

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

May 5, 2005

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- Heard a presentation by Nad Permaul, Director, UC Department of Transportation
- Heard reports from GA Executives. With no objection, authorized Mr. Sharma to continue as student Chair of the GA Manager Search Committee, and authorized the 2005-6 GA president to work on autonomy.
- Heard committee reports. With no objection, approved the report of the Funding Committee. With no objection, approved the report of the Finance Committee, and approved the 2005-6 GA operating budget.
- Heard a report from the GA's Graduate Council representatives.
- Heard a report from the GA's representative on the ASUC Auxiliary Store Operations Board.
- Held GA elections for 2005-6 and elected the following:
 - Lola Odusanya, President
 - Robert Schechtman, Academic Affairs Vice President
 - Claudia Medina, External Affairs Vice President
 - Sarah Tom, Chair, Finance Committee
 - Jenn Zahrt, Chair, Funding Committee
 - Jay Stagi, Chair, Organization and Rules Committee
 - GA reps to the Grad Council, Miriam Elnaggar, Sahar Abbaszadeh, and Jeffrey Wolf.
- Unanimously approved the Resolution to Amend the By-laws with an Environmental Sustainability Paragraph.
- Unanimously approved the Resolution In Favor of Reconstituting the Student Registration Fee Committee
- Unanimously approved, as amended, the Resolution In Support of the University of California Labor Centers.
- Approved, as amended, the Resolution to Demand UC Berkeley Refuse Official Assistance to US Military Recruiters.

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Spring Semester, was called to order by Rishi Sharma at 5:55 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Sharma said he would apologize for the late start.

Approval of the Agenda

- 2 -

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Sharma called for any questions on the agenda and called for any a motion to approve. It was so was moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Sharma called for a motion to approve the minutes from the March meeting. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 10, 2005 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

REPORTS

Reporting as the GA President, Mr. Sharma said this was his last report as President of the GA and as a student at Berkeley. Along with Mr. Schectman, he was graduating.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY -- Presentation by Nad Permaul, Director, Department of Transportation

Mr. Permaul said he wanted to wish them a good evening and said he wouldn't take up too much time. This has been the longest day he's had that semester, and it was also his 56th birthday. (Applause) He was there representing the Department of Transportation and was present to talk to the GA about the forthcoming referendum for the Class Pass. Most of them know what the Class Pass is, and many grads use it, particularly those who live in married student housing or who live away from the campus. So it's of value to them.

The Class Pass originally came to the campus at the end of the last decade, a product of a two-year pilot program between the University and AC Transit, trying to encourage students to buy discounted passes to

see if there was a market for a universal pass. They ran a referendum at the time and the students, by 88% to 12%, voted to implement the Class Pass. It was in place for three years when they had another referendum, which was approved 85% to 15%, and the Class Pass was implemented for another four years. They are now on the verge of talking about continuing the Class Pass for seven years, and the campus will have another referendum that fall.

Mr. Permaul said the reason for a referendum was because the current Class Pass will come to an end in the spring of '06. Students will have access to buses during the summer, as they always do, and then the Class Pass will be over, if they don't have a referendum that coming November, which would allow the Registrar to implement it for the following fall. Mr. Permaul said they've been negotiating about this with

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Mr. Permaul, Director, UC Department of Transportation - 3 -

a group of students, and Mr. Sharma has been the representative of the GA. In addition, they also had representatives from the Committee on Student Fees, the ASUC, and the RHA. And this group has been working on the specifics on the proposal.

Mr. Permaul said they did a survey earlier that year and found out that students make up about 75% of the passengers of the Bear Transit buses that go around the campus. The consequence of that is that they need to raise the contribution of the Class Pass program that students were making for the support of those shuttles. Students currently take more than 3.5 million rides on AC Transit and the Bear Shuttles each year. That figure was far greater than anticipated when they initially put the program into place. So the students who have been negotiating with the Transportation Department have agreed to raise the student contribution to the Bear Shuttles approximately \$120,000 per year, to almost \$500,000 per year. But he has also said categorically that they expect the campus to continue to support alternate transportation and transit as well. In the most polite terms, Mr. Sharma suggested that they would insist that the campus support elements of the Bear transit program that goes around campus as its contribution to the management and the maintenance of the Long-Range Development Plan. The campus needs to mitigate its support of parking by also supporting alternate forms of transportation. That dialogue has yet to take place.

Mr. Permaul said he wanted to give the GA some sense of how the negotiations took place and what they produced. Currently, students pay approximately \$39 per semester for the Class Pass. When they go to the next referendum, the first level of fees they'd look at was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$57 per semester. The reason for the increase was because AC Transit has been extremely generous in terms of equity issues associated with the campus' per-ride use. AC Transit was willing to allow Cal students, because they don't have a way to track every ride, to use a logarithm to predict what the ridership would be. They under-predicted what that ridership would be, and as a consequence, high school students in east and west Oakland pay more for their per-trip rides than Berkeley. That was untenable with AC Transit. But AC Transit stuck with its negotiated agreement that they came out with from the referendum. But for the next round, AC Transit expects the campus to raise the contribution of per-trip costs assessed to Cal students to be more like students pay throughout the rest of the system. So there will be a \$6 increase for the first three years of the next round. So for years 1, 2, and 3, there would be a \$6 increase. That increase would go into place the first year and would remain. In year 4 there would be another \$5 increase, and it

would stay that way for years 4, 5, and 6. In year 7 there would be another \$5 increase, for one year, and then they have to go back to a referendum again.

So that's the reason for the increase. And of course, this cascades, because as they know, there's return to financial aid. When they have a mandatory student fee, 50% of that fee had to be returned, by requirement of the Regents and the campus, as a return to financial aid. That would be the bulk of the increases over the next seven years. If they recalculate the dollars, they go from \$39 to about \$57 in year 1; in year 4, it would go up to \$65; and in year 7, the last year, it would be \$75 per semester. People have to remember they would be seven years out by that time.

Mr. Stagi asked if he had comparative numbers in terms of trends or projectories of transit fares, and where they anticipate going in terms of percentages, so people could get a sense of comparison. Mr. Permaul said he couldn't give a projection over the seven years of what he predicts amounts will be. But as they know, BART is looking at substantial increases in its fees, and AC Transit will also go for fare increases. The reason the campus was willing to lock in the \$6-\$5-\$5 model was that they believe that would cover them. They're not sure of costs over the course of those seven years because AC Transit is a \$440 million operation and has been experiencing severe increases in costs and was cutting down on its

Special Order -- Presentation by Mr. Permaul, Director, UC Department of Transportation (cont'd) - 4 -

services. The good news is that AC Transit has not cut any of Cal's services, and in fact, AC Transit is about to increase its services to Cal. Mr. Permaul said the campus was about to have a direct line from Emeryville to campus, a line from Richmond to the campus, and they're even looking at possibly having one line go through married students housing at Albany, with a stop there, where they'd run a service. AC Transit was also going to increase weekend service. Also, Mr. Permaul said that when they started the Class Pass, the year they ran the pilot, they had about four students every weekend who took the bus to the City, because of the cost of the pilot. The year the Class Pass came, it jumped to 4,000 per month going to the City for Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights. And now they're at a much higher number. AC Transit will also start to run direct bus service for the last four stops in San Francisco and the TransBay Terminal, ending directly at Berkeley. So after 12 o'clock, people won't have to transfer. Berkeley is the number one BART destination on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights, to the City and back. So everybody coalesced around this location. AC Transit was committed to making sure the school gets better service as well, despite the fact that Berkeley is a very small part of the program.

Mr. Permaul said that for one last item, Translink may come next year, a universal card to ride all transit. It's a smart card people could use on AC Transit, BART, and Muni, Contra Costa County transit, and SamTrans. If the Translink card goes into effect, they believe Cal would be asked to pay the right away \$1 more. So instead of the transit fee being \$6-\$5-\$5, it would be \$7-\$6-\$6, and that would carry through the entire program.

Mr. Stagi asked if a chip could be placed on the their student IDs. Mr. Permaul said he was negotiating about that. The vendor who would do that said there was no way in hell. So they're in a fight with the vendor over that. The vendor wants to maintain proprietary control. The Registrar would probably say that Berkeley doesn't give that stuff away, and that all the applicable information was private. So rather than

running it through AC Transit, they wanted the technology to go on their ID cards, allowing students to use their ID cards to go on buses. Mr. Permaul said they're still in negotiation about that, and he'll probably lose hair over that in the next couple of years; but they'll try to get that.

Ms. Odusanya asked if this proposal would reduce BART fares. Mr. Permaul said he would talk about BART. The delegate asked about the advantages of a TransLink card. Mr. Permaul said students could put stored value on it. People could get to ride on AC Transit, but they could use the stored value for BART, and use just one card. It's more convenient. The Metropolitan Transit Commission was imposing it on all transit, to make transit more user friendly. So they wouldn't have a choice, and would request this of students. So if they want to participate, they have to consider this.

Mr. Permaul said that was the Class Pass in a nutshell. He would talk about BART. There are thousands of students, faculty, and staff who use BART. He's been negotiating with BART for six years, and BART was very tough, tougher than the Regents, and was a very conservative operation. That's because BART is multi-jurisdictional, and the politics between jurisdictions was so complicated that when staff at BART sees the word "change," their eyes glaze over. They immediately say "no." However, Mr. Permaul said they've come up with a consortium of Cal, Stanford, UC San Francisco, Hayward, Mills College, and the City College of S.F. State, who put together a concept where they would get deep-discount BART tickets to use, with the schools guaranteeing they'd sell more than they do now because they know there is demand. BART has said this was interesting, and that maybe by 2020 they could consider it. Mr. Permaul said he was saying he wanted to consider it now and would be retired by BART's timeline, and needed to have this done before he leaves. They're working with the new BART District representative who has committed to Transportation that this will be his number-one priority. So they'll try to put a

Special Order -- Presentation by Mr. Permaul, Director, UC Department of Transportation (cont'd) - 5 -

program in place sooner rather than later. They'll look for BART discounts of 30-40% on high-value BART tickets. For faculty and staff, that would be pre-tax, as they're employees of the University. But for students, it would be at least a 30-40% discount over what they currently pay.

Ms. Odusanya asked what "high-value" was. Mr. Permaul said tickets would be \$59-52, and people would get a 30-40% discount on that ticket.

Mr. Stagi asked if GSIs and GSRs pay for those tickets out of their paychecks and therefore would receive a pre-tax benefit as well. Mr. Schectman said that was a good question, because while GSIs do 60% of the teaching, but they're not given that amount of benefit for transit. Mr. Permaul said he didn't have control over that, and pre-tax payment seemed perfectly reasonable and fair. But it currently wasn't part of the structure the University had. What they need to do is take that argument back to the campus, on a separate basis, and he would be happy to go with the GA in support of that proposal. He wanted to let them know that this vote was coming up, and he would hope that grads will support the Class Pass since it's good public policy on the one hand, but it's also something they use. He hoped they will stand behind it when it comes to a vote next fall. Most of them will be there. He thought it was important that grads talk this up and show leadership on this with regard to the student community. He knew there are strong advocates at the GA and he was hoping that students could pass the referendum strongly, as they passed the last two referenda, and

that this will be in place for the fall of 2006.

