

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 2, 2006

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

-

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m.

Announcements

The deadline for nominations for the Faculty Mentorship Award was March 17.

A change in GSHIP insurance will affect students who do field work. A Resolution to address this will be submitted next month.

GA elections will be held next month.

The African American Conference will occur that weekend.

440 Stephens

Ms. Odusanya has been working with Dean Mason to renovate 440 Stephens as a space for grad students. A request was made for volunteers to help clean up and rearrange the room.

Presentation by Mike Weinberger, Director, Recreational Sports Facility

The GA heard from Mike Weinberger, Director of Recreational Sports. As a result of a referendum in '81, all students pay a mandatory fee \$57, for the construction bond and for operations. The fee was based on a faulty assumption that the State would pay for building maintenance and operations. The budget was about \$8.5 million, with about \$1.4-5 million from student money and over \$6 million from revenues. Other schools pay much higher mandatory student fees for their facilities.

Membership fees for the RSF have increased instead of having service cuts, and the fee was currently \$65. In the current model, it would have to increase every three years. A survey that fall found that in a choice between service cuts or paying more, and 75% preferred to pay more. GA and ASUC leaders lobbied for a referendum for a low mandatory fee instead of a higher membership fee, which was paid for out-of-pocket. Over half the number of students receiving Pell Grants dropped RSF membership when a fee waiver was dropped no longer made available.

A mandatory fee would be eligible for financial aid. And many grads have fees such as this paid for. People have asked about why money was spent to move the RSF's access point, and the renovation that was done will result in cost savings.

Three more treadmills have been ordered. Space was a problem.

The RSF had about 52 career employees, including 10 custodians and five maintenance people. They also staff some off-site facilities.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 2 -

The RSF shares the building with Athletics, and they were determining costs and usage, to prorate costs.

-

RSF Referendum

Since details of an RSF referendum were not yet public information, the GA met in executive session to discuss the Referendum.

Resolution

By a vote of 26-1-7, the GA approved the Resolution In Support of International Academic Student Employees. It called for full non-resident tuition remission to all Academic Student Employees); support of the efforts of UAW 2865 to win full non-resident tuition remission for all Academic Student Employees; and a letter communicating this stance to be written to appropriate University administrators.

Since 2001, in-State fees have gone up about \$2,000 and in addition, non-resident tuition has gone up \$2,000. International students get support from the University, but fees and tuition were decisions of the State Legislature. The GSRs were not included because they're not part of the collective bargaining agreement and already get full non-resident remission.

By-law Amendment

Section 11.3 nominations and terms, was amended to allow for GA elections to be held in April, instead of May. With no objection, the amendment was approved.

Autonomy

Four options were presented for action on autonomy. The first option was the status quo. The second option was the MOU. It would resolve previous election debt and set future election costs. GA reps could sit on the Elections Council and there would be three grad students on the Judicial Council. The third option would be to get a constitutional amendment on the ASUC ballot outlining the GA's status. The fourth option was complete autonomy. The GA would need to develop its own constitution and it would lose financial benefits from being part of the ASUC.

For option #3, the Senate could no longer claim to speak for the entire student body without the GA approving the bill.

A motion was made to endorse the MOU process and to have the Executive Board continue in future years continue to work on (3), a constitutional amendment. The Org. and Rules Committee could compile information for people next year.

By unanimous vote, the GA approved option #2, while keeping option #3 in mind for future years.

Report from the Manager/Advisor

The Empowering Women of Color Conference will be on Saturday. Grad students had free admission. The theme was environmental justice. Also, the GA had two open stipended positions, the Graduate

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

Minority Students Project Coordinator and the Graduate Support Services Coordinator, at 15 hours a week. A free tax workshop was scheduled for March 14, on taxes, with a tax advisor from H&R Block. The next deadline for Events funding, Round 7, was March 17.

Executive Officer Reports

Grad students were a disproportionate number, about 40% of voters, in the Class Pass and Career Center Referenda. The Class Pass was approved with the highest margin ever for a referendum, and the Career Center referendum was defeated.

Regulations were being reviewed by the University for student groups. The GA will attempt to implement language that forbid the OSL from charging groups to register. A second issue involved UCOP. The University has not allowed groups to register if it discriminated. As a result of a suit by a Christian group, UCOP was proposing that campuses allow such groups to register, but the groups could only use University resources if their events were open to the public ("soft approach"). The Berkeley campus argued that current campus policy should apply, and such groups should not be allowed to register ("hard approach").

A straw poll was taken, with 20 votes for the hard approach and 0 votes for the soft approach.

Committees were seeking members: The Regents Professorships and Lectureships Committee, which provide funds bring speakers to campus; the Life Safety Committee, which looks seismically unsafe buildings; and the Mental Health Advisory Committee; the Affirmative Action Committee.

The Finance Committee worked on the draft budget for 2006-2007.

The Funding Committee would e-mail out the correct amounts of rewards.

The Environmental Sustainability Committee hoped to create a Web site to make the GA more environmentally friendly and was trying to facilitate recycling at Anthony Hall. They hope to introduce resolutions to change thesis requirements to be more environmentally sustainable.

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

The ASUC Senate elected a new Elections Council Chair and hired a former Elections Council Chair as a consultant.

-

Report from the GA Representative on the Store Operations Board

The SOB discussed the Cal Lodge, a ski lodge the ASUC owns at Tahoe, and also discussed Tom Cordi's replacement. The Gelateria Naia opened, and student groups were encouraged to use the space, for meetings, seminars, and workshops.

The meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m. [End summary of the meeting.]

- 4 -

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Lola Odusanya at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Odusanya said that with no objection, the agenda would be amended by adding items to New Business, including approving the election of GA Officers at the April meeting instead of the May meeting, and adding an item on the RSF Referendum. WITH NO OBJECTION, THE AGENDA WAS APPROVED AS AMENDED.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

For the February minutes, Ms. Levitan asked to have her name removed from comments last month on the autonomy issue, and instead, to have the minutes read, "A Delegate said." With no objection, the minutes were amended. Ms. Odusanya said the change would be made by the Departmental Liaison. THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 2, 2006 MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Wolf said the deadline to make nominations for the Faculty Mentorship Award was March 17.

