

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 2, 2006

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting commenced the Spring Semester and was called to order 5:30 p.m.

Announcements

A social science colloquium was scheduled for February 28, 5:00 to 9:00, for networking social science fields/research.

The UC Student Association's Student Lobby Conference will be held February 25 - 27, with Lobby Day on the 27th.

UAW 2865, the grads' union will start to bargain for a new contract and was doing a survey to learn of grads' priorities in bargaining.

A request was made for people to participate in guerilla theater about administrators getting themselves pay increases to remain at market rate.

A request was made for people interested in working on organizing a panel discussion about the politicization of science and the issue of science and religion.

The Grad Social Club will have its first meeting that semester on February 8, to brainstorm ideas for the semester.

"The Berkeley Graduate" was looking for staff for the Spring Semester.

Class Pass Referendum

The new proposal Class Pass will, if passed, include Bear Transit as part of the plan. LBNL buses would also be incorporated and available for students to use. Students currently pay \$37.40 a semester for the Class Pass. This would go up to \$58.50 for the first three years and then go up incrementally. An AC Transit pass costs \$70 a month. If it's not approved, students would not have a Class Pass. There would also be service enhancements, including late-night service and additional next-bus service. Grads receiving fee waivers wouldn't pay for the Class Pass.

Faculty Mentoring Award

The Award recognizes Berkeley faculty who show an outstanding commitment to mentoring, developing, and supporting graduate student researchers. Three awards will be given out that year, \$1,000 to the faculty recipients. This is a GA project, and a request was made for Delegates to participate. The nomination deadline was March 10

Presentation by ASUC Attorney Mark Himmelstein

The GA entered into closed session to discuss autonomy issues with ASUC attorney Mark Himmelstein.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 2 -

Back in open session, a discussion was held about various options: (A) The status quo; (B) Total autonomy; and (C) Continued negotiations with the ASUC on major sticking points; and (D) independence within the ASUC.

It was noted that people have been working on this issue for three years, and to vote on strategies to take was not seen as necessary. It was suggested that written information on the options be provided, with pros and cons. With no objection, the discussion of GA autonomy was tabled.

Recreational Sports Facility update

Use of the YMCA in Berkeley was free for all grad students that week. Students were negotiating with RSF administration to restructure its financial situation. The membership fee was currently \$65. The idea was for next year to have membership at \$10-15, with a \$30-40 mandatory fee. For students on financial aid, fellowships, and Pell Grants, the mandatory fee would count towards the financial aid allotment. As part of a referendum on this, which would occur in April, the GA was demanding that students be surveyed at least once a year, present survey results, and show a plan to respond to problems. A third option could be to decrease membership fees to \$10-15 with a mandatory fee of \$30-40. If passed, the change in fees would mean the RSF would receive a little more, and it could mean expanded hours and more money to fix equipment. Last year the membership fee was \$35. In two years it would be \$75, and \$90 in four years.

Report from the Business Director

Spending for 05-06, as of December 31, was on target, and they were not overspending. The Funding Advisor was on leave until February 13. In the 05-06 budget, the Finance Committee approved \$150,000 to be awarded to student groups and the Travel Grant. Funding deadlines for the Spring Semester were February 17, March 17, and April 21. People could sign up to receive the GA's electronic newsletter from the Funding Advisor.

Officers' Reports

For the President's report, the GA had planned to renovate 440 Stephens Hall for grads' use, but Grad Division took back the check it gave for that. The GA was working with Dean Mason to get the money back. Work has been completed on the online funding system, which should be live by next week.

For the Academic Affairs Vice President's report, Delegates were urged to get the grad student vote out for the Class Pass. The Executive Board recommended that the GA strongly support the Class Pass referendum and oppose the Career Referendum, to move the facility to a new location, across the street from Eshleman. The Referendum would have mandatory student fees used, for the first time, to pay for the lease of commercial space. The proposed move came from a recommendation of the Student Fee Committee that the Center be moved to a more central location to the campus.

A request was made for a Delegate to sit on the Campus Life Safety Committee, a joint faculty, staff, administrative committee overseeing mandatory student fee for seismic and fire safety improvements. Eshleman, e.g., was rated seismically poor.

With no objection, the GA approved the endorsement of the Class Pass Referendum and voted to oppose the Career Center Referendum.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

For the External Affairs Vice President's report, aides of the Governor asked to meet with the UCSA, and the Governor has proposed a fee freeze for graduate, professional, and undergraduate students. Students greatly had to get that through the Legislature, and there will be a Lobby Conference on Monday, February 27, in Sacramento.

Committee Reports

The Finance Committee approved an interactive budgeting process to get more feedback from units and projects.

The Funding Committee reported, and the GA approved the Committee's recommendations for Round 3 of Grants funding, Round 2 of Projects and Services funding, and Round 5 of Graduate Events funding.

For the report from the GA's Graduate Council reps, a meeting was held with the Grad Division. They dealt with affordable housing and extensions around funding to be given to women and men who have children. The campus had a more liberal policy than the GA had been aware of. Also discussed the possibility to making more standardized the language test process that was a part of degree requirements. Currently, each department had its own process.

The Organization and Rules Committee finally had a meeting, although they were short of a quorum. Per a request by the Executive Board, it was looking into changing the election date for GA Officers from May to April in order to provide for more transition time.

It was noted that every department had to have at least one Delegate on a GA committee.

The Environmental Sustainability Committee was newly created, and will focus on internal GA operations, GA-funded groups, and other groups on campus that might also have sustainability issues. A call was made for additional members.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the Environmental Sustainability Committee passed with no objection.

Mr. Fisher asked if anybody was present from the GSI/GSR Committee. This was a GA committee that no one was on, and the Chair just resigned. So if anybody was willing to step up to the plate, it would look astounding on their CD and resumé.

Mr. Fisher asked if anybody present was on the Affirmative Action Committee, another Committee that desperately needed to get up and running. It was going last semester, but he hasn't heard from the Chair in many months, and neither have the members. So they kind of need to get that going again. This and the GSI/GSR Committee have important issues. If Delegates have an interest in being a part of this, they all get his e-mails and know his address.

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

There were openings on the ASUC Judicial Council that grad students could apply for. A settlement was approved by the J-Council between the Senate and the current Executive Vice President that invalidates

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 4 -

last year's MOU, since it was never on the ballot. The GA still owed the ASUC for elections debts, which was part of autonomy negotiations.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Lola Odusanya at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Odusanya said she would like to welcome everybody back for the Spring Semester and would like to wish them a Happy New Year. She was glad to see everybody there and hoped they had a good break.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Odusanya said people should take some time to look through the agenda, and called for a motion to approve it. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Odusanya said people should have read the December meeting minutes online. She called for a motion to approve them. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 1, 2005 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Tassoff said he was there to give a quick advertisement for an event he and some students were putting on, a social science colloquium on February 28, from 5:00 to 9 p.m. The motivation for the event was because in social science fields, people often work on and do research on the exact same topics, but in different departments, and never contact communicate with each other. So the whole purpose of the event was for people who were working on similar topics to network and get in touch with each other. He brought a stack of posters and would pass around a sheet of paper and ask people in social science departments, or in other departments where research was done that was related to social science, to take a poster and write down their e-mail address, and he'd forward them the official invitation by e-mail.

Mr. McCombs introduced himself and said he was the Campus Organizing Director in the External Affairs Office. He just wanted to encourage Delegates to go to the UC Student Association's Student Lobby Conference on February 25 - 27. However, all the real work will occur on the 27th, UCSA Lobby Day. What they do is get a whole bunch of students and drive up to Sacramento and spend the day lobbying their district legislators on issues of higher education. And that year they have some hot issues. One big issue was the fee freeze that the Governor included in his budget, which the UCSA won. So the hard work has already been done, and they just want to make sure their legislators keep up the freeze in

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

the budget so students' fees don't go up next year. The second issue was the Governor having zero-funded outreach, including no money for any sort of UC educational partnerships, initiatives, or outreach that the school relies on to attempt to diversify their student body. So Mr. McCombs said he therefore really wanted to encourage Delegates, if they were interested in lobbying, or even if they weren't, to please think about this, sign up for the conference, and send him an e-mail. No lobbying experience was necessary. At his first lobby conference he had no idea what he was doing. But he got trained and it was fun; and long story short, he ended up at Law School. It's a lot of fun and a great ride. He would ask people to please sign up. Ms. Odusanya said she'd put his e-mail up. Mr. McCombs asked people to spread the word and to tell their friends.