Mr. Schectman said he would like to thank Mr. Permaul for coming to the meeting and speaking to them, and laying out the long-range plan for transportation. He thought grads make lots of use of AC Transit, particularly given the price of housing close to campus, and AC Transit was an important part of people's lives. His concern was that the proposal would be a fee increase next year of approximately 50%, and a 100% fee increase over four years; and this fee was not alone. The campus motor service just increased fees by 20%, with no service changes; the Recreational Sports Facility was planning a 35% fee increase, with no increase in services; and that didn't count the almost \$100 fee for health, which did include new services. The GA has brought this issue to the Provost and the Vice Chancellor because frankly, across the board, they're seeing differential fee increases of between 20-50% a year.

Mr. Permaul said this was not a discrepancy. Mr. Schectman said that those fees, however, were not even on the University's radar in considering how much students were paying. The campus doesn't pay attention to those fees, and they add up. He thought the rate of increase was, frankly, untenable.

Mr. Schechtman said the one thing he would suggest that Mr. Permaul and the Administration needed to do was to really publicize the service improvements that would result, because in his personal experience, Mr. Schectman said AC Transit's service was very spotty. It's a good value, but the service levels were pretty poor. He literally has had buses drive past people who were waiting. So if students were expected to swallow a 50% increase, there needed to be a pretty good publicity campaign as to what this increase would fund. He thought increased service needed to be a major part of this, because they're seeing a trend of double-digit fee increases with declining service.

Mr. Permaul said that's a trend in public services in general and wasn't limited to the University. They could find that situation across the State and in local communities and counties, and local government in general. That's because the public, in California, was not particularly interested in paying for its way. Mr. Permaul said he was an undergrad and a grad at Berkeley and has been there for 38 years. He found it interesting that they were just as conservative as their parents were. They love services but were not

Special Order -- Presentation by Mr. Permaul, Director, UC Department of Transportation (cont'd) - 6 -

always excited about paying for them, and the accumulation of that situation has been starving public services. He looked at the City of Berkeley slightly differently, since the City loves to spend, but also has the highest per capita tax rates of any city in California. But the City was also higher in providing services and liked to type itself as a service-oriented City. Mr. Permaul said he thought it was true that AC Transit could do a much better job in providing quality services for all its users, and that was also very true of BART and other big agencies. As a result, Mr. Permaul said they have a student advisory committee that can go back to BART and AC Transit and give input on what the agencies were doing. Unfortunately, they don't control the agencies themselves, and agencies give them these options, take it or leave it. The agencies don't necessarily need the campus, even though this was an important, visible public service that everybody in the Bay Area knows about. The Berkeley campus won awards Statewide and locally when the Class Pass came into play, which gave a lot of kudos to AC Transit, which really appreciated it. But these agencies also have lots of costs and were struggling to keep themselves above water.

Mr. Permaul said that all he could do was commit to the GA that the campus will continue to lobby for increases in service and that they'll be vigilant. They need to hear from students when a bus drives by people who were waiting. They need to know when they don't get the kind of service they expect. And then it's the obligation of the campus to represent students and do a good job in demanding improvements. He could commit that to the GA. He couldn't, unfortunately, do anything about differential fees on campus, and he could certainly empathize with students that they're seeing a staggering increase of incidental fees that, if added up, would be much greater than they appear on the surface.

Mr. Schectman said he would like to encourage Mr. Permaul, as they publicize the elections for the Class Pass, to really talk about new routes and any other changes in service improvements that might be coming up. He would also like to suggest that it would help to have some feedback line that could be posted around campus and by bus stops. He's called the AC Transit feedback line, and frankly, it gives worse service than the bus drivers. If there was an office at Berkeley that would be willing to heed feedback, positive or negative, on transit, perhaps that could be posted around campus bus stops. It would be a step in the right direction. Mr. Permaul said he was certainly open to that, and the Department of Transportation can collect information itself and give it to the agencies, since they do listen to the campus and would not blow them off.

Mr. Stagi said AC Transit hasn't responded to him, and he called about John Twitchell about the flex bus since he wanted to make a presentation on that. Mr. Stagi said he wanted to highlight a point that was raised in terms of the projection of fares and their trend, recognizing what they'd be paying. Although they're going to get a really good deal, even at the end of the projected increases, he thought it was important for people to recognize the amount of usage of the system. The other point to raise dealt with Bear Transit. He didn't mean to bring up things that have been discussed in other venues, but he thought it was important that people recognize that it's an important service. But there were some issues in terms of routes and in terms of stops, and he'd hope that in looking at raising their level of contribution to subsidize Bear Transit, that there will be some revisiting of the routes, the route structure, and some of the stops. Mr. Sharma said the Class Pass Committee was doing that. Mr. Stagi said part of the reason he was saying this is because it could be part of the package that's presented to the students, making the referendum a more attractive package.

A Delegate said that with the increase of funding to Bear Transit, she asked if there was a planned increase for service by the Night Shuttles. Mr. Permaul said that one thing the student committee

Special Order -- Presentation by Mr. Permaul, Director, UC Department of Transportation (cont'd) - 7 -

requested was an extension of the night safety service down Ashby and down to Shattuck. So there would be an additional late night safety service to those two sides of campus. They already have a door-to-door shuttle that goes very late, between 3:00 and 4:30 a.m. But the actual bus service would include an increment to extend the shuttles. The Delegate asked if service would be extended to the Northside. Mr. Permaul said it wouldn't be beyond door-to-door service since that was a dollar issue and depended upon how much they were willing to contribute.

A Delegate asked what would happen if this was a voluntary program. Mr. Permaul said it would go away. AC Transit has made it clear it was going to be either all or nothing. One reason they don't have a BART program of a similar type, or a program for faculty and staff, is because such a program would be voluntary. But they contribute to it on a monthly basis, with the University picking up a portion of that from parking fees to make the rest of it go. The reason for this situation is that they would have to put all 1,400 faculty and staff into the program. But they know that right now they only have 700 faculty and City users. By contrast, every semester over 27,000 students voluntarily pick up their Class Pass, and there were over 3.5 million rides last year, even if they were short rides. So they know that students use it much more intensively than faculty and staff would use it, and AC Transit has said the campus was either in or out. The Delegate said she didn't use hers at all because service was poor and she couldn't be 20 minutes late to class. Mr. Permaul said that's the kind of feedback they want. There's a grad student on the Class Pass Advisory Committee, but in some past years they haven't always had the grad member attend regularly.

Ms. Elnaggar asked how often the student Advisory Committee communicates with AC Transit in terms of raising issues, as she's had the same issues as Mr. Schectman with buses passing. A lot of students don't drive because the campus wasn't parking-friendly, and in addition, she was blind. So the bus was her primary means of transportation. It often happens that bus drivers don't stop, and like Mr. Schectman also said, she's called AC Transit's feedback line, which was truly worse than the bus drivers themselves.

Mr. Permaul asked if she's used the online response system. Ms. Miriam said she did, once, and access to it wasn't that great. But the question was how Berkeley students could participate in the feedback system. Mr. Permaul said AC Transit meets with the campus on a monthly basis. They also just held a forum on the Class Pass two or three weeks ago, and four people showed up. They rarely get people to come out for that, and this is a forum to which AC Transit brings its entire brass, coming to the campus to hear back from people on what they'd like. The Department of Transportation is committed to doing that every year, and will do it twice a year.

Ms. Elnaggar asked about publicity efforts that have been taken about these forums since she never heard about them. Mr. Permaul said they're not allowed to send out mass e-mails to all students because the Registrar was very conservative about the way the campus does that. Transportation tried to do that and the Registrar said no. Mr. Permaul said he would appreciate it if the GA would help him with this because the Registrar's Office said this was not important enough for a mass e-mail, even though 27,000 students pick up passes. The Registrar thought it would just be junk mail. So everything the Department did for publicity was passive. They put notices about the forum in buses and posted it around campus, but those were passive and ineffective ways to communicate to people. Transportation would like to communicate online to students when they have these forums, and have the forums get better turnout.

Mr. Stagi said that Mr. Permaul put his finger on something that was extremely difficult, the dissemination of information, including information on transportation alternatives and forums. It didn't seem that

Special Order -- Presentation by Mr. Permaul, Director, UC Department of Transportation (cont'd) - 8 -

passive dissemination of information quite worked in terms of getting this the most bang for their buck. If the transportation initiative takes place, they need to find better ways to disseminate information. Mr. Stagi

said he was willing to work with Mr. Permaul on that, but they need to think outside the box. Mr. Permaul said most students use online access and direct access for e-mail, and the University had to help the Department with this and get over its phobia about sending out e-mails. Mr. Stagi said part of it might be having a presence on Web pages to links into Transportation's Web site, so people get notified through various venues. It didn't take that much effort to put a link in places the Department could get feedback from. Mr. Permaul said the campus didn't think the Department was important enough to have direct access.

A Delegate said that perhaps they could ask to be a "contact of the day" maybe twice a year, when they have something important to announce. So that could be something to ask for. Mr. Permaul said he thought that was a good idea.

Mr. Sharma said that in response to what Ms. Elnaggar said, when the committee met with them, AC Transit got an earful from student reps, and they even talked about routes. As for buses passing people by, that also came up, at least on the College Ave. corridor. He was convinced that the problem was not as much with AC Transit as with ridership. He gets on the bus at Alcatraz, and by the time they get to Derby, the bus would be full, and as a result, buses will keep going because there's no room. Also, Claremont, Alcatraz, and Ashby were horrible intersections, particularly for a bus, for eight of the 14 hours people would be driving. So a lot of this was out of AC Transit's control. Mr. Permaul said that within the next two years, the Telegraph corridor will be added, since Measure B funds approved by voters years ago were coming to fruition. The first step will be the rapid transit bus, which will be a precursor to having a hard rail line down Telegraph. This will come sometime in the next two years. That will have buses at 8-minute frequencies, with longer gaps between stops and signal light prioritization that would move buses much quicker. One terminus would be at downtown Berkeley, with buses to then go back down Telegraph. This would be in conjunction with current service. Hopefully, this new service will be available in the next two years.

Mr. Stagi asked if transportation has looked at queue jumping during peak hours, clearing out parking lanes and leaving them strictly for buses, at intersections, to get them through those key intersections. Mr. Permaul said he approached the City of Berkeley about that because the City is a "transit-first City," and City staff threw up their hands because the City has such a bad relationship with the merchants over the issue of parking. So any discussion of removing street parking was difficult. Mr. Stagi asked about having peak period parking regulations at intersections. He wasn't talking about having this for the whole length of College Avenue, but at key intersections, taking effect for, say, 20, 30, or 40 feet from intersections, where buses would have the right of way. Mr. Permaul said people would be surprised how contentious that discussion is. Mr. Stagi said it does, however, need to be engaged. Mr. Permaul said they're in Berkeley and Oakland. He's proposed to Berkeley on more than one occasion whether it was interested in having remote parking, with ingress and egress, alternate street parking, and taking parking lanes down University Ave., where there would be parking, and running shuttles downtown. But the City has never even responded to that discussion. Officials know how difficult it is to engage in this. People were polarized about parking issues in Berkeley. The City's elected officials and the staff have one perspective, and the people who live there have a different perspective. So it's a complex matrix of constituencies. But the campus won't give up. He still thought that eventually they have to go forward and remove parking on one side of the street, and on the other side during peak commute hours. Otherwise their buses would be in parking lots on a regular basis. They know over 15 years the density of parking in the Bay Area, and particularly the East Bay, will go up 30%. So something had to be done.

