

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

December 7, 2006

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting concluded the Fall Semester. It was called at 5:31 p.m.

Announcements

Dan Roh, Campus Unit Chair for Berkeley UAW 2865, which represents TAs, readers, and tutors said the Union will soon be in contract negotiations with the University. A vote just ended to authorize a strike, if certain situations warrant it. The vote was to be taken seriously at the bargaining table and as a show of support. The Union was conducting a bargaining survey to learn what members wanted negotiated in the next contract. The Union negotiated fee remissions and wanted to make sure they stay at 100%.

Two grads just became members of the ASUC Judicial Council, Rachel Smith, from ESPM, and Josh Templet, a Law School Delegate.

Carolyn Kim, Deputy Chief of Projects and Programs in the ASUC, asked grads to participate in the Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program. They try to pair up undergrads with grads with similar academic interests. Grads could get one unit of credit for participating. The ASUC would also provide food at the social events they'll have and gift certificates to Strada, Jamba Juice, and local restaurants to motivate grads and mentees to go out and eat. Undergrads were looking for mentors in Business, Economics, Computer Science, Law, Philosophy, Asian Studies, and English students. People would meet for an hour every month, a in a fun social event.

Ms. ElNaggar said "The Berkeley Graduate" was distributed to GSOs and copies were available at the meeting.

Mr. Daniels the Lower Sproul survey was sent out to students whose SIDs ended in 0 or 1. The GA was also holding six or seven focus groups, which were very important, January 29-31, divided according to different categories, such as for people who inhabit the Southside or Northside, families, international students, professional students, commuters. The idea was to see what kinds of services these students do or don't want. Delegates were asked to advertise this. This was being put on by an architectural group working on Lower Sproul redevelopment.

An advisory group will be formed on how to better connect grads with the Career Center.

As this was the last meeting of the semester, Mr. Daniels said he wanted to say "thank you" to all who participated in the GA.

REPORTS

Ms. Allbright and Mr. Law reported as ASUC representatives to the GA. The Senate has allocated up to 30 student-led groups and organizations for projects and events, which the Senate was very happy about.

There was an impeachment trial for the Chief Justice of the ASUC Judicial Council, for malfeasance, and the Senate voted against impeachment. Resolutions the Senate passed dealt with sustainable investment; expressing opposition to Prop. 209, on its ten-year anniversary; expressing support to the people of Oaxaca, Mexico; supporting Cal football; campus climate neutrality; and opposing police brutality in relation to recent taser incident at UCLA. The ASUC received carryforward funding, money not spent from last year, \$151,000. They allocated \$77,000 to audit the ASUC in order to keep its non-profit status. Allocations were also made to the Cal Band; to Spring Welcome Week; and to AirBears expansion.

Mr. Eckerle, External Affairs Vice President, reported. He was graduating and this would be his last report to the GA. He's been working at the GA for three and a half years. External Affairs helped the International Student Committee lobby on the State level on ending non-resident tuition; hosted a debate series on ballot propositions; and will lobby the Governor and State Legislature for a fee freeze, a Cal Grant increase, and for a better admissions procedure for diversity. Gavi Begtrup, Legislative Liaison, was suggested as Mr. Eckerle's replacement.

Reporting for the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Agarwal the Campus Committee Liaison position was open. It was 10 to 12 hours a week job and paid \$14 an hour

Mr. Jimenez, Funding Committee Chair, reported. By unanimous vote, the GA approved the Committee's recommendations for Round 4 of Graduate Events funding.

Mr. Stavrinides, Foreign Student Affairs Committee Chair, reported. The Committee hosted a reception for international students, with more than 200 people attending.

Funding Appeal -- Berkeley Chinese Student and Scholar Association

Funding for the Berkeley Chinese Student and Scholar Association had been approved for Round 2. But due to an incident at the event, the Funding Committee decided not to reimburse funds for the event and to deny the group funding for Round 3. The group has appealed the decision, which Delegates would vote on.

Ms. Stevens-Carter, Funding Advisor, attended the event with her two children. They were not treated properly. And for almost two hours, the event was never conducted in English, and wasn't appropriately funded as a Diversity Grant event. The Funding Committee was the group that initiated the decisions to deny funding. The Funding Committee talked to the group, which did not get to speak.

Mr. Li, BCSSA President, apologized to Ms. Stevens-Carter and to the GA about the incident and thought there were misunderstandings due to people's cultures and languages.

It was noted that for the next funding round, the group received \$500.

For its deliberation, the meeting went into closed session, except for Delegates and voting members of the Funding Committee.

By voice-vote, the GA resolved funding appeal as follows: The \$304 from Grad Events and the \$1,000 from Diversity Grants, would be reimbursed only if, at the next available BCSSA general body meeting,

including all the leaders of the group, an appropriate person from the Office of Student Life, attends the meeting to engage in diversity training.

Resolutions

Due to the lateness of the hour, Resolutions were tabled until the February GA meeting.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved an amendment to the GA budget to fund the Lower Sproul redevelopment survey, up to \$1,000, from unused funds from 2005-06. The amount included prizes as an incentive to pay the Office of Student Research to set up the survey.

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Fall Semester, was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:31 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daniels said that if there were objections to approval of the November minutes, people should feel free to raise them. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 2, 2006 MEETING, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Daniels said the GA had a funding appeal to consider that evening. He called for a motion to approve. Mr. Purdy objected, and said that agenda item 7.E, "Closed Delegate Deliberations" for the funding appeal, but, closed to all interested parties. He thought that if the deliberates and potentially had a resolution, that they should bring back into the room the people who would be affected. Mr. Daniels said they would add a part that would include announcing any resolution or decision in open session. With that amendment, he called for a motion to approve the agenda.

Mr. Stavrinides asked if there would be Committee reports. Mr. Daniels said a PowerPoint presentation would be online. There will be no verbal reports other than the four people listed on the agenda. Mr. Stavrinides said he would like to give a short report on an event. Mr. Daniels said they would add a report from the Foreign Student Affairs Committee as item e) under Reports.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the agenda. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daniels said handouts were available, including the meeting agenda, with the budget amendments and Resolutions that the GA would consider that evening. He would ask Delegates to please make sure they have them. They should also have the funding allocation sheet. In addition, packets were also e-mailed two days ago regarding the funding appeal the GA would consider that evening. And most importantly, from a long-term perspective, or for next semester's perspective, was a feedback form. He would ask them to please fill it out. There were a lot of important questions, and he would go into it in greater depth later. The forms were available at the front.