Ms. Odusanya asked if the Union representative was around. Ms. Ahrendt introduced herself and said she was a steward with UAW 2865, which was the grads' union. As they may or may not know, the Union will bargain for a new contract, starting on March 1. At that time they're taking some surveys of grad students to find out what the priorities should be in bargaining, as well as to let people know in advance what the University will probably fight them on. Unfortunately, she didn't have any surveys with her because somebody forgot to bring them to her that day. But if people would like to participate in the survey, they could send her an e-mail and she would hook them up. Her e-mail address was rahrendt@berkeley.edu. People could also visit the Union Web site, www.uaw.2865.org, as she believed they'll be posting some information on this. She also wanted to inform them that there will be a campus-wide vote on February 15-16 to authorize a strike. Ballot boxes will be located at the north and south of campus. People will find out more about those locations later. Delegates need to encourage people to get vote in order to let the Union know if they would or wouldn't strike if one was needed.

Ms. Zahrt asked how this would affect the ability to strike. Ms. Ahrendt a strike authorization vote was to get people's opinions or votes as to whether a strike should be called should it be felt that the need was there. The Union couldn't call a strike unless they know people would support it, since calling for one wouldn't be fair if people support it. If people had any questions, Ms. Ahrendt said they should write to her. Grads may also get a phone call, since the Union will do some phone banking in the next several weeks, getting people to fill out the surveys. She called for any other questions.

Mr. Cantor said later that evening the GA will hear about the Recreational Sports Facility, and a petition around the RSF. At its last meeting, the GA talked a little about perhaps doing a more direct campaign around the RSF, although that didn't really materialize. That conception somewhat morphed, and he would like to recruit people for a campaign to heavily embarrass the Administration of UC Berkeley. If folks were interested in this he would send around a sign-up sheet. What he was talking about doing was essentially playing hardball with the University using market-rate logic, or corporate logic, that because they weren't being paid the market rate, they should give themselves pay raises. That story appeared in the media and administrators were so embarrassed at

the time that they actually shopped around for an advertising agency to rebrand the UC and to fix their image. So it would be a very good time to strike. Mr. Cantor said that what he was talking about doing was to set up shop outside California Hall and essentially embarrass administrators by doing guerilla theater. For example, they could have a canned food drive for the Chancellor, sell people peanut butter sandwich lunches, or have people sell their blood so the Chancellor could get market rate. Just to give Delegates an idea of how bad this was, while administrators were paying themselves hundreds of thousands of dollars under the table, AFSCME just released data about the custodial staff, who are paid a remarkably low level, actually well below market

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

rate. It's so far below market rate that the most senior custodians on campus get \$15 an hour. There are only 15 of them who have been here long enough to make \$33,000 a year; and that's the top rank at UC. Meanwhile, administrators were giving themselves hundreds of thousands of dollars in pay raises over the course of a year to bring themselves up to market rate. So Mr. Cantor said he thought administrators deserved to be embarrassed. If anybody was interested in brainstorming this and doing some sort of guerilla theater outside of California Hall, they should give him their contact information. This will probably kick in after the RSF issue plays itself out. Ms. Odusanya asked Mr. Cantor to write his e-mail on the brand so people could contact him.

Ms. Odusanya asked if Mr. Allbright was present, as he was supposed to recruit for the Student Regent position. Hopefully he'll show up later.

Mr. Daal asked if anybody there, by a show of hands, would be interested in working on organizing some type of panel discussion on campus about the current politicization of science, the issue of science and religion that's been in the media for the past several months. He was interested in seeing if people would be interested in perhaps working on some kind of panel discussion on this topic, which currently was not very well defined, although he thought he's given them the flavor of this question. If they were interested in working on this, he would ask them to raise their hands so he could get their names and contact information. He'd send around a sheet for people to write down their contact information. Basically, he was interested in doing something like this, and it so happened that his advisor was interested in this, and Mr. Daal said he thought there was money to organize a panel discussion. He did something like this before under the Graduate Assembly, two years ago. So he thought this could be a real possibility, and perhaps have a panel discussion at the end of that year.

Mr. Rosenstock introduced himself and said he was one of the Co-chairs of the Grad Social Club, which the GA funds. The GSC was an autonomous unit of the GA. His other Co-chair was Sarah Boyd. Mr. Rosenstock said he wanted to announce that the Grad Social Club was having its first meeting of the semester next Wednesday, February 8, at Triple Rock at 7 p.m. And of course, as with all their initial meetings, there will be free appetizers. Mainly, they just want to discuss or brainstorm some ideas for that semester. They are, of course, going to discuss the wine-and-cheese event they have every spring. But they also had plans to have an RSF night early that semester, which was not going to happen any more. So the docket was open, and they were looking forward to getting ideas. They'll also have a computer night and a hiking/skiing trip. The Grad Social Club would like some feedback on what people thought would be some good theater outings, or some other small events. For their wine-and-cheese event, they're looking for a venue and would like some feedback and participation from grads. So he would ask them to please attend the meeting. People don't have to put in a lot of effort by coming to the meeting, and they just want some ideas next Wednesday, the 8th.

Ms. Elnaggar said "The Berkeley Graduate" was looking for staff for the Spring Semester. People already got the e-mail about this and hopefully forwarded it to their departments. If people have any input or know of anyone who might be interested, or would like to suggest topics on what stories to cover, or anything else, they could send an e-mail to "The Berkeley Graduate" at ga.berkeley.edu. She called for any questions.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

A Delegate asked what staffmembers would do. Ms. Elnaggar said they're looking for reporters, copy editors, and the like. She could send out an e-mail again to Delegates, if they'd like.

Ms. Odusanya said the ASUC attorney, Mr. Himmelstein, was not yet present to make his presentation, and she would call for motion to amend the agenda to move to New Business. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

NEW BUSINESS

Class Pass Referendum

Mr. Stagi said there were several items in the agenda about the Class Pass. One sheet summarized the benefit and the AAVP's Report summarizes some of the larger issues, as well as the fact that it was in concert with Nad Permaul, the Director of Transportation. Sometimes he gets a boo and hiss, but this time he was actually very accommodating, and worked with the GA to develop a really nice alternative proposal. He didn't know if people realized this, but there were some real problems with the previous Class Pass proposal. The new proposal would have been more or less the same monetary costs to students, but Bear Transit was not going to be part of the plan. It was also suggested that there could probably be future reductions. Instead of agreeing to that, students held out and thought there should be a little better solution available. And sure enough, magically, a great solution was arrived at, integrating the LBNL buses that run empty all the time around the campus with the Bear Transit system. That would basically double the amount of Bear Transit, which would actually become a viable component of the whole transit system. Also, the system would be reconfigured, not completely, but some of the routes, to have that make a little more sense. For example, the reverse perimeter route will start at the same places on Shattuck that the 51 and 40 buses start, near the downtown rotunda. So people wouldn't have to make a choice to get around Berkeley and instead, people there could take any bus.

Mr. Stagi said the plan actually looked pretty good. They're currently paying \$37.40 for each semester. It would go up to \$58.50 for the first three years and then go up incrementally. People could see the figures in the information provided. Even so, it cost \$70 a month for an AC Transit pass. So this was a great deal. They talk all the time about how the Administration really screwed them over, and this was a relatively good deal. He had to say that for some reason he thought the GA already had a recommendation about this on the record, with some sort of Resolution, but the GA hasn't actually supported this particular proposal. So he would like to either the floor to a debate, to some degree, or hold a vote to get a sense of support for this proposal. He also had some wonderful little bookmarks with an AC Transit bus on one side and the Bear Transit on the other side. These

were cool little bookmarks, paid for out of Parking and Transportation funds, which were not subsidized by students since P&T was a self-funding department within the University System. So no students' money has gone to pay for the cool bookmarks. He would like it if people could take some and pass them out.