Mr. Garcia said he heard that the campus considered the option of putting transponders, or signals, on the front of buses so they would never have to stop for a red light. Mr. Permaul said that will be used by AC Transit as part of its rapid transit buses on Telegraph. They already have signal prioritization on buses on San Pablo, where signals change when a bus approaches. Mr. Stagi said that system was not used every time on San Pablo.

Mr. Garcia said what would help on College would be to get rid of stop signs, which make intersections exponentially worse than they could be, and it would greatly help to have traffic lights that buses could blow through. Mr. Permaul said College Avenue had problems and it was difficult. There used to be a trolley line on Telegraph, and the terminus was the campus. The street is so narrow, and the residents were unwilling to give up parking space, and it's one of the most popular places to live. The campus agreed that something needed to be done. How they do it, and the complexities involved, have yet to be resolved. They have a pretty conflicted community. Many people want alternate transportation to work, but they also have a car culture, and those two worlds are in a clash with each other. It's very difficult to get people to sit down at the table with each other and work together cooperatively. It makes his life interesting.

Mr. Permaul asked if there was anything else he could do for the GA before leaving.

Ms. Elnaggar said one possible suggestion to get the word out about things would be to target certain departments that might be helpful. For example, City and Urban Planning and a lot of law students might be interested in greater access to transit issues. If the Department of Transportation couldn't go through the Registrar, perhaps they could circumvent that process and be creative, and allow students to get information from departments. She would also want the GA to support getting the word out. Mr. Permaul said he would bring that suggestion back.

Mr. Sharma said he would like to thank Mr. Permaul for attending. Mr. Permaul said he would like to thank them.

Executive Officer's Reports

Mr. Garcia moved to go back to Academic Affairs report. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Giving his report as the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schectman said he had go to San Francisco and needed to give his report at that time. His report was included in the agenda packet, as was the report from the Academic Affairs Committee. A lot has been going on, and he'd provide some highlights.

First, based on a Resolution that the GA passed in November, Mr. Schectman said they have now presented a draft policy that would govern discretionary fees on campus. There's a procedure to vote on this and give feedback, but right now, there's no procedure on campus to control or give feedback on these incidental fees. Another item concerned mandatory fees. So that has been submitted. He and Mr. Sharma also submitted a letter to the Chancellor.

Mr. Schectman said they'll meet with the Chancellor next week to discuss budget priorities for the coming year. Basically, they're asking the Chancellor to focus on Berkeley's core education and research

Executive Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 10 -

missions, as well as core student services. There's a very small pot of discretionary money the Chancellor has, and the number of requests for that money far exceeds the amount available. They were asking to have that money spent on education and research, as the top priorities, and not necessarily other things, like Intercollegiate Athletics. Mr. Schectman said that if Delegates have questions, they could contact either him or Mr. Sharma.

Mr. Schectman said that based on the discussion at the last GA meeting in March, he met with the Director of the Recreational Sports Facility and spoke about some service issues. The Director has invited the GA to speak with his staff. Mr. Schectman said the GA thought it would be better to do that either at the beginning of the summer or at the beginning of the next academic year, when there's a new set of staff. Mr. Schectman said the RSF Director also asked him to Co-Chair a committee that will develop a long-range plan for sports and fitness at Cal, looking at the next 20 years. They'll convene that committee next fall, and if anybody was interested in serving on that committee, he would ask them to please send him an e-mail.

Lastly, Josh Daniels, the GA's new Campus Committee Liaison, has been working furiously to start placing grads on campus committees for the coming year. Mr. Schectman said he's made announcements throughout the year for these committees, and the next round was already coming up. The GA voted a couple of months ago that service on campus committees would fulfill Delegates' requirement for committee service for the year. So if Delegates were thinking about returning to the GA, or if any of them would like to do service at the campus level, this was a way to do so.

Mr. Daniels said he would ask Delegates currently working for the University as a GSI or GSR, or have worked in those positions in the past, to please stand up, raise their right hands, and repeat the following: "I solemnly swear that I am not now, nor have I ever been, associated with the Communist Party or any other Communist-affiliated group or association." Mr. Daniels said the reason he did that was because in 1949, the Regents passed a rule requiring all staff at the University to take an anti-Communist oath, and the group that fought that was an Academic Senate committee, much like the Academic Freedom Committee, which currently had an opening. So for those who did not want to repeat that oath, and for those who didn't feel it reflected their views, or wanted to do something about it, they should sign up for this Committee. The list of committee openings was divided into topic areas, and if interested, he would find them a committee to serve on. There are three pages of openings, and they could put their name down for as many committees as they'd like.

Mr. Stagi asked if he knew of people who would be really appropriate for certain committees. Mr. Daniels said if people have an idea, they should write those names down or send him an e-mail. Delegates were there because they feel they should do something about the campus and about issues going on, other than coming to GA meetings. These committees were another way to do that. He called for any questions and said he would pass around the sign-up sheet.

A Delegate asked if there will be a Web site with information on the committees. Mr. Daniels said they

could work on that. The best way to do that was through an e-mail. Mr. Daniels asked if anybody had trouble that semester or past semesters because they registered late for classes or paid fees late. If that was the case, he would ask them to please send him an e-mail, because he's on the Registration Fee Committee and needed their feedback about how things could be improved.

Mr. Daal asked about the fee for dropping classes late. Mr. Daniels said the Registration Committee wants to make sure as many students as possible were registered for each class.

Executive Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Schectman said he would like to thank Mr. Daniels. He had one other point to make. He was going to meet with the Department head in L&S on Monday to discuss the foreign translation requirement that many grads have to pass. He thought anyone there who's in the humanities and perhaps the social sciences, although perhaps not the sciences and professional schools, had to go through this. From feedback his office has received, the current process was not transparent or consistent from department to department, or from year to year. So students were not really sure what they were going to have to pass when taking a translation exam. He asked if there were any students there who had to go through these exams who would like to accompany him to talk a little about the process. The meeting about this was scheduled for Monday morning at 9 a.m. People could also send him an e-mail about their experiences. But it would be great to have at least one Delegate or member of a department with him. If people knew someone in their department who would like to attend, they should let him know.

Mr. Daal asked what departments in L&S and in the hard sciences have this requirement. Mr. Schectman said he didn't know which science departments have it, but all departments in the humanities and, he believed, departments such as Social Science, Political Science, and Anthropology, have this requirement. Ms. Ahrendt said some departments require more than one language. Mr. Schectman said some of the smaller departments actually require three to four translation exams.

Committee Reports

-

-

Mr. Schectman said that with the permission of the Chair, he would like to jump to the report from the Academic Affairs Committee. The Committee met several times these past two months and as a result, they now have completed the 2nd Annual Faculty Mentors Award. To discuss that, he would like to yield the floor to Mr. Stagi.

Mr. Stagi said the Annual Faculty Mentors Award has been a great event that people have been working on. He wanted to thank the people who stepped up to the plate and helped, including Jenny McGuire, Jeff Wolf, Darius Ornston, Lola Odusanya, the Academic Senate, and Mr. Schectman, who were all judges. They also had two faculty judges who were really fabulous. It was a really difficult process, and he was sure people could attest to that because there were some very excellent mentors they identified. This also dovetails with the effort going on in the Grad Council. Mr. Stagi said two of the faculty members on the Grad Council served and helped create the guidelines for faculty mentoring that will be put in place with the faculty judges. So there was a nice synergy between the two efforts. So people could see how well faculty

mentoring was working and how important it is. He thought it was a very successful process. The ceremony was coming up, 5:30 on Wednesday. Ms. Miriam said several winners were unable to attend, and the date was changed to Monday, May 23, at 5:30, in the Seaborg Room of the Faculty Club. The winners are David Collier, in Political Science, Thomas Scanlon, in Math, and Severin Borenstein, from Haas, and a faculty member from Education. Those were the winners, and there was some unanimity among the judges. It seemed every judge had at least some of their top core picks included. So the process was not as difficult as it might have been. There was a lot of reading to be done and it was clear these faculty were most deserving winners.

Mr. Stagi said they need to create a poster for the awards event. He was not Photoshop savvy, so if people present were, they're wondering if somebody could volunteer to put together a poster over the next

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 12 -

five or six days, by the end of next week. If anybody had time and wanted to help, he wanted to thank them for that and would ask them come to see him later, or to e-mail Mr. Schectman. He wanted to thank them, and called for any questions.

A Delegate said there was one award given out, and asked how they determined how many there were. Mr. Stagi said they had four last year. The Delegate said he read about past recipients of the Award, and saw only one person. Mr. Stagi said last year was the first time they did this, and there were four recipients. This was the second year of the Award, and there were four recipients. Mr. Sharma said there's another mentorship award given by the Grad Division, which has other mentorship awards. Mr. Stagi said this was the only faculty award the GA gives, and last year and this year the number of recipients was the same, four.

Mr. Sharma asked how many nominations there were. Mr. Stagi said there were about three dozen.

Mr. Schectman said they would like to thank Delegates for spreading the word and for submitting nominations, and he wanted to thank them very much. This was the first public announcement of the winners and they'll send out e-mails to all the people who were nominated, and to people who nominated professors, as well as to GA Delegates. He wanted to thank people for their efforts. People working on this would very much encourage grads to come to the awards ceremony. They'll try to get the attendance of the Chancellor, Provost, the head of Human Resources, and members of the faculty Senate, because in reading the nominations, Mr. Schectman said it was clear to him that the work these professors do on behalf of grads really achieves goals that grads want in terms of improving diversity, improving the education of grads, and improving people's mental health and their personal lives. It was really amazing what a good faculty member could do for the lives and education of grads. So they really wanted to raise awareness of the Administration that this should be something that was formally recognized and sought in tenure and job hiring.

Mr. Stagi said that everybody who's been a judge in this process walked away from the process realizing that mentoring was so very important, and amazing, and asking how they could get a professor like that to

be a mentor. If people want to get insights into how wonderful it could be, he would encourage them to participate next year when they look for judges again. Mr. Schectman said he would like to thank everybody very much.

Executive Officers Reports (cont'd)

Giving the GA President's report, Mr. Sharma said he had a few updates. As they probably know, the April GA meeting was canceled as part of the AFSCME strike, which was very successful from the GA's end. They owe Ms. Hasadsri a debt of gratitude for organizing the GA and grads in general around the AFSCME strike. It was her insistent nagging about the need to cancel the meeting that resulted in that decision.

Regarding the proposed OSL registration fee for student groups, that fee has been waived for another year. So each student group won't be required to pay \$40 to register with OSL. As of last year, OSL was saying it was a one-time waiver, so that will continue to stay on their radar.

Executive Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 13 -

Regarding ASUC elections, Mr. Sharma said he wouldn't talk about that. People know what happened with the GA's referendum, and know the outcome. The grad student turnout, which was normally about 11%, fell to 7.2% that year. On the one hand that was very bad, because it showed that grads were turned off by the dictatorial, undemocratic principles by which grad issues were removed from the ballot. The silver lining is that under the Memorandum of Understanding with the ASUC, grads now only owe 7.2% of the cost of the elections that year, rather than 29%, the reflection of the total grad population.