Ms. Ahrendt said she would like to introduce Dan Roh, the Campus Unit Chair for Berkeley UAW 2865, their Union, for some important announcements. Mr. Roh said he would like to thank them for having him. For those who were new to the campus, he wanted to let them know that UAW 2865 was a Union on campus that represented all TAs, readers, and tutors on campus. What the Union did was work to make sure they were compensated fairly and treated with respect on the job. Probably all of them, or most of them, were already members, so they knew what the Union did.

Mr. Roh said the reason he was present was because the Union will be going into contract negotiations with the University very soon. They will be able to negotiate everything from what Union members get paid, to fee remissions, to health insurance in the contract they have at that time. Last spring the contract was extended for one year, and this spring they're going to renegotiate another contract, hopefully a longer contract this time around.

Mr. Roh said a few things have been going on. Delegates might have noticed that the Union conducted a strike authorization vote, which just ended that day. It wasn't a vote to go on strike, but was just a vote to give authority to go on strike, if certain situations warranted it. The vote was taken for them to be taken seriously at the bargaining table, and as a show of support.

Mr. Roh said the main reason he was at the meeting that evening was because the Union was conducting a bargaining survey. The purpose was to get feedback from members as to what was important for them to see in the next contract. If lots of people said they needed better pay, or better health care, or better protections against being overworked, those were things the Union would listen to. And the Union bargaining team would go to the table and fight for that. And at a bare minimum, they'd go to the bargaining table and make sure things they have at that time were things the University didn't try and take away.

Mr. Roh said that since he only had five minutes for the announcement, there wasn't enough time to do a bargaining survey at the meeting. So Ms. Ahrendt would pass around sign-up sheets. There were three columns. The first was for those who were not members but wanted to be. The second column was for people who wanted to do the bargaining survey. If they check that they want to do the survey, they'd get a call. It would take five or ten minutes. The last column was if they or someone they knew wanted to find out about getting involved. They could check that box and people would call them; and there were a

lot of possibilities. If they had very little time, or had lots of time to give, and regardless of what skills they had, something could be found for them to do. As a Union, they're member-run, which made them unique. Mr. Roh said they hoped people at the GA meeting were interested in helping out. This will be an exciting year for the Union as they work to get their next contract. Ms. Ahrendt called for any questions.

Mr. Rajan asked if fee remissions were on the bargaining table. Ms. Ahrendt said fee remissions were very hard-fought for when that came up in the contract originally. Bargaining for that was really difficult. And that was something that was always threatened by the University because it cost the campus a lot of money. So it was important to not only maintain what grads had at that time, but to also get even more.

Mr. Roh said that just to let people know, the Union negotiated 100% fee remissions if grads work more than ten hours a week as a GSI. And they want to make sure that stayed at 100%, and that the University didn't try to set it at a certain amount. Mr. Roh said they couldn't say for sure what things will be bargained over, but potentially anything could be.

Mr. Rajan asked what would happen if fee remissions were revoked, and asked if departments would just make up for that. Mr. Roh said that in departments that had enough money for research, they could make up the difference if not everything was covered. That was if grads were in a department with money.

Ms. Ahrendt said this was also an opportunity to raise things they were really interested in, such as, e.g., making sure out-of-State fees or non-resident fees were also remitted. So if people were interested in that, she would ask them to fill out the bargaining survey. Mr. Roh said he would like to thank them for their time.

Mr. Daniels said there were two graduate students who just became new members of the ASUC Judicial Council, Rachel Smith, from ESPM, and Josh Templet, a Law School Delegate. Mr. Templet was no longer a Delegate since he's moved on to bigger and better things with the J-Council. If people were interested in knowing more about the Judicial Council or were interested in getting in touch with these new members, Mr. Daniels said they could let him know or they could just look them up on the Web.

Carolyn Kim introduced herself and said she was the Deputy Chief of Projects and Programs in the ASUC. She's an undergraduate there and was present that evening to make an announcement about a program that they're trying to put on next semester, the Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program. She didn't know how many grads have heard about it, but it's really a wonderful program where they try to pair up undergraduate students with graduate students who have similar academic interests in order for both parties to benefit from a mentorship relationship. Delegates were probably wondering about what was in it for them, as grads, and in addition to feeling good because they've outreached to their fellow peers, or at least fellow students at Berkeley, they would also be eligible to get one unit of credit. In addition, while she knew it was kind of cheap, the ASUC would also provide all the resources that went into a mentorship relationship. That meant free food at the social events they'll have, with incentives for everyone to come out and eat. That included free gift certificates to Strada, Jamba Juice, and local restaurants around campus, to motivate grads and their mentees to go out and eat.

Ms. Kim said that as of that point, the deadline has passed, but they were in dire need of graduate students. She'd run through the sections they really need. They have 14 undergraduate Business majors interested in mentoring, but yet no graduate students; they have 13 undergraduate Economics majors but two graduate students; two undergraduate Computer Science majors, but no grads; and they have six people looking into pre-law, but no Boalt people. There were three Philosophy undergrads, but as of yet, no graduates; and they have three undergrad Asian Studies students but no grad student; three undergrad English students, but no grad. So those were the areas they needed. But mentors weren't limited to those areas. Ms. Kim said she would encourage grads to please do this.

A Delegate said she filled out the form but never heard anything back from the mentorship program. Ms. Kim said they were in the process of matching everyone up, and once they figure out how everything was laid out, they'd send out an e-mail. So grads should be hearing from the Mentorship Program by the Spring Semester.

Ms. Kim said she had applications that she could hand out.

Mr. Daniels said that on the feedback form, a line was included asking Delegates if they were interested in serving as a grad mentor, and people could also check that box and their name would be passed forward.

Ms. Kim said that all the information on the application was on the Web site, asuc.org. If people go to the Mentorship tab, they could download the application and the e-mail at mentorship@asuc.org. Also, if grads had any suggestions about how this could be publicized to grad students, she would ask them to please let them know.

Mr. Rajan asked how much of a time commitment this would be. Ms. Kim said they meet for an hour every month, just fun social events, where they come in and check in on the progress people have made, and how people were doing. Other than that, they have an initial welcoming and a final wrap-up banquet. That was it. The program didn't require people to meet outside of those times. They also could schedule time with mentees.

A Delegate asked when the events were. Ms. Kim said that all the dates were listed. If people had any questions on how to get the word out to grad students, she would ask them to please e-mail her at mentorship@asuc.org.

Continuing Announcements, Ms. ElNaggar said "The Berkeley Graduate" has hopefully gotten to GSOs. If Delegates didn't see them in their departments, there were some available at the meeting.

