

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

April 13, 2006

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- The meeting inaugurated 440 Stephens as a graduate student lounge. The meeting was called to order at 5:34 p.m. Remarks were given by Dean Mason.

Announcements

ASUC elections will be held April 25-27, and will be online for the first time.

New Business

With no objection, the GA approved the GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding and the referendum to appear on the ballot for ASUC elections.

Held elections for the 2006-7 school year and elected Josh Daniels, President; Mariyam Cementwala, Academic Affairs VP; Ben Allen, External Affairs VP; Javier Jimenez, Funding Committee Chair; Nishanth Rajan, Finance Committee Chair; and as GA representatives on the Graduate Council, Rebekah Ahrendt (Alternate), Danna Freedman, Miguel Daal, and Meghan Anderson. Election of the Chair of the Organization and Rules Committee was tabled to the May meeting.

Passed with no objection the Resolution to Support a Sustainability Amendment to the "Guidelines for Submitting a Doctoral Dissertation Or a Master's Thesis".

Passed with no objection the Resolution In Support of International Graduate Students.

Reports

- Heard a presentation about the UC Student Association and the Student Compact it was proposing, dealing with student fees, loans, work, and access.

Approved the Funding Committee's recommendations for Round 7 of Grad Events funding.

Heard a report from the Academic Affairs VP. Discussion was held on the RSF Referendum.

Heard a report from the ASUC's representative to the GA.

Took a straw poll from the Environmental Sustainability Committee and a possible mandatory fee for environmental projects to be undertaken by the campus.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m. [End summary of the meeting.]



This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Lola Odusanya at 5:34 p.m. at 440 Stephens Hall.

Ms. Odusanya said it was a pleasure to see so many people there that afternoon as they celebrate the opening of the new 440 Stephens Hall grad student lounge. Present that afternoon was Dean Mary Ann Mason, Margarita Constantinides, on the 440 Stephens Committee, and others who have contributed to the success of this work. The idea for this project began last year at the Executive Board's fall retreat. They felt there was no space on campus for grad students as a whole to meet in a social environment and have a space to reserve for seminars, meetings, and such. And they found this excellent room. It was very unutilized and they felt they could work closely with the Grad Division to make it a much more conducive space for grad student life. And they began this project. Dean Mason was amenable to the idea and gave some funding to work on the space, for which they were very grateful. Ms. Odusanya said she was very pleased to showcase the results. A lot of people were extremely helpful in making this come to fruition.

A presentation was shown of the process of renovating the room, "Renovating 440 Stephens." (Applause)

Ms. Odusanya said they've met to discuss the policy that would be enforced to use this space. The room was open every day for studying, Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. They came to an agreement with the Grad Division to have the room available to grads and their divisions every day from noon to 2 p.m. and from 4:00 to 7 p.m., when it could be reserved through the GA for seminars, workshops, etc. It will be staffed from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. every day. People could send e-mails with questions or requests to [calendarstephens.berkeley.edu](mailto:calendarstephens.berkeley.edu), or call 642-3170 for any questions. Again, the GA was very thankful to all volunteers who contributed significantly to the success of the room.

Dean Mason gave a few remarks. She introduced Associate Deans Joe Duggan and Carlos Fernandez-Pello, and Sabrina.

Ms. Constantinides introduced Margie Green, who donated the paintings.

Ms. Constantinides introduced Carol Soc, from the Grad Division, who donated the frames. Ms. Soc made a few remarks.

Ms. Constantinides introduced Mark Pellegrino, and thanked him for the beautiful job he did in the renovation. Ms. Odusanya said they couldn't have done it without him.

Ms. Odusanya said that concluded the reception part of the meeting.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Stagi asked to amend the agenda, and said 5.A, the GA-ASUC MOU, should actually be under New Business. The motion to amend the agenda was seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate said he would like to strike 4.C and said he would present that Resolution next month. With no objection, the Resolution was struck from the agenda.

Announcements

- 3 -

Mr. Fairbrother moved to hear 4.B. as the first item under New Business. The motion to amend the agenda was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other changes to the agenda. A motion to approve was made and seconded. The motion to approve the agenda, as amended, passed with no objection.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes from the March meeting was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 2, 2006 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Jessica Wren introduced herself and said she was confirmed last month as the new ASUC Elections Council Chair, and she was happy to meet them. ASUC elections will be the week after next, April 25-27. Despite all the stress and the running around, she didn't have any concerns about them going off without a hitch. She wanted to introduce herself to the GA and was there to hear their concerns about the elections and answer any questions they might have. Executive Officers and Senators were running for office, and there were also two referenda on the ballot, the RSF Fee Referendum and the GA-ASUC MOU, which were on the last two pages of the ballot.

Ms. Wren said they're going to expand to online elections that year, and any student registered at UC could vote from any computer worldwide. Online voting will be available from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. They'll also have polling stations around campus. People could vote from any computer on campus other than by AirBears, the res hall wireless network, or at MLK, Anthony Hall, or Eshleman Hall. Having online elections will increase the voting turnout by increasing accessibility. As a result, they hope more people will be willing to vote.

Mr. Stagi asked if there was any idea about the cost for having online elections, and how the cost will differ from previous elections. Ms. Wren said the budget that year was quite a bit higher than it was in past years. They budgeted \$50,000 for previous elections, but because they've implemented online voting, they had to write a new program, which cost around \$30,000. Their estimated cost for this election was \$75-80,000. That was mostly due to start-up costs. Once the program was in place, it would just be a couple of thousand dollars to reinstate the program from previous years.

Mr. Schechtman said skyrocketing election costs have historically been a major point of contention between the GA and the ASUC. Promises were made in previous years that election costs would be reined in. Assuming online elections were successful, he asked if it was likely they wouldn't have to rent computers, resulting in a decrease in costs, from \$80,000 to something closer to perhaps \$1 a student. Ms. Wren said that was actually a great benefit of moving to the online system. She's been roped into working on the elections for next year as well, and rather than having people vote on campus as well as online elections, they could move strictly to online elections. That would cost a couple of thousand

Announcements (cont'd)

- 4 -

dollars for the program. And it would no longer be necessary to pay around \$15,000 to rent computers, use walkie-talkies, or pay poll workers, so the price should decrease.

Ms. Wren said the Elections Council Web site was up, [election.asuc.org](http://election.asuc.org). Her contact information was there, and if people had any questions, she would ask them to please feel free to e-mail her. She wanted to thank them very much. (Applause)

Continuing Announcements, Ms. Elnaggar said that if people had anything to submit to "The Berkeley Graduate," the deadline has been extended to Friday morning at 9 a.m.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Odusanya said they would consider the GA-ASUC MOU at that time.

-----  
 Begin Graduate Assembly MOU Referendum

#### GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MOU REFERENDUM

If approved, this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly will modify the relationship between both bodies and will constitute the revision of Article IV, Section II of the ASUC Constitution for the specific allowance of three nominations by the GA President to the nine-member Judicial Council. Do you approve of both the MOU between the ASUC and GA and the revision to Article IV, Section II of the ASUC Constitution?

- Yes  
 No  
 Abstain

#### *Constitutional amendments and MOU*

#### *ARTICLE IV - JUDICIAL COUNCIL (Revisions are in italics)*

#### SECTION 2: MEMBERSHIP

- A. The Judicial Council shall consist of nine (9) students, *six of which shall be* nominated by the President. The nominations of the President will then be interviewed by the Constitutional Review Committee of the Senate. The President may nominate any number of individuals to the Judicial Council positions, yet he/she may not nominate fewer than three individuals per available position on the Judicial Council. Following the interviews of the prospective Judicial Council members, Constitutional Review Committee will vote to select the nominees to be sent to the Senate for approval.
- B. Members shall have a term of two (2) years, reckoned from the date on which they are confirmed.

GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

- 5 -

-----  
 Referendum language (cont'd)

- C. In the event that the President fails to submit at least three nominations to the Senate within three (3) regular Senate meetings following the occurrence of a vacancy, nominations may be made by any Executive Officer or Senator. If a Presidential nomination is rejected, the President shall have one (1) regular meeting to introduce another nomination before right of nomination devolves to other Executive Officers and Senators. If the Senate does not consider a nomination to fill a vacancy within two (2) regular meetings after submission of the nomination, then the Senate must consider the nomination before any further business.
- D. *Three of the students in the Judicial Council shall be nominated by the GA President. Upon receipt of a vacancy in one of these three seats, the GA President will have two weeks to submit no fewer than three nominations for each vacancy. The Graduate Assembly will then forward three of the nominees to be confirmed by the Senate. If the GA President does not make nominations within two weeks, right of nomination goes back to the ASUC President, with GA delegate or Executive Board approval.*

End referendum language, as amended

-----  
 Begin GA-ASUC MOU

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into between the Associated Students of the University of California ("ASUC") and the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley ("GA") to modify the relationship of the Graduate Assembly to the ASUC. This Memorandum supercedes and renders null all previous Memoranda of Understanding between the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly. This document becomes effective upon ratification by the GA Delegates, the ASUC Senate, and approval of the student body.

NOW THEREFORE, in recognition of their mutual promises and the consideration made herein, the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly agree as follows:

I. Recognition and Status

- A. Pursuant to the ASUC Constitution, the Graduate Assembly recognizes the authority of the ASUC to speak for common interests of the student body as a whole at the University of California, Berkeley, both inside and outside the campus.
- B. Pursuant to the ASUC Constitution, the ASUC recognizes the authority of the Graduate Assembly to speak for the specific interests of graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley, both inside and outside the campus.

GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

- 6 -

-----  
GA-ASUC MOU (cont'd)

- C. When the Graduate Assembly takes opposing positions on an issue, both organizations will respect the independent legitimacy of each position, and the ASUC position shall apply only to undergraduates. This applies to external bills only.
- D. When the Graduate Assembly seeks to speak for all students at the University of California, Berkeley, the President of the Graduate Assembly shall offer its position to the ASUC Senate as a main motion.
- E. The Graduate Assembly shall transmit or make available to the Executive Officers of the ASUC the agenda and minutes of all Graduate Assembly meetings as they become available by means of electronic mail.
- F. The ASUC shall transmit or make available to the Executive Officers of the Graduate Assembly the agenda and minutes of all Senate meetings, Executive Orders, presidential vetoes, and Judicial Council decisions as they become available, by electronic mail.

II. Finance

- A. The ASUC shall automatically appropriate to the Graduate Assembly each year the total amount of mandatory student fees paid by graduate and professional students to the ASUC minus the total amount of Graduate Student Return to Aid.
- B. The Senate shall not affect a modification in Graduate Assembly expenditures, divert revenue, or withhold funds except in times of Fiscal Emergency (a Section 5, Article VI of the ASUC Constitution), and shall respect total Graduate Assembly authority over its finances.
- C. In times of fiscal emergency and if the Association wishes to make changes in the financial arrangement involving the Graduate Assembly, a committee shall immediately convene composed of the following: the ASUC President, the GA President, the ASUC Executive Vice President, the ASUC Finance Officer (non-voting), the ASUC Finance Committee Chair, the GA Finance Chair, the GA Organization and Rules Chair, the ASUC Auxiliary Director (non-voting), and a

non-voting member to be appointed by the GA at its discretion.

### III. Representation

- A. The Graduate Assembly shall make and confirm all appointments designated for graduate and professional students to academic, campus, or Systemwide committees. The Senate shall not subject such appointments to confirmation or denial
- B. The Graduate Assembly shall nominate the graduate student members of the ASUC Store Operations Board. The Senate shall deem the nominees confirmed on receipt of the nomination.
- C. The Graduate Assembly shall be entitled to representation and the right to address the general body of the Academic Senate.

GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

- 7 -

-----  
GA-ASUC MOU (cont'd)

### IV. Resources

The ASUC recognizes the Graduate Assembly's sole authority to occupy and use Anthony Hall. In extreme cases where Anthony Hall cannot be occupied, the ASUC will recognize the right of the Graduate Assembly to occupy and use some substitute space.

### V. ASUC Elections

- A. The ASUC relinquishes all claims to Graduate Assembly payment for elections costs before the 2002-2003 academic year.
- B. For the 2002-2003 year, the Graduate Assembly is responsible for paying \$18,997, the remaining balance of election costs for the 2003 Spring ASUC election.
- C. For the 2003-2004 year, the Graduate Assembly is responsible for paying \$6,789, the remaining balance of the election costs for the 2004 Spring ASUC election.
- D. For the 2004-2005 year, the Graduate Assembly is responsible for paying \$8,944 or 18.75% of the cost for the 2005 Spring ASUC Election.
- E. A debt settlement timetable will be determined by the GA President and the ASUC President, and approved by the respective bodies, according to their Constitutions and By-laws, by the end of the Fall 2006 Semester.
- F. For future academic years, the Graduate Assembly will pay either 12% of total election costs or a percentage of election costs equal to the percentage of voters in the Spring ASUC election who are registered graduate students, whichever of the two is greater.
- G. Each year, the Graduate Assembly shall budget a sum sufficient to cover the base elections costs of the Graduate Assembly for that year based on the base election cost for the prior year. The Graduate Assembly shall be responsible for paying its share of the elections costs for an overall ASUC Election budget of up to \$75,000.
- H. If additional funding is required for ASUC Elections beyond \$75,000, then a committee composed of the ASUC President, the GA President, the Chair of the GA Finance Committee, and the Chair of the ASUC Finance Committee shall convene. Any agreement coming out of these meetings shall pend approval of the ASUC Senate.

- I. The ASUC Selection Committee for the Elections Council Chair shall be comprised of six members, one-third of which shall be graduate students. Preference will be given to graduate students serving in the ASUC Senate followed by GA Delegates. The remaining members of this committee shall be from the ASUC Senate. In addition, there shall be one position on the Council with the designation "Graduate Outreach Coordinator." The Graduate Outreach Coordinator must be a graduate student.

GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

- 8 -

-----  
GA-ASUC MOU (cont'd)

#### VI. Conflict Resolution

- A. Three of the students in the Judicial Council shall be nominated by the GA President. Upon receipt of a vacancy in one of these three seats, the GA President will have two weeks to submit no fewer than three nominations for each vacancy. The Graduate Assembly will then forward three of the nominees to be confirmed by the Senate. If the GA President does not make nominations within two weeks, the right of nomination goes back to the ASUC President, with GA delegate or Executive Board approval.
- B. All powers not specifically mentioned here are retained by the ASUC Senate.

By ASUC President Manuel Buenrostro and GA President Lola Odusanya

End GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding  
-----

Mr. Stagi said everybody should have received a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding. He would highlight things that have been changed somewhat or substantively. Section A, "Membership," wasn't changed extensively. They previously had two Delegate meetings in which to forward their three Judicial Council nominees. But two months was a lot of time, and the ASUC needed something quicker. So the GA was bound by a two-week limit to forward those nominees. That was among he acceded to in the negotiations. The process would be that the GA would have people they already approved, who would be ready to go.

Mr. Stagi said that one of the hard-fought battles was to cap GA responsibility for election costs at 12%. He actually stuck to his guns, and the Senate acceded to that. He really had to compliment the GA's allies in the Senate, who were really helpful. He didn't know if he was helping them as much as qualifying them, but Max Besbris was one of them, as was Sen. Felarca. Mr. Besbris said "ally" was a good word, and they could call him that.