In terms of payment for elections, the GA was preparing to transfer \$26,000 to the ASUC to settle past debts for ASUC elections costs. And when they know how much the cost will be that year for the elections, the GA will pay 7.2% of that total cost.

Mr. Sharma said the issue of elections costs dovetailed into the issue of autonomy. The GA's referendum for autonomy was knocked off the ballot, and he would have more to say about that in a minute.

Mr. Sharma said there were two items he would like the GA to consider for approval. The first was the search for a new manager, for Ms. Dugas' replacement, which was still going on. Ms. Dugas was the Manager of the GA for 12 years, so it's been a long process to fill her replacement and identify candidates to fill some very big shoes. A replacement will not be found before his term was over, so he was asking for two things.

First, Mr. Sharma said he would ask that the GA approve that the academic year 2004-2005 GA President shall continue as the student Chair of the search committee to hire the Graduate Assembly Manager, until completion or 31 July 2005, whichever was earlier. Mr. Sharma said this would maintain continuity. He's currently student Chair, and Jan Crowder, who is the Manager's boss, is the staff Chair of the Selection

Committee. If there were any questions about the manager search, he'd answer them at that time. The motion would allow him to continue as Chair of the Search Committee.

Mr. Sharma said the second issue he would like the GA to consider for approval was related to GA autonomy. They went to the Chancellor to talk about autonomy after individuals, whose names would not be mentioned, continued to insist that the GA had no right to autonomy because the Chancellor did not recognize the GA. However, the Chancellor appears ready to recognize the GA, provided the GA satisfies certain procedural devices the GA was in the process of negotiating.

Mr. Daal asked if this occurred the week after the elections. Mr. Sharma said it did, April 12.

Mr. Sharma said the language he would hope the GA considers is that the academic year 2005-2006 GA President, in consultation with the Executive Board, was authorized to vindicate the associational freedoms and autonomy of graduate and professional students at UC Berkeley by any reasonable method, included but not limited to: 1) litigation, 2) an exclusively graduate student vote, and 3) working with ASUC Executive Officers and the Senate.

Mr. Sharma said he did not become GA President to wage the autonomy fight, but there was nothing like snotty-nosed undergrads telling him what to do to make this into an issue. And he wouldn't talk about the Judicial Council telling him what due process was, after he filed his thesis on due process.

Mr. Sharma said this was the only action part of his report. He called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. Mr. Sharma said both of those authorizations would be included in the approval of

Executive Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 14 -

the report. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT, AUTHORIZING MR. SHARMA TO CONTINUE AS STUDENT CHAIR OF THE MANAGER SEARCH COMMITTEE, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE 2005-2006 GA PRESIDENT TO WORK ON AUTONOMY, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Ahrendt said she had a chat with the new Union President, and he'd be willing to support the GA on this issue and would love to have more contact.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if there was supposed to be a second election on the autonomy referendum. Mr. Sharma said there was, but the GA told the ASUC it would not run a second election, and it was then ruled that the GA couldn't have a second election. By that time, most grads stopped paying attention. He was sure there was an e-mail sitting in his e-mail box about that. The undergrads didn't know what they were doing. He called for any other questions about that.

Mr. Sharma said that for the more valedictory part of his report, it was strange to stand there a year after being elected. He never thought he would be GA President, let alone standing there after having served an entire term as President. He went swimming that day instead of studying for a final, and thought that in some ways, it was better to be like a pope, and die before a successor was selected, because they wouldn't

have comparisons that occur on nights like that evening, when people would be elected to fill a position he once held. He wasn't a pope and wasn't even Catholic, so he didn't get those privileges.

Mr. Sharma said he thought the first question that has plagued him was whether their term on the Executive Board, as a whole, has been a failure for the GA, and he thought what that really asks was whether the GA was worse off that day than it was a year ago, when they were all elected. He was happy to say the answer was no, and that he thought they were not worse off. They were fiscally solvent, responsible, and have performed everything they were asked to do within reason. It was sad to say they weren't perfect. They don't have a manager, and they're not autonomous. But he didn't think anybody could say they were a failure.

Mr. Sharma said the more important question was whether they were a success. And similarly, he thought this question was whether that day the GA was better off than it was a year ago. He had to think a lot about that, and whether they were actually better off. In some ways they weren't. They don't have a manager and they don't have autonomy, and they've been raked through the coals on some issues. But in other ways, they're quite a bit better off than they were a year ago. After the problems they had with the Prop. 54 campaign, the GA's reputation was pretty well shot. He thought that was not the case any longer and thought they've established a pretty good reputation for the GA as a responsible place with the Administration for discourse and discussion. They have a wonderful working relationship, he thought, with California Hall, and he thought that was evidenced by their pleas for autonomy; and more importantly, with the ASUC. Members of the GA can now appear before the ASUC Senate and not be booted off the floor. That wasn't always the case. So while these things may sound petty, in the day-to-day work of the GA, they were important; and he was happy to say that a year later, not because of him, but because of the entire leadership of the GA working together, in a very good manner, the GA was better off. So for whoever succeeds him, he thought the GA was a better place, in no small way, because of the very active Delegates they have on their committees. He wanted to thank them for being a wonderful GA and wanted to thank the people they represent, the people they try to serve. To any extent they haven't done so, he would apologize. It's been a fun year. (Applause)

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 15 -

Committee Reports (cont'd)

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Mr. Lanting said this was his last report as Funding Committee Chair. He wanted to draw their attention to pages 3 and 4 of the agenda packet, which include Rounds 7 and 8 of Grad Events allocations. The Executive Board approved Round 7 in lieu of the April Delegates meeting, which was canceled. The Funding Committee met on Monday and gave out the last round of allocations, Round 8, listed on page 4. They're happy to say they fully funded all groups qualified for funding for the round. Other than that, there were no more funding rounds for the year, obviously. So if Delegates were involved in a student group, they should keep their eye on the GA Web site over the summer. There's an August funding round that will basically fund groups through September, until the GA holds its first Delegates meeting, and people should check for the deadline. Also, another set of travel

funds was due at the beginning of the year, so people should make sure they keep a heads-up for that. Other than that, it's been a good year. They've been able to fund, on average, much higher than they were able to fund last year. He thought it's been a fairly good year for funding. He called for any questions.

Mr. Sharma asked if could go over the changes that will start in August. Mr. Lanting said the only major change for groups apply, starting in August, was that all the GA's grants have been amalgamated into one grant. In the past, they had grants for Diversity, Activism, Community Service, and Educational Improvement. All those came from the same pot of money, which caused significant administrative overhead as a result of having four different grant categories. So they changed the applications and the funding process so groups that put on projects that would have qualified under those four grants will now apply under a general grant category. This will make it easier for groups that are applying, instead of deciding where to pigeonhole where their events should be funded from, and it will make it easier for the Business Office since it won't have to take from four funding grants, with some of the same applications for the same grants. Most importantly, it makes the Funding Committee's job easier not having to process so many applications from the same groups for the same event. That will be the big change, and that change will be reflected in the application. Hopefully, it will be very transparent to student groups that apply. Starting in August there will be one application, whereas before, groups would have to choose from among various applications.

Mr. Lanting said the other change was with the ill-fated Social Development Grant. This grant never got off the ground. They're changing the standing rules of the Funding Committee so that groups that would have qualified for the Social Development Grant, such as the Grad Social Club, or any other group that puts on campus-wide events that are a cross-section of many department and has 300 or more students in attendance, could apply for more than the \$1,000 per-semester-limit they had for Grad Events. So this would be a waiver of the \$1,000-limit that was currently in place. They currently limit groups to no more than \$1,000, under Grad Events, to put on general events, meetings, speaker series, etc. Groups that the Funding Committee is convinced will meet the guidelines of the Social Development Grant will get that restriction waived, and the new cap will be \$2,000. Mr. Lanting said those were the two changes the Committee was putting in place for August.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions. He called for any motion to approve the report from the Funding Committee. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Executive Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 16 -

Officer's Reports (cont'd)

Giving the Academic Affairs Vice President's report, Ms. Medina said her written report was in the packet. If people have questions they could ask her now, or later.

Ms. Medina said she wanted to take a moment to give her thanks to Mr. Sharma, who was leaving. It's been

a pleasure to work with him, not only on the Executive Board, but at the Law School. He's worked really hard that year and has always been there, at the GA. He's involved in so many other things, but yet, makes the GA a priority, and has developed a good relationship with administrators and with the new Chancellor, while at the same time, being sure that grads and professional students were well represented. She just wanted to give Mr. Sharma her many thanks. There were also some other people there who had something to say, and they wanted to toast Mr. Sharma. (Applause)

Mr. Sharma said he would like to thank Ms. Medina. He said working with her has probably been one of the most enjoyable parts of the job.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Garcia said they'd quickly take care of current budget stuff. Regarding the Graduate Minority Students Project, this was something that should have gone before Delegates at the April meeting, but didn't happen. Since money has already started to be spent, so there was a request from the Funding Committee to vote yes, so he would ask them to please do so. They do a program to help minority students take the GRE, to help them go to grad school. The GA funds them \$1,750 for this. The Graduate Women's Project gave the Finance Committee a request, a long time ago, and the Finance Committee approved the entire request. But when he typed up the report, he looked at the request and in reading and their report, it was written strangely, with confusing "total" and "grand total." He just looked at the top line and put the wrong number in his report. So this report would change that incorrect number.

Mr. Sharma already reported about the money allocated for ASUC elections, and about the MOU. The Finance Committee increased the ASUC line item to cover past elections dues, and perhaps current elections dues, and \$2,500 was added to cover unexpected programmatic should cost for `Diversity Outreach.

As for the main part of his report, Mr. Garcia said he would like to explain about the budgeting process that year, because it differed a lot from how the budget was done before. Because their business manager left, the in-house projects of the Graduate Assembly, the Executive Office and the Business Office didn't have the necessary management to put together really good proposals and justifications. As a result, he thought maintaining the status quo was probably the best way to go in terms of the budget. However, he also took into account policy that the Executive Board sent him. So the way the budget was constructed, everything stayed the same as it was last year. The Executive Board also told him to fund at least \$150,000 into student group funding, which was a \$25,000 increase over what they were initially given last year. That's slightly less than what they ended up getting this year by \$10,000, basically. But this was a conservative budget. He was not a Republican, so there will be big surpluses next year, and next year's Finance Committee Chair and Finance Committee can put more money into student group funding. That's what he would do if he was in the position.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 17 -

Mr. Garcia said the next item from the Finance Committee was that the Graduate Community and Activities

Project no longer in existence. They have recently, that year, taken in the Grad Social Club as an autonomous project within the GA, and the GSC can do the same exact thing GCAP did. They funded the GSC \$12,000. With this proposal they don't have to pay a Coordinator's stipend and health insurance. So it was a much cheaper way for the GA to get the same thing done. The Finance Committee therefore decided to make this change and to save some money in order to balance the budget. Also, the Finance Committee decided to increase stipends for Project Coordinators to \$14 an hour. This would be a .75¢-an-hour raise. Even though it's a stipend, the GA had to pay Coordinators hourly. The Finance Committee approved the increase to remain competitive with GSIships and GSRships, which still pay more than the GA. But this was a way to make working at the GA seem a little more attractive, making sure the difference in pay wasn't so great. He called for any questions.