Mr. Daniels said he realized he hadn't talked about the handout as much as he needed to, and he wanted to clarify a few things. Hopefully, most of them got an e-mail about the Lower Sproul survey. Some of them probably tried to take the survey and failed, and were very confused and angry. Mr. Daniels said it was all his fault and he would sincerely apologize. It was the first time he's done a survey, so it actually was only accessible to a particular sample of students, ones who initially got the survey. The e-mail that was more widely sent was him wanting to be overaggressive and trying to get everyone to do it. He sent out an e-mail to everyone saying, not very clearly, that if they got the original e-mail, they could take the survey, and otherwise, to tell their friends. Mr. Daniels said it wasn't clear, so he got a number of very confused, sometimes annoyed e-mails. If their SID ended in a 0 or a 1, they should be eligible for the

survey. That's how the sample was done. However, if people wanted to participate, the GA was holding focus groups that were, in many ways, the meat of the process. The focus groups will be held January 29, 30, and 31, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, the third week of school. They're divided up according to different kinds of categories that were part of the Delegate feedback form. If they considered themselves someone who inhabited the Southside of campus, then the first one was a good check-off for them, versus people on the Northside. They also currently need the perspective of students with families, so they're doing a focus group at Albany Village and one on campus. He would ask international students to also please check-off that box. There was also a box for professional students, since they have different services offered in their departments than non-professional students. So they want to see what kinds of services these students want, or don't want. And lastly, for those students who were often forgotten, students who commute, if they take a bus, ride a bike, or do anything like that on a regular basis to come to school, it was important to hear from them, since they might need different services than a person who lived close to campus. So he would ask Delegates to fill the surveys out. And when they leave, he would ask them to please leave the surveys on the podium.

Also, Mr. Daniels said he forgot to add something to the feedback form. Last month the Career Center came to give a little presentation and wanted to put together an advisory group. An e-mail about that was sent two days ago, along with a reminder, and he should have added this as a check box. If people were interested in participating in an advisory group to figure out how to better connect the Career Center with graduate students, he would ask them to please write somewhere on the front of the sheet that they were interested in that. That would be very helpful. Mr. Daniels asked if there were any questions about the feedback form.

Ms. Dodson asked if there was a way for non-delegate graduate students to participate. Mr. Daniels said there was. As with departments, they'll probably send out an e-mail at the very beginning of the semester asking people to participate. They'll hold six or seven focus groups, with one of the categories possibly being cut. They're looking for eight to ten students, so they're looking at 50 or 60 grad students. So the more that Delegates could advertise this, that would be wonderful.

Ms. Wells asked if there was one person who was overseeing all these focus groups. Mr. Daniels said they were actually being put on by an architectural group. People from the GA will be there and were kind of working with that group on the process, but people from the architecture group will actually lead the meetings. If there were groups that Delegates felt needed a separate focus group that were not listed, he would ask them to please let him know because they have not officially finalized the list. This was kind of an informal list, something of a draft breakdown.

Mr. Daniels said one thing he has not done at the beginning of most meetings that might have been helpful was to have very quick, general remarks about where they were. They were at the end of the semester. Really more than anything, he just wanted to say "thank you," particularly for those students who have been there for every meeting. And particularly for those students who couldn't be there at every meeting but did their best to make it when they could, he wanted to thank them as well. He knew they were all really, really busy and that their time was incredibly precious. He appreciated their participation and he was sure their other fellow department mates appreciated it, and that their fellow Delegates appreciated it. So he wanted to thank them very much.

Mr. Daniels said the GA was able to fill a lot of committees that year and they got wonderful attendance. Usually the attendance kind of dropped off over time, and it certainly dropped off a little bit, but in

comparison to the past, he thought it's been excellent, and that was all because of the Delegates. Mr. Daniels said GA meetings have also ended on time, also because of Delegates. Their comments have been appropriate and not long-winded, like his tended to be. He thought that made for much better, more fun meetings. He thought that generally speaking, when issues like funding bills have come up, or when contentious Resolutions have come up, it really allowed the GA to have a full, in-depth discussion, one that they all participate in, and was reflective of the graduate student body as much as was reasonably possible. They were there to better graduate students' lives on the campus, in whatever way the GA saw that. Mr. Daniels said he hoped that looking back on the semester, Delegates felt they've done that in some small way, hopefully in a larger way. And if, for some reason, they felt that this has been a waste of time, he hoped that they come talk to him and complain, and tell him what he could do differently, or talk to somebody else. Because much better than Delegates leaving and giving up on the GA was for Delegates to stay and to make their voices heard, and to complain. So he wanted to thank them again for their attention and dedication. He really appreciated it.

On a last note, Mr. Daniels said that if people were on a committee, he would ask them to please stay with it. But if not, and they needed to change, that was fine too. They should just mark it down on their sheet.

REPORTS

Reporting as the ASUC representatives to the GA were Ms. Allbright and Mr. Law. Ms. Allbright introduced herself and said she was from the ASUC and was one of three representatives the ASUC now had to the Graduate Assembly. One rep, Sen. Asuncion, couldn't be there that evening because he was working on a group project. The new representative was Sen. Vincent Law. Mr. Law introduced himself and said he was a senior in Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science, a double major. He was actually going to be a graduate student next year at Berkeley, so he was taking a lot of interest in the GA at that time, so hopefully he and the GA will be able to work very well together with the Graduate Assembly and the ASUC. Ms. Allbright said being GA rep was a present the Senate gave Mr. Law for getting into grad school.

Ms. Allbright said they both brought business cards, so if Delegates were interested in talking to anyone in the ASUC about issues between the GA and the ASUC. She would leave the cards at the front.

Ms. Allbright said they would like to give the GA a quick update on some things the Senate has done. Mr. Law said that in November they allocated up to 30 student-led groups and organizations for projects and events, which the Senate was very happy about. Ms. Allbright said there was an impeachment trial for the Chief Justice of the ASUC Judicial Council, Sonya Banerjee, and the trial lasted from 10 p.m. until 7 a.m., or so. Ms. Banerjee was not removed. Mr. Law said that was fun. Also, the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee of the ASUC Senate, a standing committee, was cleaning up and clarifying some By-laws. Ms. Allbright said it sounded like something the GA was doing as well. The Senate also passed a bunch of issue-related Resolutions that past month. Some of the first they passed included the Sustainable Investment Resolution, like the one the GA passed at its last meeting. The Senate also passed a Resolution opposing Prop. 209, in honor of Prop. 209's ten-year anniversary. They also passed Resolutions supporting the people of Oaxaca, Mexico; supporting Cal football; supporting campus climate neutrality; and opposing police brutality in relation to recent taser incident at UCLA.