Ms. Zahrt asked about the consequences of voting against the Class Pass. Mr. Stagi said that was a very good question, and the consequence would be that they wouldn't have a Class Pass at all, and they would be required to pay \$1.75 every time they wanted to get on the bus, unless they wanted to buy a pass at

Class Pass Referendum (cont'd)

- 8 -

market rate, which, as he noted, was \$70. And that was for the standard rate, and the TransBay pass costs more, \$116 a month, he believed, with each ride at \$2. So the Class Pass really was a great bargain, and they didn't want to lose this kind of placeholder, because it's so difficult to achieve again afterwards with some of these transit agencies.

Mr. Cantor said he thought the TransBay trip cost \$3.50. Mr. Stagi said he was going from what he saw on the Web site.

Mr. Stagi said that not only were students getting a good deal, but there would also be service enhancements. There would be a late-night service that would roughly mirror the BART line, and would be much better than current late-night service. They would also have the BRT Line going down Telegraph and downtown, with next-bus service, which announces when the next bus was coming. There would also be a little sweetener to the pot, a small amount that was added to fund additional next-bus service. This service, hopefully, will initially be rolled out along the night route, to give people a good sense of when the bus was coming late at night. They hope to actually be able to seed some interesting research being done around campus by transportation engineers, rather than supporting monopolistic next-bus technology, which was incredibly expensive. Using something that came from Berkeley would enhance UC's reputation and perhaps fund other things.

Ms. Cementwala asked what the rate was that they were getting the Class Pass per year. Mr. Stagi said for a year it would be \$58.50 per semester, so \$117 for the whole year. Ms. Cementwala asked if it would be accessible, and audible. Mr. Stagi said he didn't know if it was audible for which he would apologize, since he should know that. Mr. Schechtman said it was his understanding that the campus was planning to roll it out as through the Web and through cell phones. Typically, next-bus technology was at a bus stop, but the problem with the Night Safety Shuttle was that people wouldn't want to stand in bus stops for half an hour waiting for a shuttle. So the goal was to roll it out through the Berkeley Web site, which has accessibility standards. But they would certainly bring that topic back to the committee. Mr. Stagi said this has actually been discussed, although he didn't know how it was resolved.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if next-bus technology was actually accurate and valuable enough to justify its expense. Mr. Stagi said the next-bus element to be put in place along Telegraph would be there regardless of what the GA did. So the GA was actually not funding that, but was just getting the benefit as part of their AC Transit package. What they were trying to promote was a wi-fi system that undergrads and some grads were working on, which was actually more sophisticated. There were a few little bugs because of the wi-fi and the photography. Also, he thought there were some issues in terms of every time people work on this and get really close to finalizing the project, someone comes along and head-hunts them, and the person goes to some marvelous engineering job somewhere else. So it's been difficult finishing the project.

Ms. Ahrendt asked about the status of the BART negotiations, and if they ever heard anything more about that. Mr. Stagi said that was outside the purview of the Class Pass at that point. BART was really a tough customer compared to all the other transit agencies around the Bay Area. BART was its own little empire. BART Board members are elected and BART has its own tax it gets automatically from legislation that was passed long ago. So BART didn't have to be very responsive, and generally wasn't, sad to say.

Ms. Jones said it was mentioned that the late-night bus service would reflect the BART line. She asked if that would include San Francisco. Mr. Stagi said it would take the last four bus stop, as well as the

Class Pass Referendum (cont'd)

- 9 -

TransBay Terminal, along Market Street, with the route terminating, he believed in Berkeley. He didn't think it went all over, here and there, before it got to Berkeley, so it was much better than the bus, which people have to catch at the TransBay Terminal, with the drunks and with people getting sick on the buses. And they then have to transfer in downtown Oakland to get on the 40. So the proposal should be a lot better and a lot more workable, and people could actually have a social life that didn't cost them so much.

Mr. Schechtman said that as part of the Academic Affairs VP's report that month, they have a clause saying the Executive Board recommends the GA support the Class Pass. So when they vote on the AAVP's report, they'll break that out and that will be the GA's vote on whether or not to endorse the Class Pass.

A Delegate asked about the status of negotiations with BART. It was mentioned they were very tough, and he asked if there was an indication that anything was likely to change in the near future. Mr. Stagi said he'll be in touch with Bob Franklin, their representative, to try and get the lowdown. But his understanding was that there's a real divide in the BART Board of Directors, with the suburbanites against the inner-city directors. That's really the dichotomy apparent in BART, since within the inner cities it's more of a subway/rapid transit, and outside it's more of a commuter railroad/parking lot. So they have different constituencies, which makes things really difficult, and the situation was probably not going to change. Mr. Schechtman said he really wanted to emphasize one more time to please talk to people in their departments about the Referendum. It was really important for grads, more so than for undergrads, quite honestly. Truth be known, he would guess that undergrads will probably subsidize grads in this, if there was any cross-subsidization going on in this process, because undergrads live more inordinately closer to campus and grads live more inordinately away from campus and take those buses. So it would really be a benefit to grads, and he would ask Delegates to tell everybody in their departments about it. This was actually one of the few things they end up paying fees for that he thought was a good thing to pay for, and if they lose this place holder, at that point in time there was no guarantee they would get it back. So they shouldn't miss this opportunity.

Ms. Odusanya said if grads were on a fee waiver, they wouldn't pay for this anyway. So she would ask people to please let others know. She wanted to thank Mr. Stagi. 24"16s

Faculty Mentoring Award

Mr. Wolf said he was working with a Selection Committee to decide who will receive the Faculty Mentorship Award. He believed the Award was started three years ago, to recognize Berkeley faculty who show an outstanding commitment to mentoring, developing, and supporting graduate student researchers. They'll give out three awards that year. The awards were nominal amounts of money for the faculty, \$1,000, but it's very

important to them and they're always appreciative. The reason the GA began the Award was because although faculty members are rewarded for their teaching, they're not in any way rewarded for mentoring graduate students, and this was the only Award where graduate students nominate the faculty members and really have a strong voice in speaking out and showing which faculty members take an interest in them. It always means a lot to the faculty. The GA was hoping to continue this Award every year. So he would like to get the names of people who were interested in being on the Selection Committee, and he'd pass around a sheet of paper for people to sign up. If people were interested, they'd probably want to know how much time it will require from them. They'll probably have two or three

Faculty Mentoring Award (cont'd)

- 10 -

meetings. One of the meetings will be fairly long, the one where decide who will win. The other meetings wouldn't be too long. Usually they have a call for nominations, after which they get a bunch of nominating forms and letters of recommendation back, usually about 40 of them. After that, the Selection Committee will read through them and have a system of evaluating the faculty who are nominated. So it was a bit of work just around the time they select the faculty members who will within the Award. Mr. Wolf said he'd mention that he did this last year, and it was one of the most rewarding things he's done with the GA. People get a really good feeling of how different faculty members mentor grad students in various departments, and it's a very rewarding process. If people were interested, he would pass around a sheet of paper, and if people could sign up, that would be great. He was seeking from three to seven people.

Ms. Odusanya said this award was extremely valuable to the GA, actually, and to faculty members, so the GA really valued people's assistance in being on this Committee. She asked for a show of hands of people interested in being on the Faculty Mentoring Award Committee.

Mr. Stagi said he wanted to stress two things that Mr. Wolf said. First, as being a part of the first two Awards ceremonies, professors who were awarded were really incredibly moved, and said it was one of the most valuable things they'd seen, since it came from the students. And likewise, in being one of the judges and seeing all the submissions, it was truly amazing to see what professors have done. It did set off a little bit of envy in him with regard to having some of that in his own department, although his mentor has actually been pretty good that year, so he couldn't complain. But people on the Committee will be amazed. And it was a good way for the GA to raise its profile and show that they're actually actively engaged in the academic arena. It's a very high-profile, special situation.