A Delegate said a change was made to the SHIP insurance program that applied to departments that do field work. Students who weren't registered or didn't have their fees covered could opt into SHIP, but only for a maximum of two semesters. But grads can be in the field for a year or two, and then write dissertations, and could be without insurance for two to three years. A Resolution addressing this will be submitted next month.

Mr. Fisher said Delegates should sign in and wear their name badges so they can remain if the meeting entered into executive session.

Ms. Odusanya the GA will hold elections next month, and if people were interested in running, they should talk to incumbents to get a sense of what was involved. Also the African American Conference will occur that weekend in Pauley Ballroom. Issues that affect African American students on campus will be discussed.

440 STEPHENS

Ms. Odusanya said she's been working with Dean Mason to renovate 440 Stephens as a space for grad students, and she would ask for volunteers for different time slots to clean up and rearrange the room.

440 Stephens (cont'd)

- 5 -

There was no similar space on campus for grads, and this would be for their exclusive use. The GA will purchase furniture and a projector. The idea was to have this done by April 2, and then promote the space and have an

opening. Volunteers were taken. Volunteering for Tuesday were Ms. Zahrt, Ms. Tom, Mr. Jones; Mr. Wolf, Mr. Huezo, and Mr. Strange; for Wednesday, Mr. Solis, Mr. Ortega, and Mr. Buccitelli; Mr. Lin, Mr. Harish, and Mr. Harley, Mr. Schechtman, Mr. Stagi, and Ms. Elnaggar.

PRESENTATION BY MIKE WEINBERGER, DIRECTOR, RECREATIONAL SPORTS FACILITY

Mr. Weinberger, of Recreational Sports, introduced himself and said he's been Director since 1997. Rec Sports has had a long and troubled financial history. The RSF was founded by a student referendum in '81. The fee, which all students pay, was set at \$57, to pay for the construction bond and operations. However, the fee was based on a faulty assumption that the State would pay for maintenance and operations of the building. But while under construction, there was a reinterpretation that student-funded buildings were not eligible for State money. The RSF opened in 1984 with a major operating deficit and has run annual deficits almost every year, which have been accumulating. Over time they've had a lot of attempts to raise revenue, and the RSF was one of the main rec departments in the country that was primarily revenue driven. Their budget was about \$8.5 million, and over \$6 million had to come from revenues. They get student funding and some Reg Fee money, with their allocation about \$630,000. They also get the residual from the RSF fee, about \$825,000. So about \$1.4 - \$1.5 million came from student money. As for where the rest came from, that was why the RSF sells everything, sometimes at high prices compared to other schools.

A common question was why somebody's friend at San Diego gets in free, and why Cal students had to pay a membership fee at Cal. The answer was that UCSD built into its Registration Fee a designated fee for the Rec Center of about \$270, compared to the fee at Cal, with a Reg Fee of \$57. The other campuses that built rec centers, many in the 1990s, learned from Berkeley's example and have much higher fees, with built-in amounts for operations and maintenance.

A referendum in 1999, the "BEARS Referendum," was primarily to fund Athletics, but the RSF as well, but was defeated by about 60-40%. At that time the RSF Advisory Board recommended a membership fee instead of service cuts, and the membership fee started in 2001. It's gone from \$25 to, now, \$65, based on financial modeling that would get them in the black on an annual basis. Accelerating the increase was a new campus policy regarding deficits and deficit repayment. So there was pressure to increase the fee to a level that would guarantee the RSF would be in the black, generate funds for deferred maintenance, and start to make payments on the debt.

Mr. Weinberger said he's had a lot of conversations with student leaders in the GA, Mr. Schechtman and Ms. Odusanya, and ASUC leaders. They pushed hard in the fall to persuade him to not raise the membership fee to \$65. Mr. Weinberger said he listened to them, but also had to listen to his administration and whom he reported to. So in the fall, the RSF went through a process in which they held a town hall meeting and did an electronic survey, with about 2,500 students responding. In essence, the survey asked if students wanted service cuts or if they were willing to pay more; and 75% said they would prefer to pay more. Fifty percent indicated a \$20 option, and about 25% said \$15. Based on that feedback, the RSF chose not to implement service cuts but instead, to increase the fee to \$65.

-
-
-

Presentation by Mike Weinberger, Director, Recreational Sports Facility (cont'd)

- 6 -

At that point, Mr. Schechtman, Ms. Odusanya, and leaders from the ASUC, approached the RSF with a very strong interest to have a lower referendum fee instead of a higher membership fee. Membership fees are paid for out-of-pocket, and wasn't eligible for financial aid. They've had a lot of conversations about that.

Mr. Weinberger said the other key thing he'd mention was that while in earlier years the RSF waived the fee for Pell

Grant students. But in the spring that policy was changed, with all students paying the same fee, and Pell Grant students no longer eligible for a waiver. So that has brought them to the present, with a \$65 fee.

Mr. Weinberger said the RSF seemed to be selling memberships at about the same rate as last year, maybe a couple of hundred behind. Sales were through, and they're at 11,000 or so. Comparing paid students to the prior year, 2,200 Pell Grant students purchased membership, and overall sales were up. But what broke his heart was that when Pell Grant students received free membership, instead of 2,200 they had 4,500 students. So they've seen over half the Pell Grant students demonstrate that they can't afford to be there. He thought that was a shame since he thought of the RSF as a pretty vital student service to the campus.

Mr. Weinberger said he was very pleased to hear that a referendum was something Ms. Odusanya and Mr. Schechtman were interested in supporting, along with the ASUC. It would put their financial base on a much firmer basis, rather than having to rely on sales. For their current model, based on membership fees, every year or two the membership fee would have to keep going up. Even at \$65, the survey had a lot of comments that students didn't like the increase, but thought it was a good value. But it wasn't known how far down the road that would change, and they start to lose students because it's too expensive compared to other options, or they just can't afford it. At that point, the model gets very unstable. That would be a sad day for Recreational Sports and what it provides. A Referendum would provide a solid base. As a mandatory fee, it would be eligible for financial aid, which he thought was a huge advantage. Most of Pell Grant students were undergrads, but many grad students apparently have fees such as this paid for. Built into the fee would be money for deferred maintenance, allowing the RSF to do things like get the field house roof repaired. It's a large, flat roof, probably the best site for solar energy on campus. If it was repaired, they'd look at a solar option on top of the facility. So the RSF was excited. And they know they could only be as excited as the students were excited. That's why he was there that evening, to answer questions and see what they think.