Mr. Law said the ASUC also received carryforward funding, money that was not spent from last year, \$151,000, which was carry forwarded to this year's spending. Some of the things they allocated that included a \$77,000 allocation to audit the ASUC in order to keep their non-profit status; to the Cal Band; to Spring Welcome Week, which was hopefully being initialized that coming spring; and also to Air-Bears expansion. There was still \$74,000 to be allocated, and that will be a fun thing to do. Ms. Allbright said that was all for their report, and she called for any questions.

Ms. Freedman asked why the Chief Justice was impeached. Ms. Allbright said a trial could be held at the request of any five Senators, and five Senators brought forth charges of malfeasance of duty. But the Chief Justice was ultimately found by the Senate to not be guilty of those charges. It was a very contentious vote, with people on both sides.

Mr. Orquenzo asked if they could explain something about the Resolution supporting the people of Oaxaca. Ms. Allbright said the bill was online and there were a lot of clauses. Mr. Law said that neither he nor Ms. Allbright authored the bill, but it should be on asuc.org.

Mr. Rajan asked about the elections issue. Ms. Allbright said they have one grad student on the Selection Committee for the Elections Council Chair Selection, but there was one more spot for a grad student. It's just for the committee that will meet until an Elections Council Chair was appointed. So it was a temporary committee. Mr. Daniels said there was one more seat for grad student on the Selection Committee for the Elections Council Chair. People could check that on their Delegate feedback form if they were interested in it.

Mr. Eckerle said he was the currently the outgoing External Affairs Vice President and he was graduating in a week with a Master's degree in Bioengineering. (Applause) It's been three and a half years, and Mr. Eckerle said he's been working in the GA that whole time. He was proud of the work they did in External Affairs. They helped the International Student Committee lobby on the State level for an end to non-resident tuition, or at least a fair usage of the fees. They hosted a debate series on campus about all the propositions on the ballot, and that was very successful, he thought, and was something he thought the GA should continue. And right now, they're set up and the elections were over, so they're ready to start lobbying the Governor and State Legislature for a fee freeze, a Cal Grant increase, and for a better way to diversify admissions procedurally, which wasn't doing well at UCs at that time. Mr. Eckerle said they're also working with the Graduate Division to get some questions for the GA on a survey, for all graduate students, so they could start to find out what they expect the GA to do. Right now, it was the Delegates that kind of decided, and Mr. Eckerle said he thought it would be good to get some campus feedback. He was going to suggest his replacement be Gavi Begtrup, who was working as Legislative Liaison. Mr. Eckerle said that while he was working on his thesis, Mr. Begtrup has been doing a lot of work, so he knew what was going on. And if that change occurred, then Mr. Begtrup's job would be available. Mr. Eckerle said he would encourage anyone interested in his job, or Mr. Begtrup's job, to talk to them, and maybe they could set them up for next semester.

Mr. Daniels asked if these were paid positions. Mr. Eckerle said they were both paid positions. Mr. Begtrup was the Legislative Liaison on the External Affairs team there was also a Vice President and a Campus Organizing Director, interfacing mainly with students. The Legislative Liaison interfaced mainly with lawmakers. At some point the two positions shall meet, usually in April, in Sacramento, and hopefully, many, many times during the year. He wanted to thank them. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said that for those who have been around for a while, Mr. Eckerle has been an amazing, dedicated Delegate, Vice President, and part of the GA. He will be very much missed.

Reporting for the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Agarwal said that Ms. Cementwala, the Vice President, was ill and called him an hour ago and said she couldn't attend the meeting that evening. The person she works with was the Campus Committee Liaison, who mainly did committee work, both assigning students to committees or just liaisoning with students on the committees. It's a 10 to 12 hour-per-week job, at \$14 an hour, and was vitally important, since committees were how grads had their say. Academic Senate committees and GA committees were extremely important. And if GA committees didn't have quorum, or if the GA did not have representation on Academic Senate committees, and to that extent, with admission as well, they simply could not do their jobs. So if people were interested and had time next semester, 10 or 12 hours a week, he would ask them to please let him know, or let Ms. Cementwala know, at aavp@ga.berkeley.edu. He called for any questions about that.

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Mr. Jimenez said that on the back of the Funding Advisor's report were the recommended funding allocations for the next funding round, for the month of January. There was a mistake on the sheet. If they look at the College Ski & Snowboard Club, that recommended allocation should be zero. From the application the group wrote, it didn't seem they were actually a grad student group. So with that amendment to the spreadsheet, they were actually able to fund 100 percent of recommended funds for this round, which had to do with the fact that it was a short round. But it also helped that the GA increased these funds at the last meeting of the GA. And thankfully, there was enough carryover from what could have been spent last month that will then feed the following rounds. So hopefully the cuts will be a lot less in the future. Mr. Jimenez called for any questions.

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS WAS MADE AND SECONDED. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ROUND 4 OF GRADUATE EVENTS FUNDING, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Reporting for the Foreign Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Stavrinos said he would like to give the GA a report on an event the GA decided to fund. But before doing that, Mr. Stavrinos said he would like to thank Mr. Eckerle for his help that semester, especially for arranging for the participation of the white lining at the UC Regents meeting at Los Angeles, where Mr. Stavrinos said he lobbied about foreign student affairs issues. If people get the chance to go to a Regents meeting, they shouldn't miss it, as it was an interesting experience.

Mr. Stavrinos said that at the last GA meeting, Foreign Student Affairs Committee requested some funding to host a reception for international students, which was open to every student. The reception was very successful, with more than 200 people attending. It was a huge turnout and they ran out of food. Mr. Stavrinos said he would like to thank the Finance Committee for approving the funding, and wanted to thank the GA, and everybody who attended, and thank people for publicizing the event. One important detail was that they didn't use all the funds that were allocated, so they returned some money to the GA. He wanted to thank them very much.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions. Mr. Purdy said that since the reception was to serve as outreach between the GA and foreign students, he asked how many GA Delegates and members of the Executive Board attended. A show of hands was conducted for Delegates and Executive Board members who attended.

Mr. Daniels said they had cake that they wouldn't cut until 7:30, so if people were interested in having some cake, as a thank you for the semester, and as a good holiday wish, they had to stay until the very end. He promised they'd end at 7:30, or 7:35.

FUNDING APPEAL -- Berkeley Chinese Student and Scholar Association

Mr. Daniels said they had a packet of information about the funding appeal, including the order they'd follow. He would simply give a quick background. The funding for the Berkeley Chinese Student and Scholar Association had been approved by the Funding Committee for Round 2. However, because of an incident at the actual event, which the GA would hear about, and which the Funding Committee subsequently learned about, the Committee decided to not allow the reimbursement of funds for the day of the event, as well as to deny the group funding for Round 3. So that was the consequence of the experience the GA would hear about.