Lastly, Mr. Garcia said that since they're anticipating that the GA will be autonomous next year, the Finance Committee allocated no money to the undergrads for ASUC elections. That's the Finance Committee's way of saying they want this change to go forward. He called for any questions about the budget.

Mr. Sharma asked if anybody would mind if they could consolidate approval of the Committee's report and approval of the GA budget as a single item for discussion and action.

A Delegate said it used to be that elections were expensive, and asked if undergrads have brought that cost down. Mr. Sharma said the GA paid \$8,500 no matter how much the elections cost would have been. For the past several years, according to the ASUC, debts were piled up because under the old MOU, the GA was responsible for the proportion of grads and professional students on the campus as a whole, regardless of the percentage of the number of grads who voted. So Mr. Sharma said he and Mr. Leybovich, the ASUC President, settled all the past debts for \$26,000, plus what the GA already paid the ASUC. So from this year forward, the GA will only pay per grad student vote. So for every grad who votes, the GA would give the ASUC money. That's why there's an incredible drop in that cost to the GA. This year's total election cost was \$45,000, so instead of saying that, the GA would pay \$7,300 of that.

Ms. Ahrendt asked about the carryforward of \$25,000. Mr. Garcia said that this year they're projecting a much lower carryforward because student groups were spending at higher rates than in the past. So the GA was trying to take that into consideration. Mr. Lanting told him he also instituted a new deadline at the GA, whereby all things from this fiscal year had to be turned in by August 1, or else people would lose their money. That was also going to help the GA balance its budget, and that would include student group reimbursements. So if Delegates were in a student group, they could not pick up their reimbursement at the start of next semester and get money. If they have an event, they'll have to turn things in and pick up the reimbursement within 30 days, or they'd lose their money, the same situation that's been applied all year long. In the past, they gave people leeway during the summer. But that would cause the GA to be unable to do fiscal close, which would throw their budget out of whack until December. The GA lost its Business Manager at the end of November and their budget couldn't get settled until December. So he hoped following this procedure would allow whoever comes on to start working with the budget right away, so they would not have to worry about closing out last year.

Mr. Lanting said this policy has been in place but hasn't been enforced. Groups know they have 30 days from the time they spend money to get reimbursed, so this was not random or arbitrary.

Mr. Garcia said he's told people about this policy and has extended this information to all in-house projects of the GA. Everybody had to turn in their receipts. People haven't always spent their entire budgets,

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 18 -

and might continue spending out of last year's accounts, which they're not supposed to do. So they shouldn't start getting into their budgets for next year.

Mr. Sharma said people could file for their reimbursement before they leave for the summer and pick up their check when they come back. Mr. Garcia said that was not the case. They had to pick up their check within thirty days after they turn in a reimbursement. Fiscal close will be June 30. This is a change for all things within the GA, but has always been in place for student groups. So it's not a change, except for not having enforced the rules that have been on the books that people have previously been flexible about.

Mr. Daal asked if they could reconsider the rules so that if people had a check made out to them, they could pick it up after the break. He had a problem last year because he was at a conference. People who do field work over the summer also might not be able to pick up a check. Mr. Garcia said that any check could be mailed out to people if they provide an address. A petty cash voucher was the only thing he could see being a problem. If a receipt was under \$50, they could get reimbursed out of petty cash. If they have a check for anything over \$50, it could be mailed to them, and they could deposit it until August 1. For reimbursement turn-ins, they get 30 days to turn things in, and then they get 30 days to cash their reimbursement, 30 days from when it's ready. Mr. Garcia said that would be the maximum. If they wait until the last possible minute to turn in a receipt, which is July 1, they'd have 30 days to cash it in from the day they turn it, although that's only for GA projects. For student groups, the last receipts were due in three weeks, the middle of June, which means their reimbursement would be processed by the third week.

Mr. Sharma said there will be an e-mail that goes out about this, because he was confused, and he worked at the GA. Mr. Garcia said all they need to know is that if they have money coming to them, they have to cash their check or petty cash voucher by August 1.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions.

A motion to approve the report from the Finance Committee and to approve the GA budget was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE AND THE 2005-6 GA BUDGET PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Begin written report from the Finance Committee

Finance Committee Report
Delegates Meeting: Thursday, May 5, 2005

Presented by David E. Garcia, Finance Committee Chair

Current Budget:

1. The Graduate Minority Students' Project (GMSP) requested \$1,750.00 to help pay for ten students to take

the GRE and a GRE preparatory course. This request was approved and \$1,750 was moved into the GMSP PSA line item.

2. The Graduate Women's Project (GWP) requested a stipend increase of \$6,415.00 in October. The Finance Committee approved this request and communicated as much to the GWP in October. The

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 19 -

Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

transfer was accidentally omitted from the November Finance Committee Report, however, and is being presented this month for Delegate approval.

3. The GA and the ASUC reached an agreement over past election dues in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) earlier this year. Although the Finance Committee does not know the exact amount agreed upon in the MOU to settle past debts, we have been told that the value is slightly less than \$30,000.00. The ASUC line item was, therefore, increased to \$30,000.00 to safely cover our obligation under the new MOU.
4. An additional \$2,500.00 was allocated into the Diversity Outreach line item to cover unexpected costs.

Proposed Budget Highlights:

1. Student Group Funding is set at \$150,000.00 next year. This is a \$25,000.00 increase over the initial allocation last year. Like any item in the budget, this amount may be increased at anytime in the future if funds are available.
2. The Graduate Community and Activities Project (GCAP) was eliminated by the Executive Board. The Graduate Social Club of the GA was set up to fill the void left by GCAP and was funded to \$12,000.00.
3. All Project Coordinators Stipends were increased to \$14.00 per hour.
4. In anticipation of GA autonomy, no money was allocated to the ASUC for elections dues.

Proposed Budget:

See attached.

End written report from the Finance Committee

Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

Ms. Odusanya said the Grad Council met in April and they discussed moving to online evaluations, for people who were being evaluated. They discussed the pros and cons of doing that. They also discussed the theft of the laptop from the Grad Division that contained students' confidential information. Dean Reimer addressed the Grad Council about that issue and the steps they've taken to improve security. They also had a review of the Physics Department. There was an issue in that Department with the declining number of female professors, and the fact that it was in poor shape. So they talked about how to get money to fix the physical plant there.

Report from GA Representatives to the Store Operations Board

Report from the GA Representatives to the Store Operations Board

- 20 -

Reporting as the GA Representative on the Store Operations Board, Mr. Sharma said they will meet next Tuesday, their last meeting for the academic year. He didn't know if people have been in the dungeon of the ASUC mall, the far end, where the Art Studio is located. There was an arcade there, and ASUC President Leybovich was trying to clear that out to create a lounge space put in a vendor. The Art Studio itself wants to expand into that space. So there's a fight between the artists and Mr. Leybovich about what to do with that space. The arcade would go away. So there are three options: to keep the arcade, to let the Art Studio expand, or to turn it into something like the set of "Friends."

Mr. Cantor asked if there was any concern about the Student Union turning into a mall. Mr. Sharma said there was. Mr. Cantor asked if that development would continue. Mr. Sharma said it wouldn't. They have staved off an attempt to clear out the vendors in the Bear's Lair in favor of a corporate vendor.

Mr. Daal asked if the GA, when it becomes autonomous, can expect to inherit its share of ASUC property as well. Mr. Sharma said that technically, the ASUC owns nothing. Eshleman Hall and Anthony Hall are owned by the UC Regents. So hopefully, in negotiating for autonomy, the GA could strike that home, that none of this was really the ASUC's, and that it belongs to the Regents; and since the GA is one-third of the student body, it should get one-third of those facilities.

A Delegate said she was interested in the expansion of the Art Studio. If Mr. Leybovich wants to turn the arcade into a lounge, she asked if the Art Studio expansion was a possibility. Mr. Sharma said it's the ASUC Store Operations Board that will make that decision. It has six students on it, and five faculty/staff. He and Sunny Lu are the two grads on the Board, along with four undergrads. It's not clear if any option will have a majority. The decision was very much up in the air. If Delegates have a particular opinion, they should send him an e-mail and he could communicate that. Or, if they want to come to talk about the mall and what should happen there, the next SOB meeting will be next Tuesday at 4 p.m. in the Senate Chamber.

GA ELECTIONS

Mr. Sharma said he would go over the procedure they'd follow. For each election they would open up

nominations. When it looked like there were no more, they would close nominations and proceed. They would hear from candidates and then ask them questions, after which the candidates would be asked to leave the room for a discussion off the record and then proceed with a secret vote. The election methodology would depend on the nature of the election. He asked if there were any problems with the election procedure that was outlined.

Mr. Sharma called for any nominations for the Office of the President. Mr. Garcia nominated Ms. Odusanya. Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations, and hearing none, called for any objection to closing nominations. With no objection, nominations were closed.

Mr. Sharma asked the candidate to make a statement. Lola Odusanya introduced herself and sense she's a three-year student in Chemical Engineering. She's been with the GA for two years. In her first year she was just a Delegate, and last year she was on the Executive Board as a Grad Council rep with Mr. Stagi, Ms. Sanyal, and Mr. Eckerle. The Grad Council has talked about such issues as faculty mentoring and declining applications from black and Latino students. Dean Mason went to China to look about

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 21 -

increasing applications from China. In addition, other issues they discussed at the Grad Council included security issues like what she talked about in the Grad Council report she gave, and improving diversity on campus. That included faculty as well as student diversity. For the upcoming year, filling Mr. Sharma's shoes would be huge. The top item would be GA autonomy. That was very important. Also, she would do her best to have the election happen in November for the Class Pass. Another important item was diversity of the student body, and faculty diversity, which would also be at the top of her priority list. Ms. Odusanya said she was President of a student organization last year and realized it was a very painful process to turn in applications. So one goal would be to make the application process completely online. Mr. Lanting has been working with Ms. Dugas on that. Ms. Odusanya said she would try to make that an online system so people don't have to turn in paperwork each time for the reimbursement process.

A Delegate asked if she had time for the position. Ms. Odusanya said that was a big concern of hers, but with time management, she could do it. The delegate said she realized the position was not a 20-hour-a-week job. Ms. Odusanya said she talked to Mr. Sharma about that, and if she said she would do something, she would see it to its conclusion.

Mr. Sharma said he should probably give a description of the job of President. The President is to the GA what a prime minister is to any parliamentary democracy. The President chairs meetings of the Assembly and was also the chief executive, chairs the Executive Board, and is the public face of the GA to the Chancellor and to a whole list of people in California Hall. Beyond that, it's advocacy work on whatever issues were pertinent for the year. He called for any other questions for Ms. Odusanya.

Ms. Abbaszadeh said there's been a movement to get more Delegates to serve on committees, and she knew they have a big issue with involving grads in grad student government. She thought that would complement autonomy. If the grad student body doesn't care about them, their autonomy wouldn't go further. She asked Ms. Odusanya what her plans were to involve more grads in the GA and involve more Delegates in

committees. Ms. Odusanya said she had two ways to do that, the first being to go, in her first month, to student groups to talk about the GA. Most groups don't realize what the GA does or why they were there. So she planned to meet with different groups on campus, let them know about why the GA was there and how to get involved with it. Also, she needed Delegates' help to spread the word to their department and to people they know, telling them about the GA and how to get involved.