Mr. Schechtman said the Delegate body will debate the details of the Referendum. It hasn't been finalized, and the GA will go into executive session to explain where it stands at that time and to get a sense from the Delegates. The range they're looking at was a \$40 mandatory fee and a \$10 membership fee. If people have questions about the Referendum, he would ask them to please save them. Mr. Weinberger could answer questions about RSF facilities and services.

Mr. Schechtman said it was mentioned that fees have gone up from \$25 to \$65. There were plans to go beyond that, and he asked if Mr. Weinberger could share them, assuming the Referendum didn't pass. Secondly, he asked about the Advisory Board and the function it had. Questions about service levels have been brought up more than once among Delegates, and he asked how user feedback would be dealt with. Mr. Weinberger said that for future increases, he believed the model they have had it going up \$10 every three years, in perpetuity, not knowing what the market would bear, but knowing that at some point it would probably break. Demand has currently been steady at the current price. As for feedback, their

-

-
Presentation by Mike Weinberger, Director, Recreational Sports Facility (cont'd)

- 7 -

Advisory Board has six students and four non-students. The grad students on it were selected, he believed, through the Graduate Assembly. They meet every two weeks. The Board can look at any aspect of the operation it wanted to, and service issues come to them. They will put their names and contact information on the Web. The RSF was getting a new Web site. The current site was very large, but difficult to navigate, and in an old style. But they're within weeks of launching a totally new site, which will make it easier to find and contact the RSF. And if anyone wanted to send him an e-mail about a service complaint, Mr. Weinberger said he had an open-door policy and was very responsive.

Mr. Weinberger said he could bring up some of the issues Mr. Schechtman has told him about, and some issues he's

heard about, even in the survey. The RSF changed the access point from the front and swung it around so they control access to the activities center. That happened at the same time they were talking about fee increases, and there were some heated e-mails from people asking why the RSF was "wasting" money on the access system when money was needed for operations. Mr. Weinberger said the money that was spent on the access system came out of capital reserves, which were not available for operations; and some money for the change was lent to the RSF by the Vice Chancellor he reports to. The change was made because it saves a tremendous amount of staffing on a daily basis, an operational savings. The old configuration had a checkpoint immediately inside the Bancroft doors, and in coming in through Haas, outside the locker rooms, they had a chair in the hall. The second layer was a favorite entry point for people who didn't want to pay to use the facility. The RSF would staff that ramp, staff the outside of the locker room, and staff the front. By swinging the control point just across the activities space, and moving the turnstiles inside the locker room lobby, they no longer needed control points near the locker rooms and on the ramp. This change resulted in saving \$50,000 per position, in crude terms, at 100 hours a week, 50 weeks a year, or 5,000 hours of operation, at \$10 an hour. They didn't truly spend that because sometimes people didn't show up, and people would just enter the facility through those control points. The total project cost just under \$300,000, and his pitch to the Vice Chancellor, who lent money to do the project, was to have a three-year payback, with the project also providing other exciting possibilities. The change opens up the lobby and makes it public. Mr. Schechtman and others have talked to him about turning the little retail operation into something like the Free Speech Café, and the change allows the RSF to look at those sorts of options. They've also started to shut down the cashiering station, and doing those sales at the pro shop. So operationally, these changes were a great efficiency for the RSF.

Mr. Weinberger said another criticism he's heard that kind of surprised him was that people said they were taking their money and were hiring more police, asking why there was such a strong "police" presence in the building. He would assume that referred to the security patrol officers, the uniformed people who work through the Police Department, but were not actually police officers. What surprised him was that the RSF didn't change the number of security patrol officers it used. He thought what changed was having these patrol officers at the sites by the ramp and the locker room, filling in when student employees didn't show up, who aren't as visible and were in different places. With access easier to control, security was more visible in the lobby. But the RSF actually wasn't paying one dime more for security with the change in access.

Ms. Odusanya asked how many security people they have at any one point in the RSF. Mr. Weinberger said there were two shifts and an overlap period. He didn't know the exact length of that period. Ms. Odusanya said sometimes she's seen two or three security staff, and that really bothered her. Mr. Weinberger said that when there are three, he would suspect there was probably a security officer out of Haas Pavilion, paid by Athletics, who was bored and came over to talk to his friends.

-

-
Presentation by Mike Weinberger, Director, Recreational Sports Facility (cont'd)

- 8 -

Ms. Odusanya asked how many staff they actually cut by moving the turnstiles, or if they were just redistributed. Mr. Weinberger said they actually eliminated two student positions entirely. It's actually more than two people, because the RSF was open over 100 hours per week, 16 hours a day. So it was a lot of staff.

A Delegate asked if there was a way for people who never go to the RSF to pay some differential, in order to play on an intramural team. They have to pay the RSF a fee just to be on the team, even if they don't set a foot in the building. It seemed really unfair. Mr. Weinberger that's been debated. A considerable amount of intramurals don't take place in the building, with sports like flag football and soccer out on the field. The fee wasn't intended to be unfair, and was just more for ease of administration. Everybody had to be a member to be on a team. He hoped the Referendum goes through and the membership fee was no longer an onus to people.

Mr. Schechtman said that in Mr. Weinberger's defense, the RSF picks up the costs for maintenance of the fields.

However, Berkeley's intramural fees were among the highest in the country. Most Ivy League schools, e.g., don't charge for intramural sports. So people were sensitive to that.

Mr. Huevo asked if the big problem was debt repayment or operational issues, and asked if the proposed model considered revenue collection problems or any revenue-generating or expense-reduction ideas. Mr. Weinberger said they think they've been creative both in generation and reduction. The access change was a major reduction in expenses. Anything that could generate potentially \$100,000 in savings was a huge idea for the RSF. For revenue generation, that's what they were struggling with. They've gone down the corporate path a little, and people could see banners. That's been difficult to try to balance, and it's something the Advisory Board looked at. But that was an idea for new, non-student money. Another idea for revenue generation was a passport processing center they opened, which they think was a good service. They're always open to new ideas. The model clearly requires them to keep looking for both efficiencies and revenue.