Mr. Stagi said they had a good time at the Senate meeting. Ms. Odusanya showed up at 9:00 and Mr. Stagi said he left at 2:30 a.m. The vote to approve the MOU for the ballot was 16-1. In the interests of a point of information, Mr. Stagi said he had to say that it was Sen. Narodick who was the lone nay vote. Mr. Narodick has been someone who quite frankly has not been a friend of the GA in a number of instances. When the GA had its previous run-in last year, when a GA ballot measure was suspended just prior to the election, and Mr. Narodick was definitely part of the movement. He spoke in front of the Senate and was very unfriendly to the GA at that point in time. Mr. Narodick quite honestly tried to portray himself as friendly, and started out that way, but by the end of the meeting, he was basically just sulking, and after trying to behave as a gentleman, in the end, failed miserably. Mr. Narodick was the Chair of the Finance Committee, which conducted several hearings about the MOU, and Mr. Narodick tried to torpedo it in the Finance Committee. That's why they actually had to go in front of the Senate in the first place, because the Senate had to reconsider it over the Finance Committee's objections.

Mr. Stagi said there was an accord among the Senators in terms of how they would support the MOU. Other than Sen. Narodick, several Senators came up to him afterwards to and wish the GA well. He

GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

- 9 -

couldn't name them all, but one was Vishal Gupta, who he believed was running against Sen. Narodick for Executive Vice President. The GA was not allowed to give any official recommendation on ASUC candidates, but Delegates might weigh that in their minds when they go to the polls and remember who their friends were, and weren't.

Mr. Stagi said the GA also went before the Judicial Council, because there was an issue with a section of the MOU that has subsequently been removed. They could see in the MOU that was distributed a section that somehow didn't get renumbered. It has section VI.A and VI.C. The missing section was VI.B. Last week he went before the J-Council, which had a concern because VI.B directed an alternation to be made to the Council. This was an area the GA might want to think about, although he had every confidence that in balance, this measure should pass. But the MOU directed the J-Council to change its Judicial Rules of Procedure and directed it to establish rules and procedures that would create a situation that was fair for graduate students. More or less, Mr. Stagi said they were hoping for something of a rump Judicial Council that would have equal representation of grad and undergrad students. It was kind of written hastily in the hopes of avoiding the constitutional barrier. Unfortunately, it was excised, and that's why it wasn't included in the document that Delegates had. Mr. Stagi said he submitted an appeal to the J-Council which was refused.

On balance, Mr. Stagi said he thought this was a good document in that it addresses some areas of real concern. The MOU limits the GA's exposure to elections costs, from the past and in the future. They've also had input from the Judicial Council and have earmarked three justices on the Judicial Council for grad students. They also had input from the elections Council.

Ms. Odusanya said they need to vote to approve the amended MOU as it stood, to be placed on the ASUC ballot in a few weeks. Mr. Stagi said it needed the GA's approval for it to be officially sanctioned. Ms. Odusanya called for any questions.

Ms. Zahrt asked if the only parts that were changed were section II.B. and VI. B. Mr. Stagi said there was one other small section that was changed, the elections costs. Previously, the ASUC had to budget up to \$60,000 for elections, and that was switched to \$75,000, although the GA was still only responsible for 12% of the elections costs. That was just a contingency budget that the GA would base what it would contribute. In other words, the base the GA would be prepared to pay was 12% of \$75,000.

Ms. Zahrt asked if Mr. Stagi could also refresh them about the big picture and how this fit into graduate advocacy. Mr. Stagi said one big issue was the ability for the GA to speak for graduate students, and for the ability of Mr. Schechtman, the Academic Affairs VP, to speak before the Academic Senate. The ASUC has agreed that this was an important issue and that this was something the GA should be able to do. He believed speaking before the Academic Senate was still up to the Academic Senate, but the ASUC has agreed to support the GA in this position.

Mr. Schechtman said historically, and even more materially, the problem was that the GA was subject to rulings by the Judicial Council, but had no representation on the J-Council. Also, the GA was previously subject to one-third of election costs, over which the GA had no control and very little participation. Those had been major sticking points. While the MOU does not formally define the GA's ability to speak in front of the faculty Senate, it does address the other two points. And they hope to have the third point addressed that year as well.

GA-ASUC Memorandum of Understanding (cont'd)

- 10 -

Ms. Franklin asked what a "fiscal emergency" would be, as stated in Section V, Article VI, according to the ASUC Constitution. Mr. Stagi said it was very vague. A fiscal emergency was in place if the ASUC declared it. In that situation, a body would be created composed of equal numbers of grad and undergrad students, and they would be in charge of administering that issue. If the GA felt it was unnecessary, then the GA could refuse to pay. So there was a way out of it. But if it was reasonable, and there was an emergency, but it wasn't clearly delineated, it was unknown what it could be. It's sort of a "what-if" clause, although the GA had a way to not be subject to it. Ms. Franklin asked if the ASUC has ever declared a

fiscal emergency. Mr. Stagi he doesn't believe they have. Mr. Besbris said in 1998, he believed, the ASUC was in debt and they sold half their autonomy to the University, and the ASUC Auxiliary was created.

Mr. Schechtman said another benefit of this point was that in the past, when there were disagreements over finances, those disagreements tended to take place through comments and e-mails. The MOU would set up an appeals board with equals sitting face-to-face, to discuss the situation. Also, the MOU would clarify that the ASUC Auxiliary would act as the fiscal agent to both the GA and the ASUC. As such, the Auxiliary had a fiduciary, legal responsibility to protect the GA's funds, just as it protects the ASUC's funds. So legally, money could not simply be transferred without GA approval.

A motion to approve the MOU was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE GA-ASUC MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. (Applause)

## GA ELECTIONS

Ms. Odusanya said the positions they would elect that evening include the President, Academic Affairs VP, External Affairs VP, three Grad Council reps and an Alternate, the Funding Committee Chair, Finance Committee Chair, and Organization and Rules Committee Chair. All positions were members of the Executive Board.

Ms. Odusanya called for nominees for GA President for 2006-7. Mr. Daal nominated Mr. Daniels. Ms. Odusanya called for any other nominees, and hearing none, asked Mr. Daniels to give his statement.

Josh Daniels introduced himself and said he was a second-year Law student. Next year he'll be a Policy student. He currently worked under Mr. Schechtman as Campus Committee Liaison, asking Delegates to serve on various committees. If he were to be elected President, he would like to continue, more or less, what this year's Executive Board has done. He would fight fee increases as much as possible. He'd also try to get more services online for grad students. Grads live in various parts of the Bay Area, so the more services online, the better grad students would be able to use them. In addition, he would like to make their efforts more effective. So although there were many, many issues that concern them all and could affect them all, they do have limited resources, and grads were all students and were pretty busy people. So he would try to limit things to a few really important issues to make the best use of their time, money, and energy. If people had any questions, he'd be happy to answer them.

Ms. Franklin asked if he understood the time commitments involved, and if he was fully prepared to serve the whole year. Mr. Daniels said he was fully committed to make a commitment for the whole year. He had one job on the side, but his allegiance and his time would be spent more on the Graduate Assembly, along with school.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Fairbrother said he wanted to focus on a few specific issues Mr. Daniels wanted to emphasize, and asked what those were. Mr. Daniels said that one issue was fees. When they wanted to get support regarding the RSF issue, they had difficulty getting anything online about that. So it would be really nice to just focus on one simple thing, to increase their ability to move things from discussion at GA meetings, e.g., to the Web. So if they want to get the word out about a particular issue, and wanted to have a petition, a write-in campaign, something to organize and mobilize members, they could do that online. They already have GA group funding online, and there were currently other possibilities. Another important issue to focus on was access. Mr. Daniels said he was really open to the concerns people had. He had his personal issues: as a Law student, as a Policy student, as a resident of South Berkeley, as someone who took the bus, etc. But he was really open to what the GA felt, as the collective body. But the one provision was that they couldn't have ten or 15 different really important activities, because that would spread them too thin. He didn't know how it would work in terms of the May meeting, but ideally, they'll have some sort of survey asking for feedback on the issues and problems Delegates would like the GA address.

Ms. Odusanya said that to elaborate on the online issue, the GA bought two new servers that year, a new Web server and a new data server. It would be great to utilize them even more in upcoming years.