A Delegate asked if people could be on the Committee if they expect their faculty advisor to be nominated. Ms. Odusanya said they could be.

Mr. Daal asked if it would still be a requirement that year, as he recalled it, that recommendations for the award come from people who have graduated within the past five years. Mr. Wolf said that was a requirement, and more likely would stay the same. Most likely the Committee could talk about that at one of its preliminary meetings. Mr. Daal said that perhaps the Committee could reconsider that, because some faculty members take on only a few students. Mr. Stagi said that if people sit on the Committee, they could propose that.

Ms. Ahrendt asked what the schedule was, and when these long meetings will occur. Mr. Wolf said that was a good question. The call for nominations has actually gone out, although they need to do a publicity blitz. The nomination deadline was March 10, so they'll probably meet around then, and then another week or two after that will probably be a big meeting. So it would kind of be just before Spring Break. They'll announce the winners

around April 6, around there, and then hold the awards ceremony at the end of the year. People can attend whether or not they're a member of the Committee, and it's a lot of fun. So he would say the second to third week in March, was probably when most of the activities will occur.

Ms. Odusanya asked people to please raise their hands if they were interested in participating in this Committee.

Presentation by ASUC Attorney Mark Himelstein

Presentation by ASUC Attorney Mark Himelstein -- Autonomy

- 11 -

Ms. Odusanya said the ASUC lawyer, Mr. Himelstein, was present, and he has requested that the GA meet in executive session. She called for a motion to meet in closed session at that time. That would mean that only those who are Delegates or Alternates would be allowed to stay at the meeting. Whatever they say remains in the room and was considered confidential.

A motion to meet in executive session was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Odusanya asked to please have non-official Delegates leave the room. Mr. Fisher said all Delegates and Alternates should have a name badge. Ms. Odusanya said that if people were thinking about being a Delegate or Alternate, she would ask them to please do so, and the next time the GA entered into closed session they wouldn't have to leave the room.

A Delegate asked how long this would last. Ms. Odusanya said it would probably be a half hour.

This meeting entered into executive session to discuss GA autonomy issues.

Back in open session, Ms. Odusanya said they would vote on two options: (A) Maintaining the status quo; and (B) Ending representation by the ASUC. So they had two options, one of which was to suggest to ASUC President Manny Besbris that the ASUC not speak for all students, and the ASUC wouldn't budge on that.

A Delegate asked if they could have an option where they have a mini-constitution and By-laws. Ms. Odusanya said that if they had that, the ASUC would not accept not having the ASUC speak for everybody.

Mr. Daal asked if option (B) could be to focus on the problems they have with the ASUC and negotiate those problems.

Ms. Odusanya said the options were: (A) The status quo; (B) Total autonomy; and (C) Continued negotiations with the ASUC on major sticking points.

A Delegate said the way the GA had been planning on getting its equality without being autonomous was to have the student body vote on a constitutional amendment. He asked if it was possible to have a constitutional amendment. He believed Ms. Odusanya said they wouldn't go for it, but he asked if that was possible to have a vote on a constitutional amendment that would remove the ASUC's voice for grads. He believed they could get 1,000 grad students to sign a petition, and get 1,000 grads to vote, and then they'd win. He asked if the GA could have a constitutional limit that did that without getting the ASUC to agree.

Mr. Daal said that if the ASUC did anything irrational, there was also the possibility of going to the Chancellor.

Ms. Odusanya said that if the GA did get autonomy, the ASUC wouldn't speak for them. A Delegate said they actually put that into the vote. Ms. Odusanya asked if that would be option (D). Ms. Levitan said that's how the GA would implement (B), autonomy. Ms. Odusanya said the idea was that the ASUC would speak for themselves, and the GA would speak for grads. Mr. Garcia said he didn't think that would work because he thought the ASUC would strike that down because grads could still run and sit on a body, the ASUC, whose voice they wouldn't represent. That would make the GA completely

Presentation by ASUC Attorney Mark Himelstein -- Autonomy

- 12 -

autonomous and combined facts of that scenario didn't work. Mr. Schechtman said the GA did, however, have the threat of the Chancellor. A Delegate hat that if the ASUC struck that down, the GA could turn to the Chancellor and say that grads did it right, got people to vote for it, but that the ASUC wouldn't let the GA autonomy.

Mr. Daal said he thought the ASUC would have a case to strike down wording the GA wrote.

On a point of procedure, Mr. Cantor asked what they were voting on. Ms. Odusanya said they're voting on what the GA would do next. Mr. Cantor said this wasn't a motion, then. He said this has been a three-year campaign, and the GA has been talking about in that evening for about 30 minutes. There are people in student government who have been "deputized," or on sit on committees, and have worked on this issue and have been entrusted with it for the past three years, and he didn't see why at that juncture it was necessary, as a body, to vote on strategies. The question has been raised that they abandon the campaign for autonomy, and that was a huge discussion. And if that wasn't the question, then he wasn't sure what was going on. Ms. Odusanya said that was part of the campaign at that time.

Mr. Schechtman said that Mr. Besbris and the ASUC were trying to understand from the GA what they should be trying to achieve with Mr. Buenrostro.

Mr. Stagi said the reason this was coming before the GA at that time was because they wanted to have a discussion with the lawyer, Mr. Himelstein. The last time they spoke to the GA about this, they were unable to have him speak. People met with him after the GA had discussed this and had a vote. Mr. Stagi said that in the course of he and Ms. Odusanya meeting with Mr. Himelstein, some of these issues Mr. Himelstein talked about seemed pertinent, issues that he hadn't heard brought up before. So he really thought they put a new light on this, and thought it was important that everyone have this information before continuing any further.

Mr. Cantor said that on that note, people could vote for option (A), the status quo, which basically would direct the GA for the rest of the year to not worry about the autonomy question. And they can do that without abandoning their general aspirations for autonomy, which they've had for the last three years. Ms. Odusanya said that was correct. Mr. Stagi said autonomy could be picked up at any other time.

Ms. Cementwala said she wanted to hear from Mr. Stagi, Ms. Odusanya, and perhaps Mr. Schechtman, who have been actively engaged in the autonomy struggle, about which course they thought was most prudent. She thought it was important to hear from the people who have been interacting on this and hear from them where things were and were things were going, and what they saw as the pros and cons.

Ms. Odusanya said that personally, she would go with option (C), continued negotiations with the ASUC on

major sticking points. While they might have the option of going to the Chancellor, they had to realize the Chancellor made that offer before he was in the shade of the Berkeley's system, and she thought this was a very weak link for the GA to rely on. The major sticking points were representation to the Academic Senate, with the Judicial Council, and with ASUC elections. For the Judicial Council, she thought the ASUC would be very willing to have grads serve on that body. The ASUC has sent them invitations on openings and they've been e-mailed out, but no one has responded. The situation was the same with the Elections Council. Everybody was open to nominating themselves to the Elections Council and no one responded. So the GA could blame the ASUC for some things, and blame itself for some things as well.

Presentation by ASUC Attorney Mark Himelstein - Autonomy

- 13 -

Mr. Stagi said he and Ms. Odusanya were in complete accord. He hadn't thought they were totally on the same page, but now thought they were. He thought option (C) was the best option given what they know, continued negotiations on sticking points. In the course of actually reviewing their By-laws over the last month, he found that the Graduate Assembly actually had something called "the Judicial Committee," which has never convened, to his knowledge. It's fairly new language that exists to represent as a parallel to the J-Council, he believed, to start to represent an alternative to the Judicial Council. It was to be part of the GA's tripartite system, with the Executive Board, the Judicial Committee, and the Graduate Assembly. So he thought there were there were some pieces there. As has been noted, the By-laws were kind of funky, and he was hoping they wouldn't have to do a wholesale rewrite that semester. But there were pieces the GA could work with that could address some of the concerns.