Mr. Fisher asked about the maintenance of the turnstiles, which always seemed to be down, and if the Vice Chancellor gave money for that. Mr. Weinberger said what they got was a partial loan to change the access. The RSF used capital reserves for that, about \$240,000, and got a loan for \$60,000. Mr. Fisher asked if the roof was a capital project. Mr. Weinberger said it was, and would probably cost \$500,000 or more. The RSF was struggling with an operating deficit that was almost \$400,000 last year. They didn't need to miss much each year to have a large, accumulated deficit, and over 20 years, that deficit was now \$4.9 million. The campus was saying the RSF, along with other units with a deficit, needed to start repaying that.

Ms. Jones asked why there weren't more machines, given that waits were so long. She asked if space was the issue. Mr. Weinberger said it was, and that was their highest priority. The RSF opened with zero machines, because cardio machines in 1984 weren't the trend or of interest to anyone. They currently have an order to buy three more treadmills. Space was the issue. That's one reason they enforce the bag policy. He knew that was a hassle, but space was so tight, and per the fire code, they try to keep clutter down. But they look for every opportunity to put in new machines. One idea to expand the number of machines was to move the little message area on the mezzanine. It was a nice service, but wasn't particularly heavily used by the students, and he'd like to relocate it. He could see a line of 12 treadmills in that area, which would double the number of treadmills they have. The treadmills they buy cost \$6-8,000 each, because the usage they get was phenomenal.

-

-

Presentation by Mike Weinberger, Director, Recreational Sports Facility (cont'd)

- 9 -

Ms. Trahey asked if home treadmills were just not up to standard. Mr. Weinberger said they wouldn't last. They operate 16 hours a day, and they have a full-time staffperson doing nothing but repair treadmills. The Delegate asked if people could run on the track without being a member, now that the turnstiles were moved. Mr. Weinberger said people could access the track without being a member. They tried to staff it, but that was a waste of money. But Athletics was proposing to close the track quite a bit more. He was wrestling them to keep it open. They were talking about a secured entrance that only their card could trigger, to get people on to the track. The Delegate asked if they want to close it to save money on lighting. Mr. Weinberger said was no lighting. There was some vandalism, not necessarily by students, and pole vault mats were torched, causing \$100,000 worth of damage. So Athletics was motivated to try to secure it.

The Delegate said the Blue and Gold Gyms were very large, and asked if there was any thought about sectioning them off so there would be more room. She knew of one intramural sport that had to practice from 9:30 to 11 p.m. because there was no space. Mr. Weinberger said it was interesting to listen to different users. Listening to the cardio users, there would be nothing but cardio. Recreational basketball players would clean out the weight room and put hoops in there. The RSF tried to remind itself that it's an educational institution and wasn't just trying to maximize the number of machines and space, but to offer educational opportunities and different kinds of activities that may not be widely

known. People at a university should try different things. They need more dance rooms, and the two small weight rooms used to be dance studios. People also have to wait hours to play rec basketball. The balance they have was that they do have rec volleyball and badminton, which actually was pretty big. People play table tennis in the hallways. One of the highest ranked female players in the world was on campus, and played in the hallway. One goal of his was to look for space wherever he could find it.

Ms. Odusanya asked about the structure of the RSF in terms of staff because she's heard it might have multiple managers doing overlapping tasks. Mr. Weinberger said they have about 52 career employees, including 10 custodians and five maintenance people. They also staff the Strawberry Canyon facility, the Golden Bear youth gymnastics program on the Clark Kerr campus, and a site at the Berkeley Marina. They run probably one of the largest youth programs in the summer. Ms. Odusanya asked if he could provide the GA with a written document of those 52 staff. Mr. Weinberger said he could.

Ms. Levitan said it seemed there was an overlapping use of space and asked if the RSF gets any revenue for sharing the building. Mr. Weinberger said that the locker rooms were actually in the basement of Haas Pavilion, which was Athletics'. When it was built, the RSF was merged with Athletics, and if they didn't have that express cooperation, it wouldn't have been built. Athletics uses the RSF, and the basketball and volleyball teams practice in the Blue Gum on occasion, and the gymnastics team practices a lot at the Golden Bear Gym site. They were putting the final touches on a huge matrix to lay out and prorate all the costs and the usage, because he didn't think it has been fair in the past. So they're trying to resolve that.

Mr. Begtrup said it was mentioned fees would go up \$10 every three years. Mr. Weinberger said that was the last model they had. Mr. Gavin asked if the student fee would increase over time, because the mandatory fee would not, and asked if this would just postpone the same problem. Mr. Schechtman said they'd get into the details in closed session. The aim was to get the fee covered by fee waivers and financial aid so that would stay constant. Mr. Gavin said the membership fee would increase over time. Mr. Schechtman said that was correct.

-

-

Presentation by Mike Weinberger, Director, Recreational Sports Facility (cont'd)

- 10 -

Mr. Fisher said they really appreciate Mr. Weinberger coming in and talking to them. They feel the communication with RSF management has been lacking in the past, and this meeting, and meetings with the Advisory Board, were signs in the opposite direction. A prorated model with Athletics was mentioned, and he asked what savings were projected and how that would influence the cost structure and fees. Mr. Weinberger said it was really premature at that point. Athletics, of course, feels it subsidizes Rec Sports. So they are nowhere near agreement about who owes who money. It's not significant, in the neighborhood of a maximum of \$100-150,000.

Mr. Stagi said he would also like to thank Mr. Weinberger for his presentation to the GA. When issues were brought to the Advisory Board, and it came forward with suggestions, he asked how, systemically, that information would be processed and addressed. Mr. Weinberger said depending on the issue, the Advisory Board discusses options and makes recommendations. The RSF tries to implement them. They usually try to communicate with them or its members through e-mail. The Board meets every two weeks and goes dormant during the summer, and takes a while to get started in the fall. So there are periods when the Board wasn't active. They also have yellow comment sheets for suggestions that people have, and staff try to respond to each of them. The RSF tries to take action or do something about what people ask.