Mr. Schechtman said the GA was holding elections in April for the first time, instead of in May, in order to have more transition and training time. The new Officers will actually take office on June 1. What the GA has typically done was to solicit information from the delegate body in May about ideas for activism and agenda items. The Executive Board meets over the summer and usually comes up with a proposed Action Agenda, which is usually the first item of New Business to be considered in September. So Delegates have multiple opportunities to suggest what the GA should focus on.

Mr. Stagi asked if they could get a commitment that Mr. Daniels would run a survey or do something, even though he wouldn't be in office in May, to get a definitive level of input on what people were interested in. Mr. Daniels said he would commit to that.

Ms. Abbaszadeh said a lot of concerns the GA has historically focused on have been minority issues, including women and international students. She wanted to put that on his list, that this was an area of focus, maybe as important or more important than having things online, because there's more value in face-to-face interaction. Mr. Daniels said the Board was present and he would say this with them present, that one of the things that he wished they had done better was recruitment. He was the only person running for President, and he wished there were more, and that they could have a discussion about the direction in which they wanted the GA to go. He was a white man, a Law student, even though next year he won't be in Law, technically, but for whatever it was worth, on this campus, he as a white male Law student, had a lot of institutional privilege. So one thing he'd try really, try hard to do next year was to recruit and reach out to departments with communities that have been underserved, to make the GA a more representative body of the entire campus and the community.

Ms. Odusanya said that next month they'd have the election winners and the new Exec Board present more details for ideas for the coming year. They could ask Mr. Daniels more in-depth questions next month.

Ms. Odusanya asked Mr. Daniels to please step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote.

A Delegate nominated Jen Zahrt. Ms. Zahrt said she would run in the interest of people having a choice. She didn't like uncontested elections, and she had very seriously considered running. She was Chair of

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 12 -

the Funding Committee. She decided not to run because she decided to take her qualifying exams early, next May. That meant in the Fall Semester she'd have to take 23 credits, including eight credits of Latin, and then take her qualifying exam in the spring. So she didn't have the time for the position.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if she was basically running out of principle. Ms. Zahrt said she was running for those people who wanted to say they had a choice.

Ms. Odusanya asked Ms. Zahrt to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After the election, Ms. Odusanya said that Mr. Daniels was the next GA President. (Applause)

Ms. Odusanya said the next position to elect was the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Mr. Schechtman said the Academic Affairs VP was the primary point of contact with the Berkeley Administration on everything from the Class Pass and the RSF to normative time issues, admissions issues, housing issues, anything that affected grad students. The AAVP also chaired the Executive Board and the Delegates meeting in the absence of the President.

Ms. Odusanya called for any nominees.

Mr. Daal nominated himself. Ms. Tom nominated Ms. Cementwala.

Seeing no other nomination, she invited the nominees to the podium. Miguel Daal introduced himself said he gave a lot of thought to deciding to run and convinced himself he had enough time. He's been interested in the position for a while now.

He's been involved with the GA for four years and has been on several committees, including the RSF Committee and the Network Advisory Committee. He was also on a Committee mandated by a Resolution on the DOE National Labs. So he had some experience to offer. He would like to know what grads were interested in. One thing he was interested in was, first, to push for diversity issues. He also wanted to work on ways to better reach the greater grad student population. He would like to see broader grad student involvement with the GA, so grads know what it does and what services it offered. He would also like to serve more in an advocacy role for grads. He also wanted to solicit more grad student involvement in the GA and get departments to e-mail their students about GA openings, in order to see more representation from departments. He was also very interested campus committee output of the GA and would further the good work that Mr. Daniels has done. He basically just wanted to follow-up with the progress that was made that year.

Mariyam Cementwala introduced herself and said that filling Mr. Schechtman's shoes was a next-to-impossible task. She was a Law student and thought what she brought to the GA and to the Grad Council, where she currently served, was the voice of a woman who was of a minority background in terms of disability. She was particularly interested in affordable and accessible housing and childcare. She was astounded when she learned at a Grad Council meeting that the cost of a month of childcare, even at a subsidized rate, was about equal to the rent for a one-bedroom apartment, about \$1,400. These were issues that don't often get heard or don't come before campus administrators. One bad habit she had was a tendency to over-commit, which she did that year. What they would get with her was a distinct voice and a desire to definitely pursue an activism agenda. Next year she won't make the same mistakes she made this year. She knew how much time Mr. Schechtman put into this job. For people's third year in Law,

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 13 -

they basically cruise through school, as it's the lightest year; and her writing requirement was done. Her extracurricular activity at the Law School will also be determined by what happens with the election. She was really hesitant about taking on something as daunting as the AAVP position, but she thought a diverse voice was important before the Administration and the student body. She thought she had the ability to communicate, and she would ask for their vote.

Ms. Odusanya called for any questions, and seeing none, asked the two candidates to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a vote, Ms. Odusanya said that Ms. Cementwala was the new Academic Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

Ms. Odusanya said the next position was for External Affairs Vice President. Ms. Medina said she was the current External Affairs VP. Her main responsibility was to sit on the Board of Directors for the UC Student Association, the umbrella organization for the UCs, recognized by the Regents and the Legislature as the official voice of the students. Her role was to advocate for students on the State level and before the Regents and the Legislature. So a lot of political advocacy was involved.

Ms. Odusanya called for nominees. Ms. Zahrt nominated Mr. Allen. Ms. Odusanya called for any other nominees, and seeing none, asked Mr. Allen to please take the floor.

Ben Allen introduced himself and said he served that last year on the GA Executive Board as one of the reps to the Grad Council. He also was a Law student; but in his defense, he was a grad student before. He had a Master's degree in Latin American Studies and has done a lot of development work and things in other fields. After grad school and before coming to Berkeley, he worked for several years in Washington, D.C., in international development for an NGO and was Communications Director for Rep. Jose Serrano, of the South Bronx. Both experiences really helped to shape him and make him who he was, and gave him a lot of skills that would help to make him a strong EAVP. He wanted to build on the spectacular work that Ms. Medina, Ms. Joshi, and Mr. McCombs have done, putting Berkeley at the forefront of UCSA leadership. He would also like to work hard with the rest of the Executive Board and make it more of a team, pitching in with each other on different projects. He thought they need to fight on behalf of their foreign students around fee issues and to maintain access and affordability. They have to make sure the University acts responsibly on diversity and on minority, environmental, and human rights issues. He was very proud of the student action issue that resulted in the Regents divesting from Sudan, an important symbolic statement. He liked to think of himself as a listener and an advocate. He also wanted to

push hard to get the External Affairs Committee up and running so they could have more input from the Assembly. It was hard to get people to run for Executive positions because of the time commitment, but he thought they needed to get more Delegates involved in the day-to-day operations of the GA, in projects, policies, ideas, and legwork. He would encourage people to think about getting more involved in committees. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked what issues he would work on with regard to foreign students. Mr. Allen said the federal government has been making it more difficult for foreign students to get visas, and the GA needed to work more with the University in sending faculty and students to Washington to talk about how important foreign students were for the richness of their research and for diversity. They had to make the point that the University was suffering as a result of a loss of access. In addition, they need to make sure foreign students have access to student aid and debt relief that were often times denied to them. He brought this up because it was an issue he cared about. He was concerned about the decreasing number of foreign students at Cal.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 14 -

Ms. Franklin asked about sending people to Washington. Mr. Allen said he would not use the GA budget for that. Ms. Franklin asked about ideas he had within the scope of the GA budget. Mr. Allen said the most important role in the position was as advocate on the State level. He wanted to engage the University on a lot of issues. All they could do was advocate and push, as they didn't have money to fund a lot of projects. They could meet eye-to-eye with administrators, Regents, and legislators and talk about issues that mean a lot to them. The GA needed Delegates' help with contacts in Washington, Sacramento, and with the Regents, to push issues that meant a lot to them.

Ms. Odusanya asked Mr. Allen to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and vote, Ms. Odusanya said Mr. Allen was the new External Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

Ms. Odusanya said the next position was Funding Committee Chair. Ms. Zahrt said the Funding Committee meets the Monday before the Delegates meeting. The Chair was also a member of the Executive Board, which met as often as the next Executive Board decided to meet. The Funding Committee allocates student funds. Ms. Odusanya called for any nominees.