Ms. Franklin said the Judicial Committee did exist a couple of years ago. Mr. Stagi asked if people sat on it and if it functioned. Ms. Franklin said it did exist, but nobody brought any issues to it. She sat on it and they never met because there were never any issues to deal with. She thought it was originally intended to serve as a mechanism to resolve big disputes within the Executive Board. She believed there were about five people on that Committee. Mr. Stagi said he would like to talk to her about this at greater length.

Ms. Levitan said she was a little disappointed to hear Ms. Odusanya say she preferred to continue negotiations, because last year she campaigned on a platform of autonomy. Ms. Odusanya said she didn't have enough information at the time.

Ms. Levitan said it still seemed like a huge disappointment if they were to completely abandon autonomy, which option (C) seemed to be doing. She was not convinced or ready to give up on option (B) yet, autonomy. Ms. Odusanya said that point was noted.

Mr. Schechtman said they also have fee referenda they had to talk about. The discussion on autonomy was important, but the GA had a lot of other business. They have been working for a little more than three years on autonomy, and he thought the lawyer's information was very important. But he would go personally for option (D), which his understanding was some form of independence within the ASUC. The ASUC would be the undergraduate body, with its own politics and judicial executive affairs, and the GA would become the graduate body. Mr. Stagi said that would be best thing to eventuate out of option (C), negotiating, and that's what they're striving to get to as best they could.

Ms. Odusanya said that Mr. Fisher informed her that there was some conflict in that others were supposed to be using the room. She thought the GA had the room all evening, but apparently the other group reserved the room as well. The GA really should have the room all evening, and she didn't know why there was confusion. Mr.

Besbris said that according to the ASUC By-laws, the GA could hold the room for as long as it wanted, except against the Store Operations Board.

Ms. Odusanya said option (D) would be "independence within the ASUC." She asked what that would be. Ms. Zahrt said it meant the ASUC would represent the undergraduate opinion and the GA would represent the graduate opinion, but they would still all be within the ASUC, truly representing the associated students. Ms. Odusanya said the ASUC wouldn't approve that. That was the other point, that if they had an election and it passed, the J-Council could have a case. Mr. Daal said the GA with that option was setting itself up for failure because there's a loophole with forcing the ASUC to speak for undergraduates in that grad students could still run for any ASUC office. Mr. Schechtman said that when he said

Presentation by ASUC Attorney Mark Himmelstein - Autonomy

- 14 -

"independence within the ASUC," he meant the ASUC as they know it now would become an undergraduate body and the GA would become the graduate body. There's one graduate representative on the ASUC at that time, and he didn't see the need to leave open that option.

Ms. Cementwala asked how that option would affect the mandatory fee option. Mr. Schechtman said this was the option of inserting a mini constitution of the GA within an existing clause of the ASUC Constitution. Ms. Cementwala asked how the Chancellor would see that. Mr. Schechtman said the Chancellor has told the GA that it should make its best effort to obtain its autonomy, and if that failed, he would grant it to them. Ms. Cementwala said she thought they should take the Chancellor to task on that.

Ms. Ahrendt said that it seemed like options (C) and (D) were both going to the same point, but with option (D), the GA actually go to the populace and ask for a vote, where with option (C), they would just negotiate. When she said option (C), she was thinking the same sort of independence that she thought people were all talking about, but not the independence that says the GA should get a percent of independence, but the kind that would have a constitution.

On a point of order, Mr. Fairbrother said that when they look at how governments of the world operate, they have bills before them that they consider over a period of time. He felt the GA was being confronted with a pretty major decision there and was being asked to come to a vote in a very short period of time, when some people have been considering it for a long period of time. He didn't really feel comfortable voting on this because he didn't feel he's really had time to consider very subtle differences between different options, and he didn't think he understood what the different options were. Ms. Odusanya said she was very comfortable extending additional time to vote on this. The Delegate said he wasn't asking for more time, but was asking if they could have written documents in the future, to consider before coming to the meeting.

Mr. Cantor moved to table the discussion on autonomy. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daal. THE MOTION TO TABLE DISCUSSION OF GA AUTONOMY PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Fairbrother asked if the people who really knew what was going on could circulate a concrete proposal that the GA could give a vote of confidence for, he wouldn't have a problem what that. He thought that what people dealing with this were doing sounded great. But it seemed like there was more information on this than the GA could process in oral form in a short meeting when they have timelines like this. Ms. Odusanya said they've tabled discussion on this topic and she would ask them to move on to the next item.

Recreational Sports Facility update

Mr. Daniels asked for a show of hands of people who have received the e-mails about the YMCA and the RSF. He asked how many Delegates have forwarded those e-mails on. He noted that there was a good showing of hands.

Mr. Daniels said he would give a quick update on the YMCA and the RSF situation. That week the YMCA was free for all grad students. All they had to do is bring a lock and show their grad ID. The Y would provide them with a towel. The Y has classes, various swimming pools, and a lot of really good

Recreational Sports Facility Update (cont'd)

- 15 -

stuff. If people didn't live in downtown Berkeley, or if they lived in Oakland they should talk to him or send him an e-mail and they would work that out. Mr. Daniels said they are negotiating with central RSF administration and the RSF Director, to restructure the financial situation. Right now there's a \$65 membership fee. The idea would be to get \$20 of that refunded, so it would go back to last semester's fee, and for next semester, and next year, it would be somewhat in the range of a \$10-15 membership fee and a \$30-40 mandatory fee. So for students on financial aid, fellowships, and Pell Grants, the mandatory fee would count towards the financial aid allotment, and all they'd have to pay was \$10 or \$15. Overall, RSF users would pay at most about \$60, and not \$65, like they'd be paying now. And in the future, the plan was to raise the membership fee even more, \$75 and \$90, and they wouldn't be allowed to do that, under this plan. The membership fee would be kept very, very low, and the mandatory fee would be adjusted for inflation, he believed. So it's a better fee structure from at least the GA's perspective. He called for any questions.

Mr. Daal asked about the state of their communication with the RSF directorate and who they were negotiating with, and how students might better be able to be hear about that. Mr. Daniels asked if Mr. Daal got his response through e-mail. The advisory board hasn't gotten back to him. There's actually been a request for two students. Why he hasn't responded, Mr. Daniels said he didn't know. Just to fill everybody in, Mr. Daniels said there's an advisory board for the RSF and the Director actually asked for two students to participate on it. Mr. Daniels said that when he sent him names, , for whatever reason, the Director did not get in touch with them, as Mr. Daal just noted.

Mr. Cantor said the fee waivers put grad students in a similar situation to financial aid folks, and asked if it was correct that that part of their fee was covered. Mr. Daniels said that was correct. Mr. Cantor said that was important to know for people's constituencies to know when Delegates get them to sign the petition for the restructuring of the RSF fee, as he was sure Delegate would do. This applies to grads who have fee waivers, which included a lot of grad students. They pay out of pocket, and the amount they pay out of pocket to start using the RSF would go down. Mr. Schechtman said it would go down from \$65 to \$10. Mr. Cantor said that was significant.

Mr. Schechtman said that if he could speak briefly on the RSF, he really blasted RSF management in January for its lack of responsiveness and they came back, particularly Director Mike Weinberger, who said that he was very disappointed and that he tried to include the GA in every step of the way. The GA has spent an phenomenal number of hours in the last semester and a half working with the RSF. Mr. Schechtman said he pointed out that inclusiveness was not the same as responsiveness. So as part of the referendum language, the GA will demand,

at a meeting on Friday at 8 a.m. with the Chancellor's staff, that the Administration survey students at least once a year, if not every semester, and present the survey results and show their plan of action to respond to problems, and show that they addressed prior problems every year, in order to get funding, in an attempt to increase their responsiveness.

Mr. Fairbrother said he supported the protest against the RSF, and they were smart to try to get that survey. But he asked if a supposed majority could quote "mandate" changes and then spike fees to \$65. He asked if the students had leverage. Mr. Daniels said certainly the survey was a good thing, and students want feedback, and would applaud the RSF for doing that. But the problem was that while the RSF only gave two options, those weren't the only two possible options. For the RSF and its thinking, maybe those were the only possibilities. But they didn't ask the students what options they would like to be offered.