Mr. Stagi asked if those comments and the RSF's responses were collated and could be posted. Mr. Weinberger said the Web site has a collection of frequently asked questions or concerns. And as they make a decision, and publish a decision, and keep adding to that archive. He thought a good Web site would make communication a lot better. Mr.

Stagi asked if that meant the RSF was planning that in the future. Mr. Weinberger said they were. It's within weeks of being launched.

Mr. Weinberger said she would like to thank Mr. Weinberger very much for attending the meeting. (Applause) Mr. Weinberger said he would be glad to come back. Somebody said it was hard to communicate with the RSF, and it didn't need to be, and if they'd like to see him, even on a regularly-scheduled basis, once a semester, they should just let him know. Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank him.

NEW BUSINESS

-

RSF Referendum

Ms. Odusanya asked Mr. Schechtman to give the details of the Recreational Sports Facility Referendum. Mr. Schechtman asked to meet in executive session because the details were not yet public information. A motion to meet in executive session was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Odusanya said that if people didn't have a badge or were not a registered Delegate or Alternate, she would ask them to please leave the room temporarily. This meeting entered into closed session.

RESOLUTION

Back in open session, the following Resolution, as amended by the author, was authored by Mr. Fairbrother and was sponsored by the Foreign Student Affairs Committee:

-

Resolution In Support of International Academic Student Employees (cont'd)

- 11 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC STUDENT EMPLOYEES

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

WHEREAS, new international doctoral student enrollment at UC Berkeley specifically has declined by one-third since 2001; and

WHEREAS, these declines have been caused in significant part by large increases in nonresidents' total tuition and fees (\$4079.20/semester), unmatched by equivalent increases in the funding available to international students; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley consequently loses many exceptional graduate students to competing universities elsewhere in the US and abroad; and

WHEREAS, Graduate Division statistics show that foreign Ph.D. students in sciences and engineering are as likely to stay in California after graduating as are Americans from other states; and

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

WHEREAS, international students working as Academic Student Employees are likely to be in particular need of financial assistance and therefore likely to benefit the most from additional such assistance;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly:

1. Supports the University of California, Berkeley providing a full non-resident tuition remission to all Academic Student Employees (GSIs, readers, and tutors);
2. Supports the efforts of UAW 2865 to win a full non-resident tuition remission for all Academic Student Employees; and
3. Will write a letter to the appropriate University administrators communicating the substance of this Resolution.

Mr. Fairbrother said that after talking to the Union, he amended the Resolution. The Resolution proposes that the GA endorse the University giving all academic student employees a full remission for their non-resident tuition. This was primarily aimed at international students. He was the Chair of the Foreign Students Committee and he would briefly run down some of the statistics. The big decline in international graduate students at UC in the last few years was not unrelated to geopolitical developments and things the federal government has done, but was also not unrelated to dramatic increase in tuition and fees in the last few years. In-State fees since 2001 have gone up about \$2,000 and non-resident tuition has gone up \$2,000 on top of that. Mr. Fairbrother said he was offered a position as a GSI that fall, a 50% time appointment, which would give him an in-State fee waiver but would also leave him on the hook for \$7,347 in non-resident tuition. Since his salary for the entire semester was \$7,573, that left him \$226 to live on for the semester.

-

-

Resolution In Support of International Academic Student Employees (cont'd)

- 12 -

Mr. Fairbrother said he felt, to some extent, this was an issue of fairness for international students. If people work for the University in a significant way, 20 hours a week, and probably more, they should not actually have to return all the money they earn back to the University. He also thought this spoke to the prestige and standing of the University as a whole. This was a way to support the students, and he thought it should mean a lot to the University in innumerable ways. He thought international students feel a lot of support from the University and from fellow students, and even the Administration was fairly sympathetic. But to some extent fees and tuition were decisions of the State Legislature. The proposed change would make a big difference and was something the University could do. Personally, if current fees and tuition were in place when he was a second-year student, when he had to work 50% in a GSiship and 25% in a GSRship in the same semester, and had to take out the very most in loans that he could from the Canadian federal government, he would simply have had to drop out. He called for any questions.

Ms. Levitan said she was worried about whether departments would discriminate against international students. Mr. Fairbrother that was already the case. The problem to some extent was that a lot of departments give enough of an attractive package to bring students here for a year, but then starting the second year, kind of cut the students off. That happened in his case and to other students. A lot of GSIs were not particularly first-years, but were early in their programs, and a point where they were especially vulnerable. Students feel there should at least be some acknowledgement of what was going on. There was a concern this wasn't fully addressed, but he thought the proposal would be an improvement.

Ms. Anderson asked if it was worthwhile for departments to encourage people to become residents. She wouldn't want her department to pay out-of-State tuition because she was too lazy to fill out the forms. Mr. Fairbrother said the

Resolution specifically asks to have a waiver given to all non-residents. They feel to specify only international students would effectively be making a starting concession in the upcoming negotiations with the University, which were starting that month.

Ms. Tom asked if there was a reason GSRs were not included. Mr. Fairbrother said GSRs were not part of the collective bargaining agreement and GSRs actually already officially get full non-resident remission. Ms. Tom said one reason her department offered fewer spots to international students was because the extra tuition had to come out of the grant from whomever the GSR came from. So that's been a problem for her department. Ms. Odusanya said that to address that concern, she knew that Dean Mason has worked hard to have fewer admissions for students who have passed qualifying exams, so it would depend on when departments have qualifying exams.

Ms. Tom said this would be for first- and second-year students. Mr. Schechtman said that was a policy change that would start next year. It used to be a 75% reduction of non-resident tuition after passing qualifying exams, and now it's a 100% reduction. So once international students pass their qualifying exam, they get resident tuition. Mr. Fairbrother said that was for three years, and in some departments, students actually stay longer, and the tuition goes back up.

Mr. Begtrup asked what the actual financial impact of the Resolution would be. Mr. Fairbrother said he didn't know, and that was a good question. The Union was preparing to bargain over these terms and was making this a priority. Membership surveys were taken, and according to the Union, high student fees were a very high priority. This was their initial starting demand. They feel it was valid for the University to spend its resources on this.