Javier Jimenez nominated himself. Mr. Jimenez introduced himself and said he's a second-year Comp. Lit. Ph.D. student. He served that year on the Funding Committee. Other than help people allocate things equitably, he wanted to make the process a little clearer and transparent, which Ms. Zahrt has already started. They're trying to brainstorm ideas to make applications easier for people, to help people understand, e.g., what it meant when they apply for a whole semester's meetings in one deadline, which would affect the cut. Ms. Odusanya called for any questions.

Ms. Levitan asked if he had the time, and said there were a lot of e-mails involved. Mr. Jimenez said he believed he did have the time. Ms. Levitan asked if he would be prompt and have a good turnaround. Mr. Jimenez said he would.

Ms. Odusanya asked Mr. Jimenez to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Ms. Odusanya said Mr. Jimenez was elected Funding Committee Chair. (Applause)

Ms. Odusanya said they would move to the Finance Committee Chair, and she called for any nominees. Ms. Levitan nominated Mr. Rajan.

Ms. Tom said the Funding Committee's major responsibility was to create a budget for the next school year. She saw two main challenges. First, their budget was shrinking every year. They lost approximately \$60,000 from last year to this year, and they're trying to figure out how to share that loss; and that's been a challenge. Another challenge has been trying to make sure that everybody was involved in the budget and had a say, including the Executive Board, project coordinators, and other leaders, to ensure the budget process was fair.

Nishanth Rajan said he's a first-year Ph.D. student in Finance. He was on the Finance Committee that year and really enjoyed his service and time there. He was well aware of some of the challenges the GA faced. He believed the Finance Committee's place was to take the vision of the Executive Board as a whole, and try to make that a reality. He definitely had the time and

interest in the position.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 15 -

Ms. Odusanya called for any questions and seeing none, asked Mr. Nishanth to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a vote, Ms. Odusanya said Mr. Nishanth was the new Finance Committee Chair. (Applause)

Ms. Odusanya said they would next consider Grad Council representatives. They needed four or more nominees. Ms. Freedman nominated Ms. Ahrendt. Ms. Ahrendt nominated Ms. Freedman. Ms. Cementwala nominated Mr. Daal. Ms. Levitan nominated Ms. Anderson. Ms. Odusanya called for any other nominees. She said the Grad Council was really low-key and met once a month. Mr. Allen said this position was also a great entryway to get involved in the GA. The Grad Council was within the structure of the Academic Senate and governs graduate issues. Grad Council reps also sit as members of the GA's Executive Board. It's a great way to be involved without a tremendous time commitment. Ms. Odusanya said that was actually how she got involved in the GA, through the Grad Council. Mr. Stagi said it's a way for people to get their foot in the door and see what other opportunities there were. So if they were considering another position, it was a way to get the lay of the land. One concern was that there was a little lack of continuity between the previous Executive Board and the incoming Board. Fortunately, they have a little of that with Mr. Allen and Ms. Cementwala.

Mr. Schechtman said Grad Council reps were also voting members of the GA's Executive Board. If people had concerns about policy, the Grad Council was a great way to represent policy to the Administration and to also help direct the GA's policies.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other nominees, and hearing none, asked the nominees to take the floor. She noted that the person receiving the least amount of votes would be the Alternate.

Rebekah Ahrendt introduced herself and said she was a third-year student in Music, and this was her third year in the GA. Previous to coming to Berkeley, she taught high school for three years, so she had a lot of concerns about how they bring people into Berkeley and how they keep people going once they were there as far as being TAs, GSIs, or researchers. This was her fourth semester of being a GSI. She also worked for the Union, so she knew a lot of concerns grads had as GSIs, and she would like to continue that by taking those concerns to the Grad Council.

Danna Freedman introduced herself and said she was a third-year in Chemistry, which seemed to be an underrepresented department. She was interested in curricular development and mentoring. In her Department, for example, students were essentially beholden to two or three professors for their entire academic future. In a lot of ways that was a problem, and there was no oversight whatsoever. It was something she would really like to work on. Additionally, curriculum in many Department was very set, with certain courses students had to take, and no input from grad students. Because professors were on students' committees and were their advisors, students couldn't even write honest course evaluations.

Miguel Daal introduced himself and said he was a fourth-year Physics student. He was interested in policy surrounding the GA. Being on the Grad Council would be a good opportunity to dive into that policy, which he spoke about previously. One thing he didn't mention was the issue of non-resident tuition for international students. One thing that's been talked about was getting rid of that as a category, which was also of interest to him to work on.

Meghan Anderson introduced herself and said she was a fourth-year student in the Math Department. She really wanted to be more active in the GA but didn't have time for other, bigger positions. She would like

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 16 -

to advocate for more general reviews of the GA and the Executive Board. She came into the Math Department in a program for minority students and was really shocked at how many people had stories of hurdles they had to overcome because as

minorities, they had been limited in doing math. She came from a backwater town, and a lot of people still face very surprising hurdles. So she would be very interested in advocating for diversity issues.

Ms. Odusanya called for any questions or comments.

Mr. Allen asked if all the candidates understood that Grad Council meetings were once a month on Monday's from 2:00 to 4:30 or so.

Mr. Fairbrother asked Mr. Daal if he was actually interested in this position. Mr. Daal said he was.

Ms. Cementwala said sometimes at Grad Council meetings they're asked to keep certain things confidential, even from the Executive Board of the GA. She asked how nominees felt about that. Ms. Ahrendt said that was a very tricky question and she's been in that situation before, in other committees. In general, she believed that if one was asked to not talk about something, there was probably a good reason for it. So she probably would respect such a request. That could place people in a compromised position, but there had to be a reason for it. Ms. Freedman said she thought it was important to not betray people's trust. However, if the reason was not one she supported, she would strenuously object and would try to work out some kind of compromise, such as perhaps only informing the Executive Board, or one particular body. Mr. Daal said he believed he could keep his mouth shut, but thought that would be easy since his advisor was on the Academic Senate, and could chat things up with him. Ms. Anderson said she agreed with what Ms. Ahrendt said. A request to not further discuss something would best be addressed at the Grad Council, and she would try to find out more at the meeting the request was made.

Ms. Levitan asked if any of the nominees would prefer to be the Alternate. No nominee expressed that preference.

Ms. Odusanya asked the nominees to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE GA'S GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION: MS. AHRENDT (ALTERNATE), MS. FREEDMAN, MR. DAAL, AND MS. ANDERSON. (Applause)**

Ms. Odusanya said the last position up for election was Chair of the Organization and Rules Committee Chair. Mr. Stagi said that for the last couple of years, the Committee hasn't entailed that much, but he had to convene it in order to approve language on the Sustainability Resolution. And given its approval, the GA-ASUC MOU had to be included into the GA's By-laws. In addition, there was a lot of clean-up work that had to be done. Additionally, the Chair of this Committee was ostensibly the parliamentarian.

Ms. Odusanya called for any nominees. A Delegate nominated Ms. Zahrt, who respectfully declined. Mr. Allen moved to table a vote until the May meeting, to recruit somebody. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rajan asked if members of the Executive Board could hold more than one position. Ms. Odusanya said that hasn't happened before and asked members of the Board were precluded from having two positions. Mr. Stagi said they weren't. Mr. Rajan said it was mentioned that not much work was involved. Mr. Stagi said part of the By-laws had to be rewritten, which he'd talk about with the new Chair.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 17 -

Ms. Cementwala said that because of the MOU and GA autonomy, there were a lot more issues relevant to Org.&Rules that weren't relevant before.

Mr. Daal said that if somebody did have two positions, he asked if they would have two votes. Mr. Stagi said he would assume the individual had one vote. That was just his opinion.

**THE MOTION TO TABLE THE ELECTION OF THE CHAIR OF THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 12-3-6.** Ms. Odusanya said they would consider electing the position at the May meeting. Mr. Stagi said he would ask people to please consider running for the position. He could talk to anybody who was interested.