A Delegate asked if Ms. Odusanya, besides her service with the GA, had other experience that was relevant to student government. Ms. Odusanya said she didn't.

A Delegate said they've been trying to get GA autonomy for many years, and asked why she thought it would be accomplished during her term. Ms. Odusanya said Mr. Sharma has been talking with the Chancellor, and from the discussions, it seemed like the Chancellor supports the GA. They also plan to have an election in November, online. As the idea was proposed, it would be on BearFACTS. So this voting would be very convenient and people wouldn't have to leave their labs or offices. She was sure it would pass. A Delegate asked if she thought technology and the new Chancellor would help. Ms. Odusanya said she did. They have people behind them this time.

Ms. Abbaszadeh asked if the undergrads would get to vote on the proposed ballot as well. Ms. Odusanya said they wouldn't. Mr. Sharma said the vote would be exclusively for grads. Ms. Odusanya said most grads support the GA. A few of them in the ASUC don't.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 22 -

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions for Ms. Odusanya, and hearing none, asked Ms. Odusanya to step outside for a discussion on her candidacy. A discussion was held off the record.

Mr. Sharma asked people to close their eyes and said they would take a hand-vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MS. ODUSANYA AS 2005-6 PRESIDENT OF THE GA PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY HAND-VOTE.** Mr. Sharma said he would like to congratulate Ms. Odusanya. (Applause)

Mr. Sharma said all terms begin June 1.

Mr. Sharma said the next election was for Academic Affairs Vice President. He called for nominations. Mr. Stagi nominated Mr. Schectman. Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations. Hearing none, he said that with no objection, nominations were closed. Mr. Sharma noted that Mr. Schectman was the current Academic Affairs VP and was running again.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if Mr. Schectman got special permission to extend time to take exams. Mr. Sharma said Mr. Schectman was taking his qualifying exams in August, and he had no concerns with Mr. Schectman's quality of work. They should just put something out there, that there was a possibility, as with that past year, that Mr. Schectman might resign, after August, in the fall.

Mr. Sharma asked if anybody would feel silenced if, for uncontested elections, they'd vote with their eyes open. His concern was that people wouldn't want to voice dissent in public, since they normally do a written vote. He asked if anyone would be uncomfortable with an open vote.

A Delegate said that Mr. Schectman was the only person running, so if they didn't want to vote for him, they'd have to abstain or not vote. Mr. Sharma said they would keep doing votes with their eyes closed.

Mr. Cantor said the most important thing was for people to voice their opinions on the candidates, and why they thought people were or weren't good candidates. They want honest discussions. The important thing was for people to say what they thought about candidates even if elections weren't contested.

Mr. Sharma asked Mr. Schectman to leave the room for a discussion. A discussion was held off the record and a vote was held. Mr. Cantor said discussions off the record should be confidential and should not get back to people

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. SCHECTMAN AS THE GA 2005-6 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

Mr. Sharma said the next position up for consideration was the External Affairs Vice President. He called for any nominations. Ms. Miriam nominated Ms. Medina. Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations, and hearing none, said that with no objection, nominations would be closed.

Ms. Medina said she's been with the GA for a year and a half, starting as Legislative Liaison with External Affairs. The GA is part of the UC Student Association, which she mentions all the time in her reports, and Ms. Hall, External Affairs VP in the ASUC, was her counterpart at the undergrad level. External Affairs officers from UC grad and undergrad student bodies meet once a month at a different UC campus,

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 23 -

so the position required a lot of traveling, and sometimes people had to go to Sacramento or Washington. She's been doing that for a year and a half and was willing to do it for another year. Attending these meetings was the position's main responsibility. As she did last year, although Law School had lots of opportunities to be active, but knowing she was going to part of the GA, she made that choice, which is why she turned down positions in other organizations and made sure she didn't get too involved with other things, since she wanted to make the GA a priority, next to her classes. She was willing to do that again this coming year. She called for any questions.

Ms. Ahrendt said she wanted to thank Ms. Medina for the great work she's done over the past year. She thought the GA was in a good position to try to make better links with the Union, whose new President was interested in consolidating the power people have campus to make a change.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions and hearing none, asked Ms. Medina to step outside for a discussion of her candidacy. A discussion was held off the record. THE MOTION TO APPROVE MS.

MEDINA AS THE GA'S 2005-6 EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Sharma said the next position up for consideration was the Finance Committee Chair. He called for any nominations.

Mr. Garcia nominated Ms. Tom. Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations and hearing none, said that with no objection, nominations would be closed.

Mr. Sharma said the Finance Committee Chair was responsible for chairing Committee meetings. This Committee has general budgetary oversight for the GA. It works to prepare the GA's annual budget and deals with routine finance matters like budgets, transfers, and requests for additional money. It also manages the policy side of the fiscal house, whereas the ministerial work is done by the GA Manager and his or her staff.

Sarah Tom introduced herself and said she was a third-year student in Demography. She was pretty new to the GA, became a Delegate in November, and was a new member of the Finance Committee. So she didn't have a lot of experience with the GA or with GA finances, or in general. However, she was a whiz at Excel. From what Mr. Garcia told her, she thought she could handle this position. She's one of three GSIs for a class of 250, so from an administrative end, she could deal with things in large numbers. She felt very strongly about the work the GA does and in being able to allocate funds to smaller groups and projects. As grads, they're under intense amounts of stress and pressure, and she felt very strongly about the impact of community building and of having social outlets to help them throughout the process of being grads.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions. Ms. Levitan said part of the job the Finance Committee Chair was to serve on the Executive Board, which will probably take time. She asked if Ms. Tom had time to take on possibly 2-hour meetings bi-weekly, and possibly weekly. Ms. Tom said she did. She finished all her qualifying exams and was just writing at that point. Next year will be clear in terms of commitments, and this was something she felt strongly about taking on.

A Delegate asked if demographics was quantitative. Ms. Tom said it's the intersection of qualitative and quantitative, but her work was more quantitative.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 24 -

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions. He noted that everybody being elected that evening would also sit on the Executive Board which, in the past, has met as often as weekly. This year, however, they consistently met twice a month.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions. Seeing none, he asked Ms. Tom to leave the room for a discussion on her candidacy. A discussion was held off the record.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE SARAH TOM AS CHAIR OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Sharma said the next position to consider was the chair of the Funding Committee. Mr. Lanting nominated Jenn Zahrt as Funding Committee Chair. Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations. Hearing none, and with no objection, he said nominations were closed.

Mr. Sharma said the Funding Committee chair, as distinct from the Finance Committee chair, was responsible for dispensing student group spending.

Jenn Zahrt introduced herself and said she's been part of the GA for the entire year, and joined the Funding Committee upon her arrival. She's worked with the Committee and it's been fun. She'd like to continue her involvement and increase her responsibilities, considering Mr. Lanting will be leaving to write his dissertation or do further research. They've discussed changing grant applications and has worked on different formats with Sheila Moore. If elected, Ms. Zahrt said she would continue that work. Also, her number-one goal was to maximize student group funding and educate people and groups who have perhaps not filled out their applications as well as they could in order to maximize their potential. She wanted to educate people how that was possible in order to get the maximum allocation. She was detail-oriented and this was work she would like to do, and she had time to do it.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions and hearing none, asked Ms. Zahrt to step outside for a discussion of her candidacy. A discussion was held off the record. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE JENN ZAHRT AS CHAIR OF THE FUNDING COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Sharma said he would like to entertain a motion to table the election of the chair of the Organization and Rules Committee until September, considering the Executive Board might want to get rid of the position. This Committee was in charge of changing the By-laws and dealing with other parliamentary matters.

Ms. Levitan asked if this Committee could be relevant for autonomy, or as the GA changes its Constitution. Mr. Sharma said this was perhaps the only Committee they could never get a quorum for. In theory it would be useful, but as long as he's been there, it's never had a quorum, as it's boring. He believed they had three elections last year just for this position, and they had two this year. In two years they've had five different people in the position, and the Committee has never made quorum. He would be happy to conduct the election for the Rules chair, but if no one wanted to run, he would ask to table this election until September.

Mr. Stagi said they don't need to have a Committee.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 25 -

Mr. Garcia said being chair of the Rules Committee was a way to be on the Executive Board without having to do anything else.

Mr. Sharma said that when there's no Rules Committee, the Board does what the Rules Committee would

do; and since that's almost nothing, it doesn't add much work for the Board.

Mr. Stagi was nominated as chair of the Organization and Rules Committee. Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations, and hearing none, said that with no objection, nominations were closed.

Mr. Stagi said he was really gratified to be on the Executive Board and the Grad Council that year. He felt that it was a really good opportunity to help impact services and provide for grad students. He thought they did a lot. He was very gratified to work on the Faculty Mentors Award while on the Grad Council. He wanted to continue in that role, but had a class on Monday's, which would clash with Grad Council meetings. But he would like to be on the Executive Board to help lend some continuity. He was also very fired up because of the autonomy issue. So he thought this would be a good role for him to be in, and if they need to do away with the role of the Rules Committee later on, it wouldn't kill him. He'd enjoy the opportunity to continue to serve. He called for any questions.

Mr. Cantor asked if he thought rules were made to be broken or bent. Mr. Stagi said he believed rules were there for them to use, and if they do so wisely, they'd all benefit from them.

Ms. Hasadsri asked how they plan to not convene a Committee that hasn't met quorum for two years. Mr. Stagi said he hadn't given it a lot of thought. However, what would be important was to sit down with the Executive Board and make sure about the elements they'd want to be addressed, since those were the critical issues. Based upon those issues, he believed it would be possible to recruit people who also felt strongly about this, and draft up language about autonomy and other issues. There are issues that could get people fired up.

Mr. Fisher said one possibility for improving attendance would be to increase the food budget. Mr. Stagi said that would work for him.

Mr. Sharma asked what skills he had writing legal documents. Mr. Stagi said he's served on several boards that have drafted quite a bit of language. He was on the HIV Advisory Board for San Francisco Kaiser and helped draft its policy, and has been on several other boards in Sonoma County, including serving as Board Chairman, and has had to revise bills, e.g. So he did have experience drafting and revising language.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions, and hearing none, asked Mr. Stagi to step outside for a discussion. A discussion was held off the record.

Ms. Zahrt moved to stop the process of holding an election for the Rules chair. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Fisher said he didn't see a reason to not have a vote.

Ms. Jenn Sahar said the Rules Committee Chair was an important position and Delegates they didn't have enough information to determine if there might be more interest when it becomes clearer what they're

dealing with. When the autonomy process is further along, it could be more pertinent. She thought they needed more information before deciding.

Mr. Cantor said that if there were any problems, the position could be reconsidered.

A Delegate said that since a lot of this was up in the air, and the GA was making a somewhat hasty decision, after a fairly long meeting, it seemed to make sense to postpone the election. They don't lose anything over the summer not having a Rules Committee Chair.

Mr. Sharma said that hearing no further debate they'd come to a vote. The motion to postpone the election of Rules Committee chair failed by hand-vote 9-6-4. Mr. Sharma said they would continue with the election.

A discussion was held off the record. THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. STAGI AS CHAIR OF THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

Mr. Sharma said they would next consider nominations for GA representatives to the Graduate Council.