Mr. Daniels said he had a petition to distribute at the RSF. It wasn't in opposition to the RSF. He was just there, and the security guard looked at him, asked what was going on, grabbed him by the shoulder,

Recreational Sports Facility Update (cont'd)

- 16 -

and asked to see the pamphlet. Mr. Daniels said the security guard looked at the pamphlet, walked inside, and the RSF Director, Mike Weinberger, said the security guard had come up to him and said, "You know, these guys were outside protesting," and Mr. Weinberger said, "No, no, they're on our side. We're doing this together." The idea was that this was just to show that the students actually wanted a third option. They e-mailed Mr. Weinberger, so he knew about this. In some responses to the e-mail, some people asked about a boycott. But Mr. Daniels said the GA wanted the RSF to know that students don't like the fee increases, but that nobody has called for a boycott, and the students were not trying to strong-arm the RSF. They're trying to convince the RSF and the Administration that this is what students actually want.

Mr. Tran asked what the third option was. Mr. Daniels said it would be a decrease in membership fees to \$10, maybe \$15, and then a mandatory fee campus-wide from \$30 to \$40. Mandatory fees were covered by financial aid, fellowships, etc. So for certain students, they wouldn't have to pay the \$30-40. Grads who were on a fellowship probably wouldn't have to pay. Right now the membership fee was \$65. Mr. Tran asked if the mandatory fee goes towards that. Mr. Schechtman said all students pay \$28.50 a semester and that wouldn't change. The \$28.50 just pays the construction bond, which ends in ten years.

Mr. Allen asked if it made more sense to have a greater parity between the campus fee and the mandatory fee. There were a lot of schools where most of the students were not on fellowship, and as they have discussed, only 40% of the total grad population was on fellowship. He would be more interested in having a \$20 membership fee with a \$25 campus-wide fee. That might be more palatable. He understood what they were doing there, but they were spreading out to the entire campus the cost of something that not everyone used. He agreed to do that to some extent, but wondered whether they should make it more balanced.

A Delegate said that last time they brought up the fact that a lot of fees they pay for were for things that everyone used, like the Art Museum, the Pacific Film Archive, and the Science Museum. And right now they're paying a lot less for the RSF than they were for these other resources that not everybody uses. Mr. Stagi said this was heavily used.

Mr. Wolf said he wasn't talking about going back to \$65 or anything so dramatic, but to just tweak the figures. The only things he would add were things that the entire campus used and everyone paid for, such as the Class Pass. The only thing he would add was that besides raising membership to \$65 or \$45, that they eliminate the

Pell Grants waiver. It may not apply to everyone there, but in terms of an equity problem, it was a major problem for those students who couldn't pay the \$65 and would now have to pay it. So having parity was another option, with a \$30 fee waiver and \$30 in mandatory fees, for instance.

A Delegate asked how the quality of the RSF be affected by a cut in the fees. Mr. Schechtman said it actually would improve, ideally, because if everything went according to plan, as it's spec'd out, the total amount of the mandatory fee was, he believed, a little more. So the idea included in this package and in their negotiations would be a retrofit or expansion. Mr. Schechtman at the very least they would expand hours and have more money to fix equipment. Mr. Stagi said there would also be mechanisms for additional feedback.

Ms. Bartolone asked if they were specifically saying no services would be cut. Mr. Daniels said that was correct. One of the main thrusts of the GA was that it was okay to pay more, but that services had to increase.

Recreational Sports Facility Update (cont'd)

- 17 -

A Delegate asked how many Pell Grant students there were. Ms. Odusanya said she believed there were 4,000. The Delegate asked if they thought there would be any way in the new proposal to reinstate their waiver and increase the rest of the fees. Mr. Schechtman said the idea was to set the new fee low enough that the campus wouldn't have to waive this. The campus does not currently have a policy that governs user fees. So each department decides whether or not to waive Pell Grant students. And that's why the RSF was able to unilaterally say they should do that, but weren't going to do it any more. He sat on the committee that has been trying to look at this policy, and it's very clear they're not going to consider it this year and probably not next year. So they decided to just aim for something that everyone would pay and that was affordable for all.

Ms. Medina said that since this was a campus-wide fee, return-to-aid applied. So Pell Grants recipients would be covered. Mr. Schechtman said that was the case for the mandatory part of the fee, but not for the membership fee. Ms. Medina said that Mr. Allen raised the issue of increasing the membership fee, with Pell Grants recipients having more with a campus-wide fee versus a higher membership fee. Mr. Schechtman said the people who were the hardest hit, frankly, were the professional students who do not have fee waivers and who don't use the gym. Mr. Daniels said that if students do use the gym, the overall costs were a little bit lower, and if a student was on financial aid, they could take out \$40 more in loans. It's not perfect, but before, they wouldn't be able to take that from a loan, and that cost could be out of pocket. So it's not ideal, obviously, but it's better than membership fees at \$65, in two years to \$75, and in four years, \$90 that would come out of one's pocket for membership fees.

Ms. Odusanya said they'd hear a few more last comments.

Mr. Stagi said he would like to get a sense and the current milieu, and what they're supposed to do, irregardless of how they vote on this in terms of whether or not they sign up for the RSF, that kind of stuff. He signed up and had 12 hours left on his 72 hours to turn it back. So he needed to know what to do before his 12 hours were up. Mr. Daniels said it was up to him. If he needed a gym and only lifted weights and ran on a surface, it was still probably the way to go. They're not asking for a boycott. If one had kids under 13, for example, or they took a lot of yoga classes, they should check out the Y, because it has a lot of services. So if they're interested in doing more than just lifting weights and running on a treadmill, the Y was a great facility and at a great location, and he would urge them to check it out.

Mr. Fisher asked if he knew about the fee structure at other UCs that didn't have a fee for their gyms and had brand new gyms. Mr. Daniels said Berkeley pays a high membership fee and lower mandatory fees than any other UC. Mr. Schechtman said Berkeley would still pay the lowest mandatory fees in the UC System. UC Davis, e.g., pays \$200 a year in mandatory fees.

Ms. Scales said the information said the membership fee would increase, and that last year it was \$35, and she asked what that meant. Mr. Fisher said that it was \$35 in Fall Semester '05, and that Spring Semester, '06, it's \$65. Ms. Scales asked how long it was \$35 a semester. Mr. Fisher said he believed it was for two years, 03-04, and 04-05. Before that it was \$25 for two years, and then he'd guess for 1999-2000 there was no fee. Ms. Scales asked what the problem was that they were trying to solve there, and if they were trying to make the gym affordable to low-income students. Mr. Schechtman said they're trying to keep the gym affordable, period, because in two years \$65 will become \$75, and in four years will become \$90. So if people were comfortable with \$90 a semester for the RSF, and feel it's not really of enough importance to the student body for mental and physical health, then that's the way to go. The GA

Recreational Sports Facility Update (cont'd)

- 18 -

has been arguing that it's the highest used student facility on campus and that it plays an important role in great health and fitness, mental and physical, and that it should be accessible. Ms. Scales said that if the GA was worried about lower-income students, those students have Pell Grants. Mr. Daniels said that was eliminated as part of the raise. But in general, the idea was to keep the Administration from continuing the unending fee increases, from \$75, to \$90. Hopefully this structure will cap that and force them to find money in other ways.

Ms. Odusanya called for one last comment. Ms. Scales said she was trying to find out the status of this issue and how important it is. She asked if the GA was using the YWCA as an option to get the RSF to accept this, or if it was just a matter of getting the signatures that would make the RSF embrace this change, or just what the status of this issue was. Mr. Daniels said the Y was great because it's another option for grad students, and secondly, it shows the campus it can't just keep raising the fees, and at some point there were other options that were good. So that was the main thing. The petition was to give the GA negotiating leverage, to say, "Look, students would actually go for this third option and would pass the referendum if this was offered." Ms. Scales said that once the petitions were received, they'd go back and it could be decided. Mr. Daniels said the students were meeting with them on Friday morning, and it will probably be decided then, or in a follow-up meeting. So ideally, they'll agree to this Referendum which would be set for April, and the students would ask for a vote at that time.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other final comments from Mr. Daniels, and hearing none, said they would move on.