Ms. Odusanya said she would entertain a motion to accept the candidates to all positions they considered. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Odusanya said she would ask the new Executive Board members to meet very briefly after the meeting.

#### NEW BUSINESS

The following Resolution was authored by Sam Arons (ERG) and was co-sponsored by Becca Jones and Gabriel Harley (MSE):

#### RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT A SUSTAINABILITY AMENDMENT TO THE "GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION OR A MASTER'S THESIS"

WHEREAS, the importance of supporting current work toward environmental sustainability on campus being pursued by groups such as the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability (CACs), Re-Use, Students for a Greener Berkeley, and the Graduate Assembly's Environmental Sustainability Subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, all UC Berkeley graduate students will write a master's thesis or project and/or a doctoral dissertation; and

WHEREAS, as part of the writing process, many graduate students print one or more drafts of their theses, projects, and dissertations; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Division's current "Guidelines for Submitting a Doctoral Dissertation or a Master's Thesis" (<http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/degrees/pdf/disguide.pdf>) does not take environmental sustainability into account, and in fact requires double-spacing and single-sided printing (p. 5); and

WHEREAS, minimizing the use of paper in general reduces the environmental impacts of paper manufacturing such as CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, energy use, water pollution, air pollution, and solid waste; and

WHEREAS, minimizing the use of paper for theses and dissertations in particular saves the Library valuable shelf space; and

Resolution to Support a Sustainability Amendment to "Guidelines for [Theses]" (cont'd)

- 18 -

#### RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT A SUSTAINABILITY AMENDMENT TO THE "GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION OR A MASTER'S THESIS" (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Library's Preservation Department has no objections to double-sided and 1.5-line- or single-line spacing, so long as both the right and left margins be 1.5 inches to accommodate binding; and

WHEREAS, hard copies of theses and dissertations sent to ProQuest for microfilming must be printed single sided in order for the microfilming process to work correctly; and

WHEREAS, ProQuest also accepts electronic submission of theses and dissertations for microfilming; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Division and the Preservation Department require that paper used for theses and dissertations meet the ANSI/NISO Z39.48 standard for the "Permanence of Paper for Publications and Documents in Libraries and Archives" (<http://www.niso.org/standards/>); and

WHEREAS, the ANSI/NISO standard states, "The standard does not dictate the use of either virgin or recycled paper pulp. As with virgin papers, some recycled papers will meet the standard's criteria and others will not" (p. 4); and

WHEREAS, the Preservation Department is currently researching the availability of recycled paper that meets the ANSI/NISO Z39.48 standard; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Division is currently researching the possibility of converting thesis and dissertation submission to an entirely electronic process; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has shown its commitment to environmental sustainability by adopting a policy of environmental sustainability and creating the Environmental Sustainability (ES) Committee at its December 1, 2005 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Environmental Sustainability Committee of the Graduate Assembly of UC Berkeley and the graduate student group Students for a Greener Berkeley have submitted a policy memo to the Graduate Division laying out these concerns and making the following recommendations;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly supports the following Sustainability Amendment to the "Guidelines for Submitting a Doctoral Dissertation or a Master's Thesis":

§ That theses and dissertations be required to be printed double-sided, except in the case of hard copies sent to ProQuest for microfilming;

§ That theses and dissertations be required to be printed with at most 1.5-line spacing and preferably single-line spacing;

§ That theses and dissertations be required to be printed on recycled paper, provided that a source of recycled paper meeting the ANSI/NISO Z39.48 standard can be identified;

Resolution to Support a Sustainability Amendment to "Guidelines for [Theses]" (cont'd)

- 19 -

RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT A SUSTAINABILITY AMENDMENT TO THE "GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION OR A MASTER'S THESIS" (cont'd)

§ That theses and dissertations be submitted electronically -- both to the Graduate Division/Library for archiving and to ProQuest for microfilming -- whenever possible.

§ That the "Guidelines" strongly encourage students to adhere to the preceding principles when printing draft copies of their master's theses or projects and doctoral dissertations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Graduate Assembly will make its official support of this Sustainability Amendment to the "Guidelines for Submitting a Doctoral Dissertation or a Master's Thesis" known to both the Graduate Division and to the Library in order encourage the full adoption of these principles.

Ms. Jones said huge amounts of paper were required to submit a thesis or dissertation. These documents were required to be double-spaced and single-sided. In looking into this, they found that the Graduate Division got those guidelines from the Library System. But in speaking with the Library's Preservation Department, people from the Department said they really didn't see any reason why those rules couldn't be changed. So there was really no reason no to change them. Ms. Green said they have submitted a request to change those rules, which would allow theses and dissertations to be submitted double-sided, with one and a half-lined spacing. This would save considerable paper, both in drafts and in final printing, while supporting electronic submission. Ms. Green said they think GA approval would be a very strong statement in support of the changes on behalf of all grad students and a push for some action on this. It's a minor change that could save a lot of paper. She called for any questions.

Mr. Stagi said he thought this was a great idea. He was just concerned that the Resolution asked to have this required of people, as opposed to saying that it was no longer required. Ms. Jones said the reason for that was the argument of having

things look uniform. It was an attempt to have theses look the same when people open them. It made sense to make a one-time change and require theses to look a certain way. They would then have just two versions rather than opening a thesis and having it look in possibly many different ways.

Mr. Schechtman said that speaking from a department that didn't have a double-sided printer, he thought this requirement might initially cause some difficulties, but at the same time, one thing that the Sustainability Committee and Students for a Greener Berkeley have been trying to do was to move the University away from single-sided printing and towards double-sided printing. He thought the Resolution would make a very good argument for the University to spend a relatively small amount of money to upgrade at least one department's printer to print these documents.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions or comments.

A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT A SUSTAINABILITY AMENDMENT TO THE "GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION OR A MASTER'S THESIS" PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

The following Resolution was authored by Malcolm Fairbrother and was sponsored by the Foreign Student Affairs Committee

Resolution In Support of International Graduate Students

- 20 -

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS

WHEREAS, international graduate students make unique and valuable educational, scientific, cultural, and economic contributions to both the University and the State of California; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley Graduate Division statistics show that foreign PhD students in the sciences and in engineering are as likely to stay in California after graduating as are Americans from other states; and

WHEREAS, since the peak year 2001, international graduate students have declined significantly as a percentage of all graduate students at the University of California; and

WHEREAS, these declines have been caused in significant part by large increases in non-residents' total tuition and fees (\$4,079.20/semester), unmatched by equivalent increases in the funding available to international students; and

WHEREAS, the costs of graduate study relative to the available funding at the University of California are among the highest in the United States, and the University consequently loses many exceptional graduate students to competing institutions in the US and abroad; and

WHEREAS, University of California administrators and Academic Senate committees are currently considering proposals to address this serious problem;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly:

1. Welcomes the University Administration's attention to this problem and its consideration of proposals to resolve it;
2. Supports the University of California adopting one such proposal: treating international graduate students the same as American students from outside of California, eliminating their non-resident tuition after one year;
3. Will communicate the substance of this Resolution to the appropriate University administrators and to the UC Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee, which is currently addressing this issue.

Mr. Fairbrother said he would apologize for having a Resolution from the Foreign Student Affairs Committee for the second straight meeting. He really appreciated the concern that many candidates that evening expressed about the issues and financial burdens international students face. It meant a lot to hear that kind of support from the Graduate Assembly. After the GA passed the first Resolution, they requested and got a meeting with Graduate Dean Mason and some of her staff to talk about the first Resolution. They found Dean Mason very sympathetic and were told that there was already a movement among University administration to address this issue. Dean Mason also told them of a UC Systemwide Committee on Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee to specifically address this issue, charged with making recommendations to the Office of the President. One proposal being considered was to treat international students the same as US students from outside California, such that grads would stop paying non-resident tuition, starting their second year. That's why they need to

Resolution In Support of International Graduate Students

- 21 -

pass a new Resolution. Dean Mason specifically suggested that the GA endorse this proposal and tell the Advisory Committee that the GA supported this idea. That's why another Resolution was submitted.