Mr. Daniels said the group has appealed the decision, through lots of different processes, and was present. The decision would be made by a vote of the Delegates; so if they were not a Delegate or Alternate, they could not vote. When they have closed Delegate deliberations, if people were not a Delegate or Alternate, they would need to step out of the room.

A Delegate asked if he could explain the GA's role, and if this involved an employee, or a student, and what they were supposed to be doing. Mr. Daniels said there will be time for questions, and if that hasn't been addressed, he would ask her to please raise the question at that time.

Mr. Daniels asked if there were any procedural questions about how this would work, or the roles people would play. Questions were only allowed by Delegates, or if a Delegate ceded the floor. He would apologize and ask people to please keep the back and forth from going on, and would ask them to raise their hands. People could ask a question, and if they wanted a follow-up question, they'd have to raise their hands again. He didn't want to be rude, but in order to keep things civil, in case things became uncivil, he would be fairly strict with that.

Ms. Stevens-Carter asked if they wanted her to tell the story again. She typed it all up, to give people a chance to read it. Mr. Daniels said it was in the agenda packet.

Ms. Stevens-Carter said she was the Funding Advisor, a full-time employee at the GA, and her job was to educate groups on funding, on finding funding, and to also attend events, which was something new for her position. Historically, the GA has not sent the Funding Advisor out to events, and she'd like them to know that the events she's attended have been wonderful. This specific event was advertised, and when the Funding Committee looked at the event, they requested that the group advertise on Sproul Plaza the day before, or the day of the event, two fliers, they wanted it to be advertised.

Ms. Stevens-Carter said she went to the event and took her two children. Her daughter is 5'11", she's usually there, and her son was 5'2", and was really big. So to call them "children," they wouldn't miss them, they're really large people. Ms. Stevens-Carter said she attempted to gain entrance to the event and presented her badge, because the two people there stared at her, like "What do you want?" She showed them her badge and said she was the Funding Advisor. One person said, "So?", and Ms. Stevens-Carter said she thought, "Oh, I have a problem." That's never happened before, anywhere. Her son instantly said "They don't want us here," and she said "Maybe it might feel that way right now. Stand over there and I'll get us into the event."

So Ms. Stevens-Carter said she subsequently paid for tickets. The Treasurer came out and recognized her. Ms. Stevens-Carter said she told her what happened and the Treasurer apologized, and said they didn't understand, they didn't know. Ms. Stevens-Carter said she explained to the Treasurer that the group received a Diversity Grant, and the people serving other people should know how to present, and should know these things. The Treasurer apologized, and said, "Really, they don't know."

Ms. Stevens-Carter said she was okay with that. She introduced the Treasurer to her kids, told them a story, and they were fine. The Treasurer brought them a bag of moon cake, tied it in a bag, and gave her money back for the tickets, because the tickets were for when people there voted on who was the best singer. Ms. Stevens-Carter said she was fine with things.

They went to go in and two guys were standing at the door talking, and they said, "Hey, you can't go in there with that food. You're going to eat it." Ms. Stevens-Carter said she wasn't eating anything and she got a little frustrated, because again, it was like "We don't want you in here." When she got in, there were maybe 50 people, total, for the whole event. Out of that, there were four Caucasians and three African Americans, the three of them who had to force their way in. The whole event was done in Chinese. The only English words that were spoken were "Graduate Assembly," and she thought they were acknowledging that the GA had funded the event. She sat for almost two hours, and during the whole event, and it never went into English. Her kids asked when they'd speak English, and she told them they were learning something from this. She thought the performances were nice. So after two hours, they left.

When she returned back to the GA she reported that this had occurred, and that really, it wasn't appropriately funded as a Diversity Grant event. It was not appropriate for anyone to encounter that type of resistance to go into an event, because no groups, since she's been doing this, have done that to her at all. She didn't take her son anymore to events. She had the fliers for the events, and they were all in Chinese. And she was accosted on the 13th, when she was doing a funding workshop, by the group's President, who again, sat there and told her she didn't know what she was talking about, and that these things didn't happen.

Ms. Stevens-Carter said she was deeply offended at the group President's behavior. He hadn't addressed him about the issue, and she didn't bring the issue up. They were doing a workshop. But to tell her she didn't know what she was talking about deeply concerned her, and she thought the group would need to have diversity training and need to understand what was appropriate and what wasn't. If people had questions, they could ask them.

Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank her for the statement. The GA would next hear from Mr. Hernandez.

On a point of information, Mr. Daal asked about Diversity Grants and their purpose. Mr. Daniels said Mr. Jiminez would speak next and could address that.

Mr. Jiminez said it was interesting, because in the By-laws, there really wasn't recognition of a "Diversity Grant," and it was one of those things that people tend to think they know exactly what it is, but it wasn't very clear. The way they were interpreting "Diversity Grants" was to promote underrepresented minorities, groups, or communities at the University, but also to have these events also encourage interaction between that minority and other groups at the University. The purpose of Diversity Grants was actually to integrate groups a little more and to learn a little more about different groups' cultures, agendas, and points of view. That was one goal of an education there at Berkeley.

Mr. Jiminez said that just to follow-up on what Ms. Stevens-Carter said, as he wrote in his statement, Ms. Stevens-Carter actually did not report this incident to the GA. She put it in one of her little reports for every event she goes to, and she mentioned it to a couple of people in the GA Business Office and to some Funding Committee members. So Mr. Jiminez said he first heard about it second hand. So he talked to Ms. Stevens-Carter and tried to figure out what had happened, and thought there was a serious concern. So he initiated a process through e-mail and contacted the Funding Committee. They discussed a little about how they could respond and what they should do.

Mr. Jiminez said the Funding Committee discussed some of the issues Ms. Stevens-Carter brought up, such as the language, and how appropriate that was, and the Committee decided that, in fact, the language of the event maybe shouldn't have mattered, per se, because it was part of adding diversity to the campus. But they did agree that the posters and other types of publicity should not just have been in the language of the community, because otherwise, nobody who didn't actually read that language would attend. So that was one point of contention. But they did recognize that the event was being held the day after a general body meeting, which meant that the group did not know whether they would get funding for the event or what restrictions might come with the funding. So Mr. Jiminez said he understood there was clearly a turnaround time. Groups must publicize, but then, they may actually not be able to do it as prescribed if there was not a 24-hour turnaround.

Mr. Jiminez said he wanted to address the response that Ms. Stevens-Carter wrote up, because there clearly was an issue. The Funding Committee discussed the issue of what happened, he consulted people, and they decided the consequence Mr. Daniels mentioned would be an appropriate response, to nullify expenses the Funding Committee awarded for the October 6 event, both the Diversity Grant funding and the Grad Student funding, since the event received two types of funding. The Funding Committee also decided that it would be appropriate to bar the group from eligibility of funding for the next funding round. The Funding Committee came to this conclusion and invited the group to a meeting.