REPORTS

Report from the Business Director

Ms. Hsueh said she's reviewed spending for 05-06, and as of December 31, they're on target and were not overspending. In addition, she brought the report from the Funding Advisor. The Funding Advisor was on leave and will return to work on February 13. In the meantime student staff were helping out, processing applications,

conducting funding workshops, and so forth. Ms. Hsueh said she wanted to stress that in the 05-06 budget, the Finance Committee has approved \$150,000 to award to student groups and to the Travel Grant. That was a lot of money, which they get from Reg Fees.

Ms. Hsueh said she would like to point out several space funding deadlines. One that was coming up was February 17. Other deadlines were March 17, and April 21. She didn't know whether people have received the GA's electronic newsletter from the Funding Advisor, but if they haven't, or have never received it, there's a e-mail address, gabusinessoffice, to which people could send their e-mail addresses, and the GA would be happy to include them in e-mail messages and the newsletter, and keep them abreast of what was going on and the deadlines. For those who receive funding, when they complete their events, they should follow-up by the deadline, because otherwise that wouldn't be able to receive a reimbursement. She wanted to thank them.

Ms. Odusanya said she would entertain a motion to approve Ms. Hsueh's report. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Officers' Reports

- 19 -

Officers' Reports

For the President's report, Ms. Odusanya said they have discussed autonomy, and the next item was 440 Stephens Hall renovation. Delegates were probably not aware, but the Grad Division has actually taken back the check it gave the GA last semester to renovate that space, which Ms. Odusanya said was very upsetting to her personally. She's working very closely with Dean Mason to get the money back. But all work has been suspended until that money is received from the Grad Division.

Ms. Odusanya said she knew people had other places to go, but she would ask them to please stay, and said they'd be done in about 15 minutes.

Ms. Odusanya said that as the GA approved last semester, Jimmy Kittiyachavalt completed work on the online funding system, and that should be live by next week. She'll talk with him on Friday to discuss timelines and how best to phase in this process into the GA's system. Ms. Odusanya called for any questions on her report, and hearing none, called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the President's report passed with no objection.

For the Academic Affairs Vice President's report, Mr. Schechtman said that Delegates have already heard about the Class Pass. He would pass the bookmarks around again. They need Delegates to take them back to their departments and put them in grad lounges. If the grad vote was not turned out, particularly in those departments with Ph.D. students with GSIs and fellowships, who have fee waivers, there was a possibility the Class Pass would not be approved. The undergrads were starting to look at fee increases and were concerned about them. If grads use AC Transit to commute, and know people who do, the grad vote needed to be encouraged. He called for any questions.

Mr. Schechtman said the first part of his report indicates that the GA Executive Board was recommending that the GA strongly support the Class Pass referendum. So when the GA votes on his report, that will be the GA's endorsement of the Class Pass, unless the GA held debate or had questions to the contrary. His statement was

included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Schechtman said his second item was the Career Center, currently located at Bancroft, between Oxford and Shattuck. In the same vote in February, the Career Center will have a student fee referendum to move it to a new location, across the street from Eshleman. The GA's Executive Board was recommending that the GA oppose the Career Center Referendum. First, mandatory student fees would be used to pay for the lease of commercial space, which would be unprecedented in the UC System. Usually, mandatory student fees pay for programming, such as at the RSF, or they pay for construction bonds, like the MLK Union, or the RSF building. If passed, this Referendum would set a precedent that could open the door to future fees being used for commercial leases. The larger problem would be that if the Referendum was approved, the campus would have no commitment to get the Career Center out of that space on Bancroft before the lease expired in ten years, at which point the student body would be faced with the option of renewing at whatever rate the landlord deemed it be, or of having to move the Career Center somewhere else. The Executive Board did not think it was a realistic option to burden a generation of students who weren't even on campus yet. Lastly, a lot of professional schools have their own career centers, so grad students had a much lower percentage of usage of the Career Center. As a result, the Executive Board was recommending that the GA oppose the Career Center referendum. He called for any questions.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 20 -

A Delegate asked why the Career Center was being pushed out of its current space. Mr. Schechtman said it wasn't being pushed out, and it was actually a recommendation of the Student Fee Committee that the Center be moved to a location that was more central to campus. The Executive Board agreed with that. The Career Center was very important and should be close to the central campus. They simply disagree with using fees for a commercial lease to relocate the facility.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if this would be on the same ballot as the Class Pass Referendum. Mr. Schechtman said it would be. So if grads vote to oppose this, they'll be contacting Delegates during the days of the elections to educate grad students in their departments about the benefits of the Class Pass and about the potential downfalls of the Career Center Referendum. He called for any other questions.

Mr. Schechtman said the Campus Life Safety Committee was a joint faculty, staff, administrative committee that oversees several millions of dollars of students' mandatory student fee funds that go into seismic and fire safety improvements to fee-funded building. Delegates were currently sitting in one of the seismically poor buildings on campus. The Life Safety Committee will start by looking at Eshleman and what could be done to either seismically improve it or demolish it and rebuild it. More than one dozen buildings on campus also fall under the Life Safety Committee's purview. They need a graduate student to sit on this Committee and asked if anybody in Engineering, Architecture, or Structural Engineering, might be interested. It met once a month, at most. Mr. Stagi said he was interested. Mr. Schechtman said he would also send another e-mail out. It would be appreciated if Delegates could ask students if they were interested in this. They didn't have to be in Engineering or Architecture, but that would be easiest.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve Mr. Schechtman's report, which would state the GA's support for the Class Pass Referendum and the GA's opposition to the Career Center Referendum. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the Academic Affairs Vice President, and to endorse the Class Pass Referendum and oppose the Career Center Referendum, passed with no objection.

For the External Affairs Vice President's report, Ms. Medina said she had really good news. Mr. McCombs went over this earlier, but for three years they've tried to unsuccessfully get a meeting with the Governor's office. But in December his top aides called the UCSA and wanted to meet with the students. The students made a very convincing and compelling argument because they were able to simplify facts on how the UC calculated affordability, manageable debt, and work burden. So the Governor proposed a fee freeze for graduate, professional, and undergraduate students. But the fight wasn't over, and students had to get this through the Legislature. So it was really important that they get people out to the Lobby Conference on Monday, February 27, which was the actual day they'll lobby in Sacramento. She would ask them to please come out. She really wanted to thank everybody who has been at testimonials, sending e-mails, and signing postcards. It really did help. A lot of times it just felt like they were banging their heads against a wall, because it's been that way in previous years. But finally, they did get something. While it might be an election year, the fact that students made those efforts made a big difference.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the External Affairs Vice President passed with no objection.

Committee Reports

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 21 -

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Ms. Tom said the Committee met on Tuesday and approved a new interactive budgeting process designed to get more feedback from units and projects involved with the budget. Ms. Odusanya asked if she wanted to describe the interactive process. Ms. Tom said that each member of the Finance Committee was assigned to one or more units and would send them a form to show them what this year's budget was and to ask them what their projected spending would be for next year. The Finance Committee will then convene and draft a budget, go back to each unit, get their feedback, convene again, and draft a final budget.

Ms. Odusanya said this process was to get around the problem of having numbers simply moved on from year to year, basically. Ms. Tom said that was correct, and to give the units a voice in the process. Ms. Odusanya called for any questions. Seeing none, she called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the Finance Committee passed with no objection.

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Ms. Zahrt said the Committee met and they had a really fun first meeting of the semester. They were asked for more money than they had. So they divided it up, as people could see on the two sheets. Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the Funding Committee report passed with no objection, approving Round 3 of Grants funding, Round 2 of Projects and Services, and Round 5 of Graduate Events, passed with no objection.