Mr. Fairbrother said the last time he presented a Resolution he went over the gravity of the problem and some of the statistics. The change being proposed would mean a massive difference for international grad students and would be an unbelievable change. Dean Mason suggested that it actually could happen. In particular, such a change would make irrelevant the situation with international GSIs. It would mean international GSIs would be in the exact same position as everybody else. In the interests of full disclosure, Mr. Fairbrother said the one drawback to the proposal was that it was priced out to the UC for about \$40 million a year. That was a lot of money, and it would have to come from elsewhere in the UC budget. So there was a downside to this. There were scarce resources, and this would have to come at the expense of something else. But there was a lot of interest about this in the Administration, and it would make a massive difference. So he would encourage Delegates to support this. He called for any questions.

Ms. Medina asked if there was any mention by Dean Mason as to where the money might come from. Mr. Fairbrother said there was no corollary proposal to take it out of something else. This was not binding, and it would simply be a very strong recommendation to the Office of the President to adjust its budget and propose this change to the Regents, which would have to approve it. It's not clear where the money would come from.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions or comments. A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

## REPORTS

### UC Student Association Presentation

Anu Joshi introduced herself and said she was the Legislative Liaison. She and Ms. Medina would do a quick presentation on what the UCSA has been working on for the past couple of months. Ms. Medina said she had two things to distribute. The UCSA made a Yearbook on research on affordability and produced a report they gave to legislators. They photocopied four pages from the report to distribute that evening in order to give people the flavor of what the UCSA was doing. The other hand-out was a survey that didn't apply as much to grads, since it talked about loans, and many grads have all their fees paid for. But if it did apply, they were asked to fill out the survey. They should also feel free to write on the back anything else about affordability, the cost of living, and whether or not they could afford everything. The surveys will be collected at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Medina said they've had to deal with misconceptions at the State level. Legislators don't know much about how the University runs, and neither do the Regents; and those were the two bodies that make decisions for the University. The Regents just raised fees. After imposing a \$5,000 professional fee for Public Policy and Public Health for the first time, and without thinking about the implications of that action, two years later they were looking at the impact on students. The

misconception at the State level was that financial aid met the need of low-income students, and for undergraduates, that was absolutely not true. When administrators calculate financial need and the financial aid package, they already factor in every

Presentation on the UC Student Association (cont'd)

- 22 -

student, regardless of income, having to pay \$9,500. That amount would come from either loans or work. And then, whatever Pell Grants or loans didn't cover, that would be the financial aid that was provided. It could be \$300 or \$500. But low-income, needy students will still have to come up with \$9,500. That was the biggest misconception they've had to deal. Ms. Medina said they've tried to explain this to Regents and legislators. What convinced the Governor and the Governor's staff that year to start sympathizing with the students dealt with another misconception, that the University was really cheap, because they're cheaper than other colleges across the nation, at all levels, professional, graduate, and undergraduate. When compared to other schools, they might be cheaper; but their cost of living wasn't, and the UCSA had to argue that all the time, that UCs were located in very expensive areas. Also, when they're compared with other schools, Berkeley might be cheaper, but if Michigan raises fees next year, the question was whether UC would follow.

Ms. Medina said the UCSA introduced the Student Compact at the legislative level. They're trying to change the debate so that legislators look at the cost of living and the cost of attendance, and the cost to families, instead of just comparing UC to other institutions across the country.

Ms. Joshi asked how many people have heard about the Compact the Governor made with the University. A couple of years ago the UC President and Chancellors went into a room and decided to do something, and ended up really screwing students. They decided to have a multi-year agreement that fees would increase 8-10% every year as long as there was a fiscal emergency, as defined by the Governor, and that financial aid would be reduced to 20% and academic outreach would be zero funded. Students and legislators were totally kept out of the decision-making process; and community colleges were never in the Compact, or discussed. That was why the students went forward and decided they wanted a compact, between the University, the State, and the students. The UCSA last Wednesday introduced a Resolution, through Carol Lu, the Chair of the Higher Education Committee.

The Student Compact had four main points: student fees, loans, work, and access. They feel student fees should be based on what students can afford to pay, not on the cost of instruction, or whether the State was in a fiscal emergency. Every time there's a fiscal crisis student fees are increased, so the State could pay for other things. Graduate and professional students should not be looked to as a source of revenue, which has been happening. The Governor wanted to increase grad fees by 40% in one year because grads make so much money when they graduate. A lot of people don't understand the role of grad students. The fees of professional students have been going up dramatically, in order to pay for other costs of the University. Ms. Joshi said the financial aid part of the Compact was that they feel students should have no unmet need. That meant the University and the State had to come up with a way to meet that, because currently, students do have unmet need. Another element was work. The UCSA didn't feel students should have to work so much as to affect the quality of their education. The UCSA also felt students should be able to pay back all loans within ten years, at a manageable rate, which was not the case at that time. For access, they think the University should reflect the diversity of the State, and one way to get there was to fund academic outreach programs.

Ms. Joshi said that's the Student Compact that will be introduced and heard in committee on Tuesday. They've heard the committee will unanimously approve it, and the legislation will go to the floor of the Assembly, as a Resolution from the Higher Education Committee, not just from Carol Lu. The Resolution will frame the debate in a great new way, about affordability, and not just about student fees or being in a crisis situation. She called for any questions.

Presentation on the UC Student Association (cont'd)

- 23 -

Ms. Cementwala asked if some modification would be needed in the budget that will come out. Ms. Joshi said they got a

pretty good budget that year, and got a fee freeze, which included graduate and professional students. That was really important. The problem, however, was that fees have increased each year for the past six years. So one year of a fee freeze didn't make up for the fact that UC was not affordable at that time. In fact, they're at an affordability crisis for a lot of students. The Compact was more long-term, and obviously wasn't binding, as the State's budget was decided from year to year. Short of a constitutional amendment, that couldn't be changed. The Resolution the UCSA submitted was just to get the Legislature to talk about long-term solutions to UC's funding problems. Ms. Cementwala asked how they would get dollars into the education system. Ms. Joshi said that was a big problem. Assembly Democrats have said that education was their issue, and then didn't vote that way. The Compact was a way to make sure legislators will lead in this priority, and it would allow students to hold them accountable. Right now, students didn't have anything to hold legislators to.

Mr. Allen asked what they'd like to see more out of grad students to help with this. Ms. Joshi said people don't really "get" grad students, and how they pay their fees, why their departments pay their fees, and who it hurts when grad fees are increased. She thought the other thing was that they just need more participation in events, such as lobby days and letter writing, especially because grad students have a unique voice and tend to vote more than undergrads. And that was really important. Ms. Medina said that every time they make an announcement about a lobby conference, or to collect postcards or testimonials, the more people to get involved, the better.

Mr. Schechtman said the last time he and Ms. Odusanya met with the Chancellor, he specifically asked them to get grad students involved to speak with the Legislature about the value of graduate education to the State of California. That includes a diverse domestic and an international audience. The Chancellor said legislators were elected by Californians, and understand the benefits of educating undergrad Californians, but don't understand the benefits of a diverse, international grad student body, and don't realize the enormous economic benefit to the State. The External Affairs team next year would be the perfect place to get grads involved. The UCSA had the tools to support grads in making that presentation. They just need to give them a little help and go to Sacramento once or twice to make their case.

Mr. Stagi said that Ms. Joshi alluded to the benefits of having a diverse student body. The GA had within its midst a lot of analytic powers. He asked if there was some way to develop some analysis beyond anecdotes of how important these issues are, so it wasn't just grads saying "This is what we believe." Their power was in their ability to graphically represent the issues. Ms. Joshi said UC did an impact study on California economics. Students who graduate pay more in taxes, and with all the inventions and things done by students who graduate, for every dollar the State puts into UC it gets \$6, put into the State economy. It would be great if grads could do a more specific impact study. The Campaign for College Opportunity did a study for the Legislature, but it just looked at tax revenue, and found that for all higher education, for every dollar that was invested in education, the State got \$3 within ten years, from increased tax revenue. And that didn't include businesses that open and create jobs.