Mr. Jiminez said the Funding Committee talked to the group, and he did sort of launch into what concerned them, to the consequence, and he did not let the group speak, which was an error on his part. However, they then got into a huge sort of feedback loop, where the group started to try to bargain with him and the other Committee members in attendance, Johanna Franklin, and what he got from that was basically that the word of one person was being taken over somebody else. He thought the group's statement spoke to that. Mr. Jiminez said he tried to explain to the group, as he did in his written statement, that with Ms. Stevens-Carter, this was really kind of a special case. Ms. Stevens-Carter wasn't just a person who walked off the street and complained about how she was treated. She was a representative, an agent of the GA, who supplied the Funding Committee with a wealth of information regarding

everything that groups do on campus. She was also a non-voting member of the Funding Committee. So that was another thing altogether. And Ms. Stevens-Carter was also an employee of the Graduate Assembly, meaning she was Delegates' employee, everybody there. He said that because he really wanted to point out that Ms. Stevens-Carter's voice, in fact, was not like everybody else's. Nobody's voice there was like anybody else's, and thought that holding this position in the GA structure, that she would actually be accorded a little bit more credibility than if someone just came off the street and made this allegation. Thus, Mr. Jiminez said the Funding Committee found that it could actually, indeed, act on what Ms. Stevens-Carter said.

As their employee, Mr. Jiminez said he also thought that the GA had the responsibility to protect Ms. Stevens-Carter from harm that she was exposed to in the duties of her job and in the way she carries out her role as the GA's agent on campus.

Peng Li said he would first apologize to Ms. Stevens-Carter and to the GA about all the incidents that caused Ms. Stevens-Carter to be very sad. But he thought everything was because of a misunderstanding and because of people's cultures and languages. First of all, he would explain about the incidents of the day. For those who don't know, the Moon Festival was one of the largest festivals of the Chinese, and was like Thanksgiving or Christmas to people in the US. Most of them in the group came from Mainland China and got bachelor's degrees there, and came here for maybe two months and don't speak English as their mother language. So their English was really bad at times, and they haven't spoken English much. So sometimes when they do, they can't understand what others were saying. So he thought that should be understandable. They were trying their best to improve that. Also, there were cultural differences between Chinese people, US people, and all other races. People might sometimes think it was improper to laugh or smile or to say something or to keep silent. All of that happened on that day.

Mr. Li, BCSSA President, said that when Ms. Stevens-Carter came in, he went to the table, and two of the group's volunteers, Haohui Zhang and JingQin Su, were there to collect money for tickets. And actually, they didn't really know Ms. Stevens-Carter, and they didn't know the GA that much. Mr. Li said he also regretted that he wasn't involved very much before with the GA, and he'd try his best to listen to them in the future. Mr. Li said he talked to the two volunteers and they told him that Ms. Stevens-Carter came in and said something like, "I'm the Funding Advisor." But they had no idea what that meant. They were new students there and didn't speak English, and they needed to clarify something. So as Chinese people, they talked to each other in Chinese because they couldn't speak or think that fast in English, and when they need to elaborate something, they don't talk to each other in English. Apparently, they really didn't know who Ms. Stevens-Carter was. So they discussed it. Because she showed her ID, they treated her as a UC student, an employee in graduate student government. Later, when Treasurer Qi came in and saw Ms. Stevens-Carter, and she recognized them. Also, when Ms. Stevens-Carter tried to go into the classroom, because it's University policy to not allow food in classrooms, and mooncake there, they gave a box of mooncake to Ms. Stevens-Carter and nobody else. So they initially just tried to prevent everyone from taking boxes into the classroom. That was also the case why she was originally asked not to go into the classroom with her box.

Mr. Li said he wasn't there all the time, but he heard things from his members at the last meeting with Ms. Stevens-Carter and giving a funding application. He thanked her for the funding, but he was pretty sure he didn't say anything like she didn't know what she was saying. In that instance, he was pretty sure about that. Everything was because of a misunderstanding and difference of cultures. There was definitely no discrimination, and he could promise that. And there will be no such thing in the future.

Mr. Daniels said they would have questions, and if their question was directed to a particular person, he would ask them to please state that. They would have ten minutes of questioning, and for the record, he would ask people to please state their name.

Ms. Ahrendt said she would like to thank all three of them for their presentations. This was a highly charged issue, so she would like to remind the Delegates of what was exactly at issue. She believed the President of the Berkeley Chinese Student and Scholar Association was truly sincere in his apologies. As they noticed, in their latest funding issues, the group has, indeed, gotten \$500 funding for the next round. So that issue has been resolved. And this group has received a lot of funding in the past. So to just boil it down, the first question was whether or not the group fulfilled the contingencies of the funding, i.e., did they have the number of people at the event they were supposed to; did they do everything that GA funding asked them to do in order for the group to be able to receive the funding. That's the only question that needed to be answered.

Mr. Daniels asked who she was addressing. Ms. Ahrendt said the question was to Mr. Jiminez. Some vague contingencies were mentioned, and she would like to clarify that because that was the non-emotional and technical side of this issue.

On a point of information, Mr. Daal said that Mr. Jiminez mentioned that the group received both a Diversity Grant and Grad Events funding. He asked how much of each was received. Mr. Daniels said that could be asked as the next question. But at that time, he would ask Mr. Jiminez to answer Ms. Ahrendt's question.

Mr. Jiminez said the stipulation was that the group had to actually publicize the event to make sure it was diverse, because it seemed to be an inner-directed event.

Mr. Daal asked how much of each category of funding the group received. Mr. Jiminez said that for the Diversity Grant the group received \$1,000, and for Grad Events, it was \$300. Zhenzhen Qi said it was for a series of events.

Ms. Franklin said she could address the attendance from the application that Mr. Jiminez brought with him.

Mr. Purdy asked Ms. Stevens-Carter if other events she may have attended that were not in English. He asked if this event was different in that from other events that she may have attended that were in, e.g., Korean or Japanese. Ms. Stevens-Carter said it was different. Every event she's gone to that had a different language had subtitles and there was someone there who would acknowledge things in English and understand what people were asking. So when she identified herself, most groups knew from the e-mails they received that someone from the GA was coming, so it's not a secret that she was going to be there. At this event, the people also did not really acknowledge her, and it was like she was invisible in a crowd of people. Ms. Stevens-Carter said Ms. Franklin came, and Ms. Stevens-Carter said she was the one person she was happy to see, because Ms. Franklin spoke to her in English, aside from her two kids, who asked if they could go outside and leave. So this was considerably different from any event she's been to.