Ms. Romi Sanyal nominated herself.

Mr. Daal nominated Jeffrey Wolf.

Mr. Stagi said the Grad Council goes over reviews of programs and decides on various issues that were pertinent to grads. Ms. Odusanya previously gave a brief discourse on several issues of the Grad Council covers. It's a committee of the Academic Senate, and as such, its members include professors. Three Grad Council members from the GA are the only student representatives on the Grad Council. The rest of its members are professors and Vice Chancellors. It's a very interesting opportunity to see how various department on campus are run, maintained, and expanded or contracted. There were several issues of contraction.

Ms. Odusanya said there was also an Alternate position available.

Ms. Abbaszadeh asked to run for the Alternate position. Mr. Sharma said the lowest vote getter would become the alternate. In the past, the four Grad Council members themselves arranged who the alternate would be. The Alternate should be prepared to attend all of the meetings. Mr. Stagi said the Council meets the first Monday of the month from 2:00 to 5:00. The alternate should be prepared to be at the same level as the rest of the GA reps. And Executive Board members meet the Thursday before and after the Delegates meeting.

A Delegate asked about the function of the Grad Council. Mr. Sharma said it's the Academic Senate committee that has oversight over, and was in charge of, grad student education at Berkeley, from admissions to coursework to advancement to candidacy to, ultimately, degrees. There are three student members on the Grad Council and one Alternate, representatives of the GA. The Delegate asked about the rest of its scope. Mr. Stagi said other issues include developing new standards for various media such as with dissertations or theses and also dealt with issues around candidacy and departments.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 27 -

Mr. Sharma said that in the past, Grad Council issues have been pulled into Executive Board projects, like the Faculty Mentors Award, where they've been part of other projects. Mr. Stagi, e.g., was involved with autonomy. Ms. Odusanya said the Grad Council also dealt with such things as issues of quality and drop dates.

Mr. Sharma called for any other nominees. Ms. Abbaszadeh said she was not sure about the position because of class on Monday. Mr. Sharma said that in the past, people have skipped once a month to attend these meetings.

A Delegate said the problem was not the Grad Council, but Executive Board meetings. Mr. Sharma said they've had problem with quorums for the Executive Board when Grad Council reps didn't attend.

Ms. Abbaszadeh nominated herself for the Graduate Council.

Mr. Sharma said that hearing no objection, nominations would be closed. He said they'd have an election in September for the remaining Grad Council position. He would suggest they consider Ms. Elnaggar and Mr. Wolf for the actual, full positions, and Ms. Ms. Abbaszadeh for the Alternate, with the third full position to be considered in the fall.

Mr. Sharma called for statements from the candidates.

Miriam Elnaggar said she knew it was late, and so would make this short. It's been a pleasure being part of the GA after having become a Delegate, through the Law School. She thought about what she wanted to do next year and how she wanted to make the best use of her time. Through her involvement in Law School and being part of the GA, she's come to learn the importance of faculty diversity, and how it trickles down all the way to undergrad and grad admits, and producing faculty diversity in a very real way. That was an issue she was really committed to. In terms of time management, she's had the craziest schedule and was trying to finish her Master's thesis in human rights law, along with her first year in Law School. That summer will be last wrap on her thesis. So despite her schedule, she took on the GA as a Delegate and made it to every meeting except one, when she was sick, despite having a Thursday class for part of the second semester. She was committed and wanted to serve as a voice for grads. Legal training educates one on how to be a written and oral advocate, and that was an intrinsic part of who she was. That's the voice she would like to project to the Grad Council, although moderating that voice with diplomacy, care, and caution. Hopefully, she'll be as thoughtful and articulate as Ms. Medina has taught her. She called for any questions.

Jeff Wolf introduced himself and said he served on the Faculty Mentors Awards Committee, which was important because it showed how important faculty mentoring could be with respect to grad education and the quality of life at Berkeley. In a big way, that inspired him to be a Grad Council rep as it was a direct way to interact with faculty on Grad Division questions. He's been part of the GA for a whole year and he wanted to continue. He said time wouldn't be a problem.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

Sahar Abbaszadeh introduced herself and said this was her second year in the GA. She's a Delegate, from Architecture, and hasn't been able to come to GA meetings regularly that semester because of her Thursday class. But she really wanted to get involved next year. However, she wasn't sure how much she

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 28 -

could commit to Monday meetings, so she wanted to be an Alternate and also be on the Executive Board, and help out. Next year was her third year, and she'll finish her Master's next semester and move on to the Ph.D. program.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions. Hearing none, he asked the three nominees to step outside for a discussion off the record. A discussion was held off the record.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE GA'S GRAD COUNCIL 2005-6 REPRESENTATIVES PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION: MIRIAM ELNAGGAR, SAHAR ABBASZADEH, AND JEFFREY WOLF.

Mr. Sharma said they have elected a ten-member Executive Board.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Sharma said that last year the GA considered all of the Resolutions at their final meeting in one minute each. Some people expressed concern with that. He called for a motion to limit consideration of each Resolution to three minutes. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to consolidate consideration of Resolutions, at three minutes each, passed by voice-vote.

The following Resolution was authored by Gabriel Harley and Becca Jones (MSE):

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS WITH AN ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY PARAGRAPH

WHEREAS, the importance of supporting current work toward sustainability on campus being pursued by groups such as Chancellors Advisory Committee on Sustainability, Berkeley ECo, Re-Use, Students for a Greener Berkeley, Green Architecture and Research Design; and

WHEREAS, in line with the Chancellor's recent approval of the Green Fund Grant; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly's counterpart, the ASUC, already has an article written regarding the same subject (ARTICLE XIII); and

WHEREAS, the availability of equal quality recycled content paper at minimal increase in cost (<9% cost difference between 30% and virgin paper); and

WHEREAS, the graduate student group, Students for a Greener Berkeley, is attempting to make purchase of recycled content paper mandatory for UC Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly currently purchases a large quantity of paper products; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly should be a model for sustainability at UC Berkeley; and

Resolution to Amend the By-laws with an Environmental Sustainability Paragraph (cont'd)

- 29 -

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS WITH AN ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY PARAGRAPH (cont'd)

WHEREAS, natural resources are already overdrawn and supporting sustainable practices will help reduce the demand for resources (such as virgin wood), thereby decreasing our ecological footprint;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly be committed to buying minimum 30% post consumer recycled content paper for office supplies, and 100% post consumer recycled content paper for other supplies such as paper products for meals at meetings and events.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a request be made to the Procurement Manager for the Graduate Assembly to switch to recycled-content paper.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the following By-law is created to require all paper purchases to meet the above mentioned standards:

All Graduate Assembly administrative purchases shall adhere to the following condition, the purpose being to use more environmentally-preferable products: An environmentally preferable product shall be purchased instead of a non-environmentally preferable product if its price falls within ten percent of the price of the non-environmentally preferable product. In addition, student groups that receive funding from the Graduate Assembly will also be expected to adhere to the above condition.

The phrase "environmentally preferable product" shall indicate a product that has a lesser or reduced effect on human health and the environment when compared with competing products that serve the same purpose. This comparison may consider raw materials acquisition, production, manufacturing, packaging, distribution, reuse, operation, maintenance, or disposal of the product.

Mr. Harley said the Resolution would make Berkeley more environmentally friendly, which they weren't, in a lot of ways. A recent report said Berkeley ranked last in terms of paper that was purchased that had recycled content. UC averages 30% and UC Davis averages 75%. So there was room for improvement. Things were happening on campus to bring get up to speed in terms of sustainability. The Chancellor's Advocacy Committee, which has two grads, was working on that. The language of the Resolution amending the GA's By-laws was part of amendment to the ASUC's By-laws, which the Senate approved. The Resolution would have the GA adopt that language, which sets out an environmentally preferable product plan. If the cost of such a product is within 10% of a non-environmentally friendly product, the GA would make that purchase.

Mr. Sharma said purchasing was an important factor in terms of what the GA could do to meet its social or environmentally-friendly obligations.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS WITH AN ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY PARAGRAPH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution to Demand UC Berkeley Refuse Official Assistance to US Military Recruiters

- 30 -

The following Resolution was submitted by Brian Brown (Near Eastern Studies):

RESOLUTION TO DEMAND UC BERKELEY REFUSE OFFICIAL ASSISTANCE TO US MILITARY RECRUITERS

WHEREAS, the United States military actively discriminates against homosexuals with its "Don't ask, don't tell" policy; and

WHEREAS, discrimination and violence against women in the military is rampant; and

WHEREAS, vital funds for primary, secondary, graduate, and professional education are being diverted to fund this discriminatory military establishment and maintain foreign occupations; and

WHEREAS, military recruiters regularly make false promises to potential recruitees concerning, among other things, length of service, college and veterans' benefits, duty assignments, and likely hazards; and

WHEREAS, all members of the Graduate Assembly (GA), as signatories to student groups, have pledged to oppose any and all discrimination on the basis of sex and sexual orientation at the University of California, Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, all members of the GA, as graduate students in an institution of higher learning, have assumed a responsibility to uphold traditional academic standards of intellectual honesty and integrity;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls upon the Administration to refuse to offer any official assistance to US military recruiters on the University of California, Berkeley campus, including but not limited to flyering space and room facilities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA ask the Administration to limit US military recruitment activities to a single table (which the US military must provide) on Sproul Plaza.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA request the Administration to offer assistance to student groups active in countering US military recruitment activities in Berkeley high schools.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that these requests be included in a letter written by a member of the GA Executive Board and signed by the GA president and vice president, to be delivered to the Chancellor's office.

Mr. Brown said the US military discriminates against gays and has a well-known policy, "Don't ask, don't tell." As Delegates have seen at the meeting that evening, the GA spends half its time taking about its budget, and a quarter of the national budget goes for funding the military. They've all agreed to not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, and Berkeley, he believed, also has a non-discrimination policy. Having military recruiters come there was basically saying that wasn't much of a policy. The Resolution would have the GA ask the Administration to not extend any official facilities for military recruiters when they come there.

Resolution In Favor of Reconstituting the Student Registration Fee Committee

- 31 -

Mr. Sharma said there might be debate on this and he would therefore ask if they could table this and go on to the other two Resolutions up for consideration, and then come back to this. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

The following Resolution was submitted by the Executive Board:

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF RECONSTITUTING THE STUDENT REGISTRATION FEE COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, the intent and purpose of the campus Registration Fee is to fund core student services; and

WHEREAS, since the early 1990's, increasing amounts of the Registration Fee have been shifted from core student services to educational support and peripheral services; and

WHEREAS, every other campus of the University of California has a student-run Registration Fee Board which advises the campus in allocating Registration Fee revenue, and on every other campus the advice of the Registration Fee Board controls the allocation of Registration Fee revenue,

and on some campuses like Los Angeles, the Registration Fee Board has near complete authority to allocate Registration Fee revenue; and

WHEREAS, the Chancellor's Committee on Student Fees and Budget Review (CSF) was once called the Registration Fee Board on the Berkeley campus, and once had the advising and allocation authority that the Registration Fee Boards do on the other UC campuses; and

WHEREAS, CSF's name was changed to reflect the broad authority students did have in advising the campus on all student service fees and in allocating student service fee revenue; and

WHEREAS, Berkeley students, like their counterparts on every other UC campus do have, and should be able to exercise, the right to allocate Registration Fee revenue intended to serve their needs;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly endorse the reconstitution of CSF to include full budget allocation and advising authority over all student service fee revenue, including the Registration Fee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that graduate and professional students be proportionally represented on the reconstituted CSF.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the reconstituted CSF study current allocations of Registration Fee revenue to determine whether those allocations comport to the needs and priorities of Berkeley students in the context of the larger academic mission at UC Berkeley.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the President and Academic Affairs Vice President work with the Chancellor, the Provost, other campus administrators, and the leadership of CSF to achieve the goals of this Resolution.