A Delegate asked how easy it was for a group of grads to see a legislator. Ms. Medina said it was really easy to set up a meeting, and they've never had a problem of legislators not wanting to meet with them. People could go through the External Affairs office. They have taking points, and they just need people to go.

Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank Ms. Medina and Ms. Joshi for the presentation.

Report from the Funding Committee

- 24 -

Report from the Funding Committee

-  
-

Ms. Zahrt said the funding allocations were distributed, and she was happy to report that there were no cuts. There were some changes to Travel Grants, which was on the sheet. She called for any questions.

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, APPROVING ROUND 7 OF GRAD EVENTS, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the Academic Affairs Vice President

Giving his report as the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said that after a year and a half of work, they got the Chancellor's Cabinet to approve a committee to oversee all student fees, including fees that are imposed by departments or colleges. One immediate result was that the College of Environmental Design's computing fee, \$40-60 per semester, was stricken, because it was pointed out that it was an illegal fee. It was illegal for colleges to impose fees across the board that were not tied to a course and were not approved by the Regents. This fee was repealed through students' work, and having the need for this Committee to be seen. He'd pass around a sheet, particularly for professional students, for people to list the fees they pay. He knew Law and Business have fees they pay school-wide. There will be more updates next month.

Regarding the RSF, Mr. Schechtman said he would cede the floor Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels said the RSF Referendum will be on ASUC the ballot April 25-27. He had two fliers, one with Gov. Schwarzenegger and one without. If people thought one or both would be effective in their department, he would ask them to please take a handful and distribute them. They'll also send out an e-mail to the Delegates, which they'll hopefully forward to their departments and school mates.

Mr. Schechtman said the Class Pass was approved two months ago, but they've run into a problem with the Lawrence Berkeley Lab. The federal government denied the merger of the LBL shuttles with the Bear shuttles due to security reasons. At the same time, AC Transit was proposing service cuts. Students have raised this as a very serious issue with Administration. He would cede the floor to Mr. Stagi. Mr. Stagi said AC Transit was still debating and was aware of the furor they're starting to create. So it wasn't a done deal. The specific cuts would be along the 43 line. For any grads that would affect, he would suggest they weigh in with the AC Transit Board and check their Web site and their feedback opportunities. As far as LBNL buses, Mr. Stagi said they're looking at some different options. But it was looking pretty tough, with the Department of Energy being a stickler. This was about security issues, but it wasn't really clear how it made sense. So they're trying to come up with other solutions, but they're not certain. On a better front for the Class Pass they're already in negotiations as far as Next Bus, and perhaps using a student-led Next Bus-type technology. There were more or less 16 perimeter stops along the campus periphery, for Bear Transit and AC Transit, and half of those stops will be outfitted with Next Bus for the AC Transit rollout of its BRT line that would go to downtown Berkeley. They're seeing how it would look to outfit the rest of the perimeter stops to announce the next bus' arrival, for Bear Transit and AC Transit. So it looked pretty favorable one way or another. It looked like this will be in place hopefully for an upcoming election.

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA (cont'd)

- 25 -

Ms. Odusanya called for any other reports.

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

Mr. Besbris said ASUC elections were coming up, so he would suggest avoiding Sproul. He was on the ballot, but he would ask them to please not vote for him. There were things going on with the RSF Referendum, but apparently Mr. Allen had things in hand. Mr. Besbris said he would encourage all of them to not vote online in this upcoming election, and instead, to vote on campus, if they could. If they ask him personally whether online elections will happen, he would say they wouldn't. So members of the GA shouldn't vote online if they could help it. The reason was because the Elections Council Chair created a system, through Student Information Systems, that was not in accordance with the current By-laws for online voting. He knew a lot of people didn't want them to happen the way they were structured at that time.

Ms. Odusanya asked if the Senate couldn't approve the system being used. Mr. Besbris said he would guess the process would be that if elections took place online, someone would sue to throw out all those votes.

Mr. Jimenez asked if that meant the \$75,000 to put the election online will have been wasted. Mr. Besbris said the program could still be used, and could be adjusted to follow the By-laws for next year. It's just that with the timeframe the Elections Council Chair was given, he didn't think she understood that there were specific things that the Senate really wanted to have in the process of online voting that could not be followed and included in a program in the timeframe. At least that was just him

editorializing.

Mr. Daniels said that when they send out the e-mail to Delegates about the RSF Referendum, they'll include an update on the elections. At that point people should assume they could vote by their computer, since they don't want to discourage people from voting. They'll let people know if they can vote online, and if they can't, where they should vote.

Mr. Stagi said he would assume the e-mail that's sent out would also include information about the MOU, as well as the RSF.

For the report from the Environmental Sustainability Committee, Mr. Harley said he would like to take a straw poll. There were a lot of environmental projects that have been identified on campus, a lot of areas that could use improvement, especially in comparison with other schools. But there really wasn't money to implement a lot of these things, even though they would be cost-saving in the long term. An environmental assessment was conducted over a year ago, and there wasn't money for a lot of these things. So they're talking about proposing a student fee referendum in a year to raise initial project money for environmental projects on campus. That would show it's a strong issue, one that mattered to students. The referendum would ask the Chancellor to fund a full-time staff position, a sustainability coordinator, to administer these funds and to work full-time on these issues. A lot of campuses have done this.

Mr. Harley said he would ask for a quick straw poll of people who would be willing to have a fee, something in the order of \$5, for sustainability projects. A straw poll was taken. A straw poll was taken of people who would support a higher fee, such as \$10. Mr. Harley said he would like to thank them.

- 26 -

Ms. Odusanya said she didn't think ASUC Executive candidates were there to make a presentation, so they'd cancel that part of the agenda.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other reports. Seeing none, she said she would entertain a motion to adjourn. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank them very much.

This meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary

PRESENT AT THE APRIL 13, 2006 MEETING OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY

Name	Department	Name	Department
-			
Abbaszadeh, Sahar	Architecture	Haubenreich, Jacon	German
Ahrendt, Rebekah	Music	Haynes, Erin	Linguistics
Allen, Ben	Law	Humphrey, Jennifer	Social Welfare
Anderson, Meghan	Math	Jimenez, Javier	Comp Lit
Angus, Annette	Plant & Microbial Biology	Jones, Alexander	Plant & Microbial Biology
Arons, Sam	Energy & Resources Group	Jones, Becca	MSE
Berlanga, Monique	Law	Kasad, Roshni	MCB
Bertucci, Sonja	French	Levitan, Carmel	Bio E

Besbris, Max	ASUC Rep	Litwak, Steve	GA Transcriber
Chanizit, Adam	East Asian Languages	Martire, Anthony	Italian Studies
Crosby, Joy	Performance Studies	Miyazaki, Karin	Optometry
Daal, Miguel	Physics	Murphy, Melissa	Social Welfare
Daniels, Josh	Campus Committee Liaison	Odusanya, Lola	GA President
Elnaggar, Mariam	Publications Committee Chair	Patel, Seema	Law
Fairbrother, Malcolm	Sociology	Purdy, David	Stats
Fisher, Josh	GA Dept Liaison	Rajan, Nishanth	Haas Ph.D.
Franklin, Johanna	Logic	Schechtman, Rob	GA Acad Aff VP
Freedman, Danna	Chemistry	So, Stella	Transportation Eng'rg.
Ghias, Shoaib	Jurisprudence and Social Policy	Stagi, Jay	DCRP
Gross, Stephen	History	Tom, Sarah	Demography
Guan, Huan (Kandy)	Optometry	Trahey, Lynn	Chemistry
Hagar, Loddie	Chemical Engineering	Virgili, Justin	Chem Eng
Hao, Andy	Anthropology	Zahrt, Jenn	German
Harley, Gabriel	MSE		