Mr. Daniels said he wanted to remind everyone that the reason to deny funding was the treatment that Ms. Stevens-Carter received at the event, so the issues of fulfilling the criteria were somewhat secondary. The main issue was her treatment.

Ms. Wells said she would try to go to the more difficult, emotional side, which was to perhaps pin down a question to Ms. Stevens-Carter, what it was that made this a racist incident. Ms. Stevens-Carter said there was a difference between racism and discrimination. Ms. Wells said she would clarify her question. She asked what, in Ms. Stevens-Carter's view, was the nature of the unfair treatment. Ms. Stevens-Carter said that first, she was qualified to teach diversity. When one experiences discrimination, as any ethnic identification, such as when one walks into a room and people stop and stare at them, then one was an object. When one walks to a counter and people don't want to speak to them, even people who didn't speak English can be kind enough to acknowledge them. Ms. Stevens-Carter said she was never acknowledged until she forced that on them. She actually never had to force that on people before. Berkeley was a place of education, not a place where she was trying to force people to acknowledge her. No other group has ever done that. And it wasn't only to her. She tried to downplay it. She had two children with her, and instantly they caught it, that "They don't want us here." That was the feeling.

Ms. Wells asked if people from the group barred entry. Ms. Stevens-Carter said they didn't bar entry until she pushed to go into the room to actually try to see the event, and people from the group said they couldn't go in. That was the second time, when her kids said, "Why don't we just leave. They don't want us there." They went outside to eat because they weren't welcomed inside, where everybody else was eating. It was not a very good feeling. It didn't feel good when they knew people didn't want them there.

Ms. Qi introduced herself and said she was the Treasurer of the club, BCSSA, and was wondering if it was proper for her to participate in the Q&A. She wasn't sure if Ms. Stevens-Carter has been to any other of the group's events other than this one. Mr. Daniels said that Ms. Qi could respond to a question, but couldn't ask Ms. Stevens-Carter a direct question. Ms. Qi said that from her interaction with Ms. Stevens-Carter, she felt this was the first event Ms. Stevens-Carter attended, which was based so intensively on Chinese culture. Ms. Qi said she's spent a month kind of lamenting about the people who talked to Ms. Stevens-Carter at the event. The lady who sold the ticket to Ms. Stevens-Carter, Jingquin Su, wrote in her testimony that Ms. Stevens-Carter came to her. She was a transfer student, an undergrad, and when she was spoke to Ms. Stevens-Carter that night, she had been to this campus for only a couple of months. So when Ms. Stevens-Carter said she was the Funding Advisor, Ms. Su mistook that to be the financial aid advisor and she asked herself why this lady was telling her, at the club's event, that she was a financial aid officer, and wondering what she should do. She didn't know what she was supposed to do. And she questioned if she actually heard Ms. Stevens-Carter right, because of her very limited language. She came to Berkeley to actually speak to people in English. To just clarify, to make sure she heard it right, Ms. Su turned around and asked if she heard it correctly, that Ms. Stevens-Carter was a financial aid advisor. But the person she asked said her English was worse than hers, and said she didn't understand a word. She's a post-doc at UC Berkeley and wasn't going to class.

Ms. Wells said that in all respect she felt her question wasn't answered. If there were people in the room, and this person was not allowed in for that reason, she asked Ms. Qi felt her group was unfairly discriminating. Mr. Li said there were actually no people who were allowed to eat in that classroom. The classroom does not allow any food, and that's the reason they tried to deny people with food from being inside the classroom.

Mr. Wolgin asked what authority the GA had to actually revoke funding from a group that they've granted funding to, because there was nothing that he saw in the By-laws that would allow the GA to revoke funding once they've allocated it. Mr. Jiminez said they were given the responsibility to allocate funds, and he would think it would be logical for someone with that responsibility to be given responsibility to

take action the other way, which was part of the reason for the reimbursement process. Because otherwise they could just give checks out to people. But they don't, partly because it was University policy to engage in this reimbursement procedure, and partly because the GA also did have oversight and control over how its money was used, and was ultimately responsible as to the money was used. So because they need to maintain control over how it's disbursed, they could always stop it.

Ms. Constantinides, for clarification, asked if it was correct that it wasn't in the By-laws that they could actually take funding away. Ms. Ahrendt said it didn't have to be specifically mentioned in the By-laws. Mr. Daniels said that if there was disagreement about that fact, they could debate it during deliberations.

Ms. Constantinides asked if, before this whole situation exploded, the group was contacted to have a conversation about it, or if it just exploded off the bat. Mr. Jiminez said they discussed it. Ms. Constantinides asked if they had a conversation. Mr. Jiminez said it was clear in his statement that when they went to have a conversation with the group, they went to say there was this problem, what the situation was, and that this was what would be done about it. Ms. Constantinides asked if it wasn't, however, a conversation, with members of the group not allowed to talk. Mr. Jiminez said they could talk, and they talked for quite a while. What he wanted to point out about the other procedural issue, and the power to revoke funding, was that when the GA allocated funds, they also gave reasons why funds weren't allocated, and that routinely meant that they could actually decide not give funding to groups. There might be a different quality to not initially grant funding, and revoking funding later on. But to him, it seemed to be part and parcel of the same authority. That's something they could debate.

Mr. Li said the first time he heard about the whole thing was when he was asked to come to the office and was told him that the group was being punished by having its funding revoked. Before that, they were not talked to by anybody, and they actually thought there was no serious issue before that.

Ms. Freedman said she had one suggestion about questions dealing with the By-laws. Mr. Daniels said By-law questions could be addressed when they have deliberations.

Ms. Freedman said she had a question for Ms. Franklin, and asked if she could tell them about the difference in the people in the room, and if she could clarify the point about food earlier, and if there was a separate room for food. Ms. Franklin said she was the other Funding Committee member who was at the event, the only voting Funding Committee member there. She couldn't stay for the event, but when she was there, it mostly took place in 155 Dwinelle, and that caught her interest because she the course she worked for in the semester was in Dwinelle. So she stopped by to see how things were going, especially because members had stopped by the Funding Committee. The event was held at one of the main classrooms in Dwinelle. There's a large lobby, with large auditoriums to the left and to the right. The event was held on the right. When she was there she saw people eating and milling about. Her guess was that the main event actually took place in the classroom, and that was where the food couldn't pass. She wasn't there for that. But that would be her guess.

Mr. Daniels said they had time for one more question, and then he'd talk about procedure and they'd decide where to go from there.