Reporting for the GA's Graduate Council representatives, Ms. Cementwala said the Grad Council didn't meet in December and their next meeting is on Monday. Mr. Allen said they had a meeting with a couple of people from the Grad Division about a couple of issues that have been brought up. One issue involved affordable housing, which Mr. Schechtman will talk more about at the next meeting. There were a couple of other issues that involved extensions given to particularly women, but also to men, who have children, and extensions around

their funding. It looked like the campus has put in place a more liberal policy than the GA was aware of, which was a good thing. Another issue that was brought up related to making the language test process a little more standardized, because lots of different departments do their own thing. While there wasn't a lot of interest on the part of the Administration to impose any new things on the different departments, there was an understanding that they need to encourage department to be much clearer about what the standards are. When students take language exams as part of their requirements for their degrees, they need to more information about what the exams involve. So this was an ongoing issue.

Ms. Odusanya called for any questions, and hearing none, called for a motion to approve the Grad Council representatives' report. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the GA's Grad Council Representatives passed with no objection.

Mr. Stagi said the Organization and Rules Committee had a meeting. However, they were short of a quorum. Ms. Odusanya said the Org. & Rules Committee actually met, and that deserved applause. (Applause) Mr. Stagi said they would have had quorum if they had five members present, but they only had four. They need five members on the Committee, with four members present in order to have a quorum.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 22 -

Mr. Wolf said the Org. & Rules Committee has come back, and people should have a better understanding of its importance. Mr. Stagi said he's been reviewing Org. & Rules language, and to some degree, the Committee was more about implementing into By-laws any language that is improved, and was also about re-numbering and maintaining the By-laws, and also about settling disputes as they pertain to the By-laws. The Committee was not necessarily just about drafting new language. If they read Section 8 of the By-laws, dealing with changes to the By-laws, the rules do not necessarily charge the Org. & Rules with the drafting of the language. However, having said that, the Committee can be enjoined to do so, and they have been enjoined to do so in several instances. The Committee was asked by the Assembly to draft language about the Sustainability Committee and the Sustainability Resolution last year, which the Committee was in the process of doing. The Committee was unable to approve those, however, since it didn't have quorum.

Org. & Rules was also asked by the Executive Board, at the Executive Board retreat, to look into changing the election date of the Officers from May to April in order to have more transition time. This would help the GA not to simply pass the gavel on. That language has been completed. They're also looking at a couple of other issues and acquainting themselves with the By-laws a little more thoroughly. One thing they're looking at was the non-existent Judicial Committee. He would appreciate it if Josh and Johana could give him their sense of this Committee.

Mr. Stagi said they'll meet the fourth Tuesday in February in Anthony Hall at 5:00. If he could have one person join them, that would be great. He called for any volunteers.

Mr. Fisher said there's a little rule he's been neglecting to enforce, whereby every department had to have at least one Delegate on a GA committee. He's been nice about that because his predecessor was nice about it. Mr. Cantor said he would be the fifth member of the Organization and Rules Committee.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions for Mr. Stagi and hearing none, called for a motion to approve the

report. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the Organization and Rules Committee passed with no objection.

Reporting for the Environmental Sustainability Committee, Mr. Harley said that for those who were at the last meeting, the GA passed the Environmental Sustainability Resolution, which created a new Committee, the Environmental Sustainability Committee. They're working on language, through the Org. & Rules Committee, to get it official, and that will probably come out in a report at the GA's next meeting. In the meantime, they met and picked areas to focus on for the semester. These include the internal GA operations, their relationship with GA-funded groups, their relationship with other groups on campus that might also have sustainability issues they're working on, and any legislation or resolutions to bring up at the GA. So they need help on a lot of stuff, and there's a lot of opportunity. His e-mail was included in the report, so if Delegates would like to participate, the Committee would like to have them.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the Environmental Sustainability Committee passed with no objection.

Mr. Fisher asked if anybody was present from the GSI/GSR Committee. This was a GA committee that no one was on, and the Chair just resigned. So if anybody was willing to step up to the plate, it would look astounding on their CD and resumé.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 23 -

Mr. Fisher asked if anybody present was on the Affirmative Action Committee, another Committee that desperately needed to get up and running. It was going last semester, but he hasn't heard from the Chair in many months, and neither have the members. So they kind of need to get that going again. This and the GSI/GSR Committee have important issues. If Delegates have an interest in being a part of this, they all get his e-mails and know his address.

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

Mr. Besbris said he wanted to apologize in that this semester he had a class from 5:00 to 7:00, so he'd get to GA meetings late, although his report would be included in the agenda packet. In terms of ASUC stuff, there was still at least one empty seat on the Judicial Council, if any grad students were interested. Also, the Judicial Council approved a settlement between the Senate and the current Executive Vice President that, in effect, invalidates the MOU from last year, as the Referendum never passed because it was never on the ballot. So the GA still owed the ASUC \$90,000 for elections debts. Mr. Stagi noted that that debt was part of autonomy negotiations.

Ms. Levitan asked how many people were on the Judicial Council. Mr. Besbris said there were nine members. Ms. Levitan asked how grad students could apply. Mr. Besbris said they could send an e-mail to the ASUC President. The President forwards nominations to the Senate, which confirms nominees.

Mr. Garcia asked how many openings there were on the J-Council. Mr. Besbris said there were currently three openings, and two nominees were coming before the next week. So whether or not they're confirmed, there

could be one opening. Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions and called for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the report from the ASUC Senate representative to the GA passed with no objection.

Ms. Odusanya said the last report was from the Store Operations Board, but the first meeting will be in a week, and they haven't met yet that semester.

Ms called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank them very much for staying.

This meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

- 24 -

Present at the GA Meeting of February 2, 2006

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Dept.</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Dept.</u> |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Agarwal, Harish | Physics | Huezo, Hector | Law |
| Ahrendt, Rebekah | Music | Huff, Eric | Astronomy |
| Allen, Ben | Law | Jimenez, Javier | Comp Lit |
| Anderson, Meghan | Math | Jones, Alexander | Plant & Microbial Biology |
| Arons, Sam | Energy & Resources Group | Jones, Becca | MS. ENCARNACION |
| Babel, Molly | Linguistics | Levitan, Carmel | Bio He |
| Bartolone, Pauline | Journalism | Litwak, Steve | GA Transcriber |
| Battle, James | Medical Anthropology | Medina, Claudia | GA External Aff VP |
| Begtrup, Gavi | Physics | Miyazaki, Karin | Optometry |
| Berlanga, Monique | Law | Murphy, Melissa | Social Welfare |
| Besbris, Max | ASUC Rep | Ng, Charlene | IB |
| Botello, Elizabeth | Journalism | Notareschi, Loretta | Music |
| Cantor, Chris | Vision Science | Odusanya, Lola | GA President |
| Chakrabarti, Monami | Law | Ortega, Alberto | Public Health |
| Chanzit, Adam | East Asian Languages | Peterson, Elizabeth | DCRP |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Chavez, James | Law | Rajan, Nishanth | Haas PhD |
| Cobb, Corie | Mech Eng | Rinehart, Bruce | SIMS |
| Cohon, Adam | Political Science | Salas, Luis | Art Hist |
| Daal, Miguel | Physics | Scales, Joyce | Public Policy |
| Diaz-Herrera, Christine | Law | Schechtman, Rob | GA Acad Aff VP |
| Fairbrother, Malcolm | Sociology | So, Stella | Transportation Engineering |
| Fisher, Josh | GA Dept Liaison | Stagi, Jay | DCRP |
| Franklin, Johanna | Logic | Strange, Jason | Geography |
| Freedman, Danna | Chemistry | Tasoff, Josh | Economics |
| Garcia, David | Chemistry | Trahey, Lynn | Chemistry |
| Ghias, Shoaib | Jurisprudence and Social Policy | Tran, Richard | Rhetoric |
| Gross, Stephen | History | Troyani, Sara | Italian Studies |
| Hagar, Loddie | Chemical Engineering | VanderSal, Nicole | ESPM |
| Hao, Andy | Anthropology | Wolf, Jeff | Philosophy |
| Harley, Gabriel | MSE | Zahrt, Jenn | German |
| Haubenreich, Jacon | German | Elnaggar, Mariam | Chair |
| Hsueh, Susan | GA Manager | Tom, Sarah | Demography |