A Delegate said she was also concerned about making this open to all members. Mr. Fairbrother said after one year, students would become residents. The Delegate said that was only if the student does all

-

-

Resolution In Support of International Academic Student Employees (cont'd)

- 13 -

the work. Mr. Fairbrother it was difficult, and the process of becoming a resident in California was incredibly crazy and bureaucratic. And international students could never become residents. The Delegate said that was why she thought this should be specific for those who could not become residents. For those who can, it should be their responsibility to do so. Mr. Fairbrother said he was sympathetic to her point, but it made sense to still become a resident, unless they expect to work as a GSI/GSR every semester. The Delegate said that's what people in her department do, and it was an issue.

Mr. Schechtman said this really came down to a problem with the Legislature, which funds GSI salaries. It's not very keen on just targeting international students. They take the stance that they don't want to subsidize non-California residents. So it's already an uphill battle.

A Delegate asked about the likelihood of this actually passing. Mr. Fairbrother said a partial non-resident tuition waiver for international students was feasible, and would make a tremendous difference. He thought pressure from the Union plus the voice of the GA would make headway.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC STUDENT EMPLOYEES, AS AMENDED BY THE AUTHOR, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 26-1-7.

BY-LAW AMENDMENT

-

-
Ms. Odusanya said the next item on the agenda was Mr. Stagi's By-law change. Mr. Stagi said he would apologize that they don't have the By-law in favor of them. It was 11.3, dealing with nominations and terms. "Nominations for Officers and elected representatives to the Assembly for the following year shall be made no earlier than the April Assembly meeting and election of the Officers and representatives shall be the first order of business at the last Assembly meeting." The idea was to back that up one month each, so it would read:

"Nominations for Officers and elected representatives to the Assembly for the following year shall be made no earlier than the March Assembly meeting and election of the Officers and representatives shall be the first order of business at the second-to-last Assembly meeting of the Spring Semester."

Ms. Odusanya said the change would move elections from May to April, allowing for more transition time.

A motion to amend the By-laws was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

AUTONOMY DISCUSSION

Ms. Odusanya said people should take about five minutes to read the four different options.

-

-
Autonomy Discussion (cont'd)

- 14 -

Mr. Stagi said option (1) was the status quo; (2) was the MOU. Again, it would be about resolving previous election debt and setting election costs in the future. The MOU would give the ability for GA representatives to sit on the Elections Council to make sure costs were under control. The ASUC Judicial Council currently has having purview over the GA, and the proposal would have three grad student members. That would be a little onerous for grads who fill those positions, but it was a way out from having to be under the J-Council. This option would need to be done fairly expeditiously. Option (3) was "equality," going through the process of getting a constitutional amendment on the ASUC ballot, which would be tricky in terms of developing language and getting it on the ballot. The GA would still be part of the ASUC and it wouldn't screw up the financial benefit with the ASUC, which the GA talked about with the lawyer. Option (4) was the same amendment process as (3), with the only difference that the GA would have complete autonomy. That would mean they'd have to develop their own constitution and they'd lose any benefit from being associated with the ASUC. They couldn't run for ASUC office and the GA would have a problem with the financial benefits it now gets. From speaking with some people, it didn't seem like option (4) would at all would be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. Fairbrother said he appreciated the written discussion that was provided. Ms. Odusanya said it was written by Ms. Levitan and Mr. Stagi. Mr. Fairbrother asked if there was a consensus among the Executive Officers as to which option was preferable and if the options could be put in rank order. Ms. Odusanya said the Executive Board didn't have a preference to present. She could tell them what she thought, but that would be her personal preference. Mr. Stagi said they thought they'd leave it to the GA.

Ms. Levitan asked if having three grads on the J-Council would require an amendment to the ASUC Constitution, or a referendum. Mr. Stagi said that would be part of it. Ms. Odusanya said the ASUC was willing to approve that portion of the MOU. Ms. Levitan asked if that could be on the ASUC ballot in April. Ms. Odusanya said it could be.

Mr. Garcia asked if, in option #3, there would need to be joint passage of a bill if the ASUC or the GA wanted to speak for the entire student body. That would mean the Senate could no longer claim to speak for the entire student body without the GA approving the bill. Ms. Odusanya said that was correct.

Ms. Anderson asked about the chances for options #3 or #4 passing. Ms. Odusanya said #4 was close to dead. Ms. Levitan said that if the ASUC didn't approve #3, the GA could get 1,000 signatures to place the question on the ballot. That also applied to option #4.

Mr. Purdy said it was mentioned in the past that the GA could go to the Chancellor, and he asked if that was an option. Ms. Odusanya said the Chancellor would come in if the GA got screwed with the process they were undertaking. The Delegate said it seemed like the ASUC might do that with option #4. Mr. Stagi said that in the final analysis, the GA wasn't 100% certain about the Chancellor. Ms. Odusanya said the Chancellor said he would look into it, so it wasn't guaranteed. The Chancellor would prefer that this be resolved by the students.

Mr. Harley asked if it was possible to have an MOU deal with the budget and the elections debt, and then pursue another option. Mr. Stagi there could be some separability if they say they don't care about the other stuff, since most of this was being done at the GA's behest. The reason the ASUC was making a deal on elections costs was because the GA would agree to pay a certain amount it owes. He felt the ASUC would follow through with that element of the MOU.

-

-

Autonomy Discussion (cont'd)

- 15 -

Ms. Levitan moved to endorse the MOU process and to continue to have the Executive Board in future years and continue to work on a constitutional amendment, and try to get it passed. Ms. Odusanya said that Ms. Levitan was suggesting they go with the MOU while keeping options #3 and #4 in mind for future years. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Garcia asked for a straw poll. A straw poll was taken on the proposed options. For option #1, 0 votes; option #2, 8 votes; option #3, 14 votes; option #4, 0.

Ms. Odusanya called for any objection to Ms. Levitan's suggestion, to go with option #2, with the intention of pursuing options #3 and #4 in future years.

Mr. Garcia asked what the point was, since that would be saying that sometime in the future they'd start over again. Ms. Levitan they should adopt option #2 and people could consider whether or option #3 was beneficial.