Ms. Rowen said she was curious how this came about, from the time that Ms. Stevens-Carter she wrote it in the report, and how the Funding Committee made its decision, whether the purpose was punitive, to punish the group, or preventative, so that if event was held again, it was advertised correctly. Mr. Jiminez

said Ms. Stevens-Carter put this in one of her write-ups, and from that, and from other people who communicated with him, they decided to have a conversation online about what should be done. And through that conversation, that's how the decision came about. The intent was preventative, but clearly, it was also punitive.

Ms. Rowen asked if it was clear to the group what all the rules of a Diversity Grant event were when they applied for funding. It was mentioned that there was a Committee meeting, and a short turnaround. Mr. Jiminez said the rules for Diversity events were basically what appeared in the facesheet of the grant and in the By-laws. And they don't specify what it was. So he thought that was part of the issue, overall. But they do sort of all subscribe to the accessibility and non-discrimination clauses of the University and the By-laws of the GA. So it was in all the rules they abide by. Ms. Stevens-Carter said discrimination was dealt with in the funding rules and how there were consequences. But it was vague as to what the consequences were, and just acknowledged that there should be no discrimination.

Mr. Daniels said a motion could be made to extend time for questioning. That would mean that the 7:30 deadline to end the meeting would be extended by that much time as well. So he'd keep them past 7:30. If no motion was made, they would go directly to deliberations. Ms. Ahrendt moved to extend speaking time by one minute. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daal said it occurred to him that as a student group, they were also under the laws and rules of the Office of Student Life. He asked if they had any diversity statements. Mr. Jiminez said they did.

A Delegate she almost got clarity, and asked if the reps could respond to whether they felt it seemed like Ms. Stevens-Carter had some good points, or if they really felt things were not at all discriminatory towards Ms. Stevens-Carter. Mr. Li said he didn't. He didn't think it was discrimination and said it was just a misunderstanding, and miscommunication. There were also several things he wanted to say. Regarding the number of people there, Ms. Stevens-Carter said there were only 50 people, but there were 500 people. The classroom could hold up to 440 people, and a lot of people left in the middle, and others came in. He recalled about 100 people came in late.

Mr. Daniels said that again, time had expired. They would not end the meeting at 7:31. He asked if people would like to extend the meeting longer and continue questioning. If so, they could make a motion, and if not, they'd move directly to deliberations. A motion to extend questions by one minute was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Ms. Moody asked about the capacity of the room Ms. Franklin taught in. Ms. Franklin said it was almost exactly 500. Ms. Moody asked Ms. Stevens-Carter if she felt people in the group understood her request when she spoke to them, or if they understood and were purposefully uncooperative. Ms. Stevens-Carter said there was a third woman who understood her very well. The two other women started laughing and it was the third person who told them to stop laughing. So they understood her and they just spoke to her very well in English. So she didn't see that they didn't understand her. Her issue remained with this group. She thought they needed to learn about diversity. The University had a lot of different people to do that. Ms. Stevens-Carter said her recommendation was never to not fund the group, but rather, to fund them contingent upon the whole group taking a diversity program to understand this was how it worked, so they could never say they didn't understand.

Mr. Daniels said speaking time had expired, and he would only take motions to extend for five-minute intervals. Hearing no motion to extend speaking time, he called for a motion to move into closed session.

It was so moved and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. Mr. Daniels said he would ask all people other than Delegates, members of the Funding Committee, and Ms. Stevens-Carter, to step outside. He asked Ms. Jones to please monitor that. This meeting entered into closed session.

Back in open session, Mr. Daniels said that in the extended deliberations, the motion was made to extend time for the meeting until 7:50. So that was their deadline. After they deal with this issue, they'd talk about whether they had time for the Resolutions.

Mr. Daniels said he was informed that they could not make any decision officially in closed session, so that meant he would read the motion. The motion would take another voice-vote of the Delegates.

Mr. Daniels said the motion to settle the funding appeal was as follows: The \$304 from Grad Events and the \$1,000 from Diversity Grants, would not be reimbursed, unless, at the next available BCSSA general body meeting, which must include all the leaders of the group, someone, an appropriate person from the Office of Student Life, would come to the meeting and engage in diversity training for the necessary length of time.

Mr. Daniels said the GA President would attend the meeting to ensure that the diversity training happened and to make sure all leaders of the group were there. If that happened at the next available Board meeting, the group would be reimbursed. If that did not happen, the group would not be reimbursed. To make that official, the GA needed to take a vote in open session.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION OF THE BCSSA FUNDING APPEAL PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said the funding appeal was settled in that manner and the issue was closed. He would like to thank everybody.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Daniels said they were four minutes from closing, according to the schedule they set. They had Resolutions and budgetary amendments to consider, although he knew of only one that was pressing, the first one, to fund the Lower Sproul survey, which will end on Monday. If they don't approve granting the money they'd be stuck in a situation.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to table the Resolutions until the February GA meeting, and to immediately vote on the budgetary amendment. The motion was seconded. Mr. Daniels said they would do one at a time.

THE MOTION TO TABLE RESOLUTIONS UNTIL THE FEBRUARY MEETING, ITEMS VIII. B) THROUGH E), PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following budgetary amendment was authored by Mr. Daniels and the Graduate Student Committee on Lower Sproul:

A BUDGETARY AMENDMENT TO FUND THE LOWER SPROUL SURVEY

To amend the 2006-07 Budget to change new line item "Lower Sproul," under "Dues & Subscriptions," from \$0 to \$1,000. This would fund the Graduate Student Committee on Lower Sproul's survey of the graduate student body on their opinions on Lower Sproul and its redevelopment. This amount will come from the unused funds from the 2005-06 year.

Mr. Daniels said they would next vote on the motion to move directly to a vote on the budgetary amendment to fund the Lower Sproul survey. Ms. Constantinides objected, and said she would like a breakdown of the amount in the amendment. Ms. Nakogawara said that one iPod Shuffle was about \$80, and they were buying three. They're asking for \$265. Ms. Constantinides asked about the rest of the amount. Mr. Daniels said it was to pay the Office of Student Research to set up the survey. Hearing no further discussion, he was assuming the objection was withdrawn.

Hearing no further objection, Mr. Daniels said the GA would vote on the budgetary amendment to fund the Lower Sproul survey. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BUDGETARY AMENDMENT TO FUND THE LOWER SPROUL SURVEY PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank them for being so wonderful and staying an extra 20 minutes. He wanted to thank them for a great semester and hoped they had a great break. He would ask them to please tell their friends to fill out the survey, and to please fill out the feedback form.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to adjourn. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

This meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

[Roster unavailable.]