerns of surety of ride through accurate and updated information on bus arrivals; and

Whereas, AC Transit currently employs NextBus technology with success on several routes in its service area; and

Whereas, negotiations are currently underway between UC Berkeley and AC Transit for the renewal of the Class Pass;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly of the University of California at Berkeley urge that the negotiations currently underway between UC Berkeley and AC Transit include implementation of NextBus technology at key stops adjacent to the UC Berkeley campus.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Executive Board support the negotiating team in working towards an agreement with AC Transit to provide NextBus technology at the key stops.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly representatives to the Class Pass Advisory Committee

and the Chancellor's Parking and Transportation Committee communicate the Graduate Assembly's support of implementing NextBus technology at key bus stops, and that NextBus technology meet non-visual accessibility standards.

Present:

<a href="#">German</a>	Robert	Schechtman
Law	Claudia	Medina
Law	Rishi	Sharma
<a href="#">Architecture</a>	Romi	Sanyal
Chemical Engineering	Lola	Odusanya
<a href="#">Chemistry</a>	David	Garcia
<a href="#">City &amp; Regional Planning</a>	Jay	Staqi
<a href="#">Physics</a>	Trevor	Lanting
Anthropology	Meg	Stalcup
<a href="#">Architecture</a>	Aditi	Rao
Astronomy	Jason	Wright
Bioengineering	Matt	Eckerle
Bioengineering	Brian	Carnes
<a href="#">Chemistry</a>	Lynn	Trahey
<a href="#">Civil and Environmental Engineering</a>	Geetika	Maheshwari
<a href="#">East Asian Languages &amp; Cult</a>	Patrick	Noonan
Economics	Andrew	Hayashi
Economics	Kevin	Stange
Education	Ronald	Cruz
<a href="#">ESPM</a>	Ainsley	Seago
<a href="#">ESPM</a>	Josh	Fisher
Ethnic Studies	Dorothy	Nason
<a href="#">Folklore<sup>1</sup></a>	Anthony	Buccitelli
Geography	Jason	Strange
<a href="#">German</a>	Jenn	Zahrt
History of Art	Elizabeth	Quarles
<a href="#">IEOR</a>	Stella	So
<a href="#">Information Management &amp; Systems</a>	Bruce	Rinehart
Integrative Biology	Jenny	McGuire
Integrative Biology	Rebecca	Lutzy
<a href="#">Italian Studies</a>	Marisa	Escolar
Law	Bryant	Yang
Law	Kiyana	Davis
Law	Daniel	Aguilar
Law	Hollie	Sawyers
Law	Maximo	Fuentes
Law	Yael	Livny
<a href="#">Logic &amp; the Methodology of Science<sup>1</sup></a>	Johanna	Franklin
<a href="#">Materials Science &amp; Engineering</a>	Gabriel	Harley
<a href="#">Materials Science &amp; Engineering</a>	Becca	Jones
<a href="#">Mechanical Engineering</a>	Eugenio	Urquiza
<a href="#">Near Eastern Studies</a>	Brian	Brown
<a href="#">Philosophy</a>	Jeffrey	Wolf
<a href="#">Plant and Microbial Biology</a>	Jon	Penterman
<a href="#">Political Science</a>	Darius	Ornston
<a href="#">Psychology</a>	Melissa	Adams
<a href="#">Social Welfare</a>	Lawrence	Smith
<a href="#">Social Welfare</a>	Maayan	Greene
<a href="#">Social Welfare</a>	Sara	Ortega
Bioengineering	Carmel	Levitan
<a href="#">City &amp; Regional Planning</a>	Duane	De Witt

<a href="#">Integrative Biology</a>	Christine	Petersen
<a href="#">Music</a>	Loretta	Notareschi
* Staff - Dept Liaison	Chris	Cantor
* Staff - GSSP	Anna	Berg
* Staff - Leg. Liaison	Anu	Joshi