Mr. Fairbrother said there seemed to be a bit of fuzziness with the motion as to whether the GA's intention was firm. Ms. Odusanya said they couldn't decide on the agenda for next year, although that year's GA could suggest that this be pursued. So they couldn't make it a firm commitment. Mr. Garcia asked if they could create a standing committee that would continue next year, to be charged with making a decision. Ms. Levitan said she would suggest that the Organization and Rules Committee compile information to be passed off to people next year so they hit the ground running.

Ms. Odusanya said the wording would be that the Assembly would approve option #2, with the intention to pursue option #3 next year and in future years.

Mr. Garcia asked if they could vote for option #3 and also move forward with the MOU as well. Ms. Odusanya said doing both at the same time was almost impossible.

Ms. Hsueh said the GA and the ASUC have been working very, very hard to come to an agreement. Option #2 already had a lot of things that have been in effect for at least a year. Next year there will be a new Executive Board and a new ASUC President. If they want to have the whole thing start over again, they could vote for an option different from the MOU. But if they want to keep what has already been agreed upon, then option #2 was the best they could do at that point. The GA could continue discussing options #3 and #4 in the future, but they should not have the energy and effort wasted.

A Delegate said it didn't make sense to pursue option #3 that year because there was no time. If they did anything that year, it would have to be option #2.

Mr. Besbris said that even if the GA voted for option #2, a lot of things still needed to happen with it in the ASUC.

Mr. Huezo asked if the MOU was annual. Ms. Odusanya said it was in perpetuity.

Mr. Harley asked how many seats were on the Judicial Council. Ms. Odusanya said there were nine. Also, there was a typo in the agenda packet in the discussion on the MOU, and the GA would forward three nominees to the Senate for confirmation, not two.

-

-

Autonomy Discussion (cont'd)

- 16 -

Ms. Levitan asked if the GA's nominees to the J-Council would have to be approved by the Senate. Ms. Odusanya said they would need Senate approval.

A Delegate asked if there would be a minimum of three grads on the J-Council. Mr. Buenrostro it could be more than three, but in that case, the ASUC President would have to make the additional nominations.

Ms. Ng asked if there was any movement to lower election fees in general. At other universities, students pay out of pocket, and people have a cap on how much they could spend on campaigns. Mr. Buenrostro said reducing costs would be up to future Senates. This year they're trying to move to online elections. If things go well, they could start to decrease costs in the future. He felt the numbers under consideration would allow the ASUC to have a framework to make sure elections were efficient, and that it was something the Senate would approve. He tried to get as much feedback from ASUC Senators as possible.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE OPTION #2, WHILE KEEPING OPTION #3 IN MIND FOR FUTURE YEARS, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. (Applause)

REPORTS

Report from the Manager/Advisor

Ms. Hsueh said the Empowering Women of Color Conference was on Saturday, at Barrows Hall, starting at 8:30 a.m. Grad students had free admission. The theme that year was environmental justice, and the speaker was from the Hurricane Katrina area. She had publicity to distribute for people to share.

The GA also has two open stipended positions, the Graduate Minority Students Project Coordinator and the Graduate Support Services Coordinator, at 15 hours a week. Also, quite a few Executives were graduating, so people were needed to run.

Ms. Hsueh said the next workshop will be March 14, on taxes, with a tax advisor from H&R Block. The workshop was free. Also, the Funding Advisor submitted a report. There were a couple of mistakes, so the report that was distributed was preliminary, and all the needed adjustments will be made. People receiving allocations will receive e-mails notifying them of the amount. Ms. Hsueh said the next deadline for Events funding, Round 7, was March 17.

Executive Officer Reports

For the President's report, Ms. Odusanya said that for the last month she's worked on 440 Stephens, on autonomy, the RSF, the Class Pass, and the Career Center. Hopefully the next meeting will be at 440 Stephens.

For the Academic Affairs Vice President's report, Mr. Schechtman said he would like to thank and congratulate them for the fee referenda. Grad students were a disproportionate number of voters, about 40%.

-

-

Executive Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 17 -

The Class Pass was approved with the highest number margin ever for a referendum. And the opposition to the Career Center referendum sent a very strong message to the Chancellor, who was sending the message down to Vice Chancellors that it was their benefit to work with students and not against them.

Mr. Schechtman said UCOP was reviewing regulations for student groups that register with the University. The Office of Student Life last year proposed charging all student groups \$40 just to register with the University. The GA and the ASUC successfully defeated that. So the first issue was a proposal to get language approved that would forbid the OSL from charging a fee for groups to register.

The second issue was around the right to assembly. Currently, groups were not allowed to register with the University if they discriminate against protected categories, such as race, gender, ethnicity, religion, national origin, language, sexual orientation. There's an exception for fraternities and sororities. A Christian organization has a lawsuit against UCSF claiming the constitutional right to assembly, to form a group and determine the group's membership. The University OP was recommending what Mr. Schechtman said he'd call "the soft approach," which would allow campuses to register such groups and allow the groups to discriminate on the basis of membership as they choose. But such groups could only use University resources if their events were open to the public and all were invited. In the worst-case scenario, the Ku Klux Klan could register as a student group, but wouldn't be allowed to get Projects and Services funding, but could get Events funding as long as the entire campus community was invited. The UCOP General Counsel's office believed that was the constitutionally right thing to do. The Berkeley campus Administration was taking a harder line, which he'd call "the hard approach," that current campus policy should apply, forbidding groups from discriminating. Such groups should not be allowed to register, because just by the process of registering and using classrooms, they were de facto using University resources, which were publicly financed. This was a very sticky legal area.

Mr. Schechtman said he was recommending the harder approach, which the Berkeley campus was leaning towards. But that might result in a lawsuit.

A Delegate asked what kinds of groups they were talking about. A Mock Trial group, e.g., had to minimize the

number of people on the team, and asked if that was discriminatory. Mr. Schechtman said it wasn't. The example, he believed, was Seventh Day Adventists at UCSF who did not allow gay and lesbian members to serve on their board because it violated the group's religious credo. The group claimed a right to form an organization and exclude those members from its organization because gay and lesbian people have their own organizations.