Resolution In Favor of Reconstituting the Student Registration Fee Committee (cont'd)

- 32 -

Mr. Sharma said this issue was something he and Mr. Schectman have been working on. The Committee on Student Fees used to have authority to dictate where the money from Registration Fees went. It is now directed by the Administration.

Mr. Sharma called for any debate, and seeing none, said the question was automatically called. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF RECONSTITUTING THE STUDENT REGISTRATION FEE COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

The following Resolution was authored by Wanda Hasadsri, Campus Organizing Director, and was sponsored by the External Affairs Committee:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CENTERS

WHEREAS, the University of California's fundamental missions are teaching, research and public service;
and

WHEREAS, for sixty years, the University of California has provided opportunities for students and faculty to advance scholarship about California's working communities at the UC Berkeley and UCLA Institutes of Industrial Relations (IIRs); and

WHEREAS, for forty years, the Institutes of Industrial Relations have provided public service activities to working people through their Centers for Labor Research and Education; and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Labor Research and Education have provided innovative research opportunities for graduate students to produce critical scholarship in economic development and social policy that is relevant to the lives of working-class communities; and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Labor Research and Education have also provided unique internship opportunities for students to connect with labor organizations, to cultivate their knowledge of labor struggles, and to develop their leadership skills; and

WHEREAS, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger has singled out this \$3.8 million item for elimination from the 2005-2006 State budget in response to those who find the work of these scholars to be undesirable; and

WHEREAS, Governor Schwarzenegger's singling out of the UC Labor Centers for elimination is contrary to the ideals of academic freedom and constitutes inappropriate interference with the University curriculum; and

WHEREAS, the California Labor Federation AFL-CIO has stated that "this is an unfair and unwarranted political attack. Labor Studies receives only a small fraction of what the Business Schools receive, yet the Governor wants to stop any labor-related research and block working people from having access to resources within the University of California";

Resolution In Support of the University Of California Labor Centers (cont'd)

- 33 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CENTERS (cont'd)

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly call upon Governor Schwarzenegger to stop his political attacks on working people, cease his assaults on academic freedom, and remove his proposal to eliminate funding for the UC Labor Centers.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly call upon the members of the State Legislature

to restore funding for UC labor research and education in this year's State budget and all future budgets.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly calls upon the University of California to fully support labor research and education at its current level or higher on a permanent basis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President of the Graduate Assembly write letters to the President of the University of California, Governor Schwarzenegger, and Representatives of the California Legislature, stating the Graduate Assembly's unequivocal support for full funding for the UC Labor Centers.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that as the elected representatives of 9,060 graduate and professional students, we will devote our resources to support the restoration of funding to our University of California Labor Centers.

Ms. Hasadsri said they've been working on this issue in the External Affairs office. The Governor has proposed entirely eliminating the funding of the two Labor Centers, at UC Berkeley and at UCLA. These Centers provide innovative research opportunities for grads and faculty, and produce a lot of relevant scholarship. The Resolution basically has the GA, and its External Affairs office, devote time and resources to fight to restore this funding. It asks the GA President to send a letter in support of the restoration of the funding for the Labor Centers.

Ms. Ahrendt said the sixth Whereas Clause contains a claim that some might see as unsubstantiated, the Governor singling out the Centers for elimination in response to the work of some scholars. She would suggest striking "in response to those who find the work of these scholars to be undesirable," unless that was substantiated. Ms. Hasadsri said that was a summary of a large, consolidated block quote from the American Association of University Professors.

A motion was made to strike the proposed language, was made and seconded. Mr. Sharma said the amendment would strike everything after the word, "budget," in the sixth Whereas Clause, to read as follows:

"Whereas, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger has singled out this \$3.8 million item for elimination from the 2005-2006 State budget."

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Sharma called for any other discussion and hearing none, said the question was called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CENTERS.

Resolution In Support of the University of California Labor Centers (cont'd)

- 34 -

Mr. Sharma said they would return to the Resolution to Demand UC Berkeley Refuse Official Assistance to US Military Recruiters.

A Delegate said a related issue was before the Supreme Court. So requirements the University must follow were yet to be decided. Mr. Wright said there's a lower court decision and military recruiters not being allowed on campus was being considered, but the wording doesn't demand that military recruiters be kicked off, but that no official facilities be offered. A Delegate asked if that was independent of the scope of the Resolution and said it wasn't clear how policy would be reworded in light of how the Supreme Court decides. It's not clear what the University's requirement would be.

Ms. Levitan noted that the Resolution expires June 1.

A Delegate asked how these interacted. Ms. Ahrendt said that what she saw as problematic was the third Resolved Clause, because if the Administration offers assistance to groups active against recruiting, they would also have to offer support to those in favor of offering military recruitment. That's a situation that's gotten them into trouble before, so she would move to strike that Clause and keep the sentiment of the rest of the Resolution. The problem is that they have an equal opportunity society, and they have to fund everybody if they fund one. If they got rid of that, she would have no problems with the bill. The motion to strike the third Resolved Clause was seconded.

Ms. Tom said that given the fact that there's a Military Affairs Office on campus, she asked how they would be able to limit the military from their facilities. Mr. Wright said this concerns US military recruiters coming on campus. It comes down to saying that Berkeley had to get rid of military recruiters.

Mr. Sharma said that hearing no further debate, the question was automatically called. **THE MOTION TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION, STRIKING THE THIRD RESOLVED CLAUSE, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Sharma said that seeing no further debate, the question was automatically called.

Ms. Odusanya asked what the question was. Mr. Wright said the question dealt with the Military Affairs program and the Resolution didn't address that. The Resolution did not call for a complete ban on the military on campus, and would just say that Berkeley wouldn't offer any kind of official support for military recruiters who come on campus.

A Delegate asked if this was against the Solomon Amendment. Mr. Wright said it wasn't, because the bill would allow access.

Mr. Stagi said the Resolution would put them on record as not having the military on the campus or extending a welcome mat. It's important that the Chancellor, or any other administrator who was sympathetic to these points of view, receive recognition or token support from student organizations. This was a way to signal that the GA supports this issue.

Mr. Sharma said that since there was further discussion, with no objection they would go into a committee of the whole.

A Delegate asked if this policy has been implemented at other universities. Mr. Wright said it has been, and said Columbia has a similar policy. They'd have to keep an eye on what happens in court.

Resolution In Support of the University Of California Labor Centers (cont'd)

- 35 -

Mr. Daal asked why it mattered if other universities have done this, and said this concerned what grads at Berkeley were resolved to do.

A Delegate said the Resolution would also have the campus not invite recruiters, because they want federal aid money. She thought that was the distinction. It wasn't being negative or positive and instead, would support a policy that was widespread among grads, from people she's talked to.

Mr. Sharma said that seeing no further debate, they would come to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO DEMAND UC BERKELEY REFUSE OFFICIAL ASSISTANCE TO US MILITARY RECRUITERS.**

Mr. Sharma called for a motion to adjourn for the academic year. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

- 36 -

Present at the GA Meeting of May 5, 2005

Resolutions As Amended at the GA Meeting

- 37 -

Resolution In Support of the University of California Labor Centers (as amended on the floor)

Whereas, the University of California's fundamental missions are teaching, research and public service; and

Whereas, for sixty years, the University of California has provided opportunities for students and faculty to advance scholarship about California's working communities at the UC Berkeley and UCLA Institutes of Industrial Relations (IIRs); and

Whereas, for forty years, the Institutes of Industrial Relations have provided public service activities to

working people through their Centers for Labor Research and Education; and

Whereas, the Centers for Labor Research and Education have provided innovative research opportunities for graduate students to produce critical scholarship in economic development and social policy that is relevant to the lives of working-class communities; and

Whereas, the Centers for Labor Research and Education have also provided unique internship opportunities for students to connect with labor organizations, to cultivate their knowledge of labor struggles, and to develop their leadership skills; and

Whereas, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger has singled out this \$3.8 million item for elimination from the 2005-2006 State budget; and

Whereas, Governor Schwarzenegger's singling out of the UC Labor Centers for elimination is contrary to the ideals of academic freedom and constitutes inappropriate interference with the University curriculum; and

Whereas, the California Labor Federation AFL-CIO has stated that "this is an unfair and unwarranted political attack. Labor Studies receives only a small fraction of what the Business Schools receive, yet the Governor wants to stop any labor-related research and block working people from having access to resources within the University of California";

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly call upon Governor Schwarzenegger to stop his political attacks on working people, cease his assaults on academic freedom, and remove his proposal to eliminate funding for the UC Labor Centers.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly call upon the members of the State Legislature to restore funding for UC labor research and education in this year's State budget and all future budgets.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls upon the University of California to fully support labor research and education at its current level or higher on a permanent basis.

Be It Further Resolved, that the President of the Graduate Assembly write letters to the President of the University of California, Governor Schwarzenegger, and Representatives of the California Legislature, stating the Graduate Assembly's unequivocal support for full funding for the UC Labor Centers.

Resolutions As Amended at the GA Meeting (cont'd)

- 38 -

Resolution In Support of the University of California Labor Centers (as amended on the floor) (cont'd)

Be It Finally Resolved, that as the elected representatives of 9,060 graduate and professional students, we will devote our resources to support the restoration of funding to our University of California

Labor Centers.

Resolution to Demand UC Berkeley Refuse Official Assistance To Us Military Recruiters (as amended on the floor)

Whereas, the United States military actively discriminates against homosexuals with its "Don't ask, don't tell" policy; and

Whereas, discrimination and violence against women in the military is rampant; and

Whereas, vital funds for primary, secondary, graduate, and professional education are being diverted to fund this discriminatory military establishment and maintain foreign occupations; and

Whereas, military recruiters regularly make false promises to potential recruitees concerning, among other things, length of service, college and veterans' benefits, duty assignments, and likely hazards; and

Whereas, all members of the Graduate Assembly (GA), as signatories to student groups, have pledged to oppose any and all discrimination on the basis of sex and sexual orientation at the University of California, Berkeley; and

Whereas, all members of the GA, as graduate students in an institution of higher learning, have assumed a responsibility to uphold traditional academic standards of intellectual honesty and integrity;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls upon the Administration to refuse to offer any official assistance to US military recruiters on the University of California, Berkeley campus, including but not limited to flyering space and room facilities.

Be It Further Resolved, that the GA ask the Administration to limit US military recruitment activities to a single table (which the US military must provide) on Sproul Plaza.

Be It Finally Resolved, that these requests be included in a letter written by a member of the GA Executive Board and signed by the GA president and vice president, to be delivered to the Chancellor's office.