Mr. Ortega asked what other public schools were doing. Mr. Schechtman said he was shocked to hear administrators say that has not come up. He was told there was no federal court case that provided a precedent.

A Delegate asked if there's a middle ground, of having such groups register but to not use University property. Mr. Schechtman said the soft approach that UCOP was taking was that groups could register and use University property, but not receive UC financial resources. Groups would have to meet off-campus, except for public events. That might be a middle ground.

Ms. Odusanya said they would take a rough straw poll. Mr. Schechtman said this wouldn't be decided upon for another six months.

-

-

Executive Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 18 -

A Delegate asked what the point was in registering if a group couldn't use any resources. Mr. Schechtman said they could be listed on the Web site. Mr. Daniels said the soft approach would allow these groups to meet on campus. Mr. Schechtman said the middle ground would at least allow these groups to hold debates or public forums.

Ms. Levitan said that if the Ku Klux Klan held a march that anybody could participate in, under the soft plan it would be eligible for money. Mr. Schechtman said that was correct.

Mr. Schechtman said he would ask for a straw poll on the hard and soft options. The hard approach would not allow groups to register if they discriminate. The soft option would allow such groups to register. A straw poll was taken. For the hard approach there were 20 votes, and for the soft approach there were 0 votes.

Mr. Schechtman said his last point dealt with campus committees. There were three committees looking for members. The Regents Professorships and Lectureships Committee doles out money to bring interesting people to campus; the Life Safety Committee looks at what to do with Eshleman, e.g., because it's seismically unsafe; and the Mental Health Advisory Committee. If Delegates knew of any grads who were interested, he would ask them to send an e-mail.

Mr. Fisher said the Affirmative Action Committee also needs to be filled.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Ms. Tom said the Finance Committee worked on the draft budget for 2006-2007. She could answer any questions people might have. They were also one member short of a quorum. They meet on the Tuesday before the GA meets, usually from 6:15 to 7:15.

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Ms. Zahrt said she sent Ms. Moore the correct spreadsheet for student funding and she failed to print it out. She would e-mail out the corrections.

Ms. Odusanya said Mr. Allen, a Grad Council rep, had to leave, but said there was nothing substantial to report.

Reporting for the Organization and Rules Committee, Mr. Stagi said they voted on the change of By-laws. Since the

elections will be held at the GA's next meeting, candidates should figure out their platforms. The Committee also considered the Sustainability Resolution that will be considered at the next GA meeting.

Reporting for the Environmental Sustainability Committee, Mr. Harley said they were looking at a lot of different ways to make the GA more environmentally friendly. They hope to create a Web site for this and were looking at facilitating recycling at Anthony Hall, to make it easier. The GA was buying 35% recycled paper and will probably be able to buy 100%. They're also looking at how to help other groups become more environmentally sustainable. They hope to introduce some resolutions to change thesis requirements, to be more environmentally sustainable, since theses now require wide spacing and a certain type of paper. They also want to push the University to use its investments in a more socially conscious manner.

Ms. Franklin said the written report mentions a new funding category, the "Environmental Sustainability Grant." She thought, instead, they could change the title of another grant. Mr. Garcia said a new

-

-
Executive Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 19 -

category could also create a further burden on the GA's SAOs and might result in a huge financial cost as a result of bumping up Ms. Moore's classification.

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

Mr. Besbris said the ASUC Senate elected a new Elections Council Chair last night. There's a big time crunch, because the earlier Chair had to resign. They also decided to hire a consultant, a former Elections Council Chair. A bill was also approved to tentatively push elections back two weeks, to late April. But it might be challenged before the J-Council.

-

Report from the GA Representative on the Store Operations Board

Ms. Odusanya said the SOB discussed the Cal Lodge, a ski lodge the ASUC owns at Tahoe. They also discussed Tom Cordi's replacement. Mr. Schechtman said the Gelateria Naia has opened, and student groups were encouraged to use the space. It's open late at night and profits help fund the ASUC Auxiliary. He would ask Delegates to please spread the word. Ms. Odusanya said the owner was willing to have meetings, seminars, and workshops in that space.

A motion to approve the reports was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

This meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

-
-

- 20 -

Present at the March 14 GA Meeting

Agarwal, Harish	Physics	Humphrey, Jennifer	Social Welfare
Allen, Ben	Law	Jones, Alexander	Plant & Microbial Biology
Anderson, Meghan	Math	Jones, Becca	MS. ENCARNACION
Angus, Annette	Plant & Microbial Biology	Kasad, Roshni	MCB
Arons, Sam	Energy & Resources Group	Levitan, Carmel	Bio He
Battle, James	Medical Anthropology	Litwak, Steve	GA Transcriber
Begtrup, Gavi	Physics	Lutzy, Rebecca	IB
Bertucci, Sonja	French	Ng, Charlene	IB
Besbris, Max	ASUC Rep	Odusanya, Lola	GA President
Buccitelli, Anthony	Folklore	Ortega, Alberto	Public Health
Chakrabarti, Monami	Law	Patel, Seema	Law
Chanzit, Adam	East Asian Languages	Peterson, Elizabeth	DCRP
Cobb, Corie	Mech Eng	Purdy, David	Stats
Cohon, Adam	Political Science	Rajan, Nishanth	Haas PhD
Daniels, Josh	Campus Committee Liaison	Rinehart, Bruce	SIMS
Elnaggar, Mariam	Publications Committee Chair	Salas, Luis	Art Hist
Fairbrother, Malcolm	Sociology	So, Stella	Transportation Engineering
Fisher, Josh	GA Dept Liaison	Stagi, Jay	DCRP
Franklin, Johanna	Logic	Stalcup, Meg	Anthro
Garcia, David	Chemistry	Strange, Jason	Geography
Gross, Stephen	History	Tom, Sarah	Demography
Hao, Andy	Anthropology	Trahey, Lynn	Chemistry
Harley, Gabriel	MSE	Tran, Richard	Rhetoric
Haynes, Erin	Linguistics	Troyani, Sara	Italian Studies
Hsueh, Susan	GA Manager	Wolf, Jeff	Philosophy
Huezo, Hector	Law	Yu, Way	Optometry
Huff, Eric	Astronomy	Zahrt, Jenn	German