

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

September 14, 2006

### **SUMMARY OF THE MEETING**

This meeting commenced the Fall Semester. It was called to order at 5:30

#### Announcements

Taylor Allbright, ASUC representative to the GA, introduced herself. Graduate Assembly.

Garbirel Bollag, from SOJA, Students Organizing for Justice in the Americas, said they were working on a sweat-free initiative, the Designated Suppliers Program, so items sold on campus were from factories that don't use sweatshop labor, use unions, and pay a living wage. SOJA was also working on a living wage for cafeteria workers and custodians.

Vishal Gupta, Executive VP of the ASUC and Chair of the Senate, introduced himself. He invited Delegates to Senate meetings, such as to make announcements. Senators could do a lot of outreach. The ASUC also hoped to hold a GA/ASUC mixer.

#### ELECTION OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT

At the April GA meeting, Delegates elected Ben Allen as the External Affairs VP. But since then, Mr. Allen became the Student Regent. Since he couldn't serve as the VP, the Executive Board elected Matt "Tex" Eckerle as the interim External Affairs VP. The position dealt with off-campus issues and the UC Student Association, the Systemwide student government.

With no objection, the GA elected Mr. Eckerle as External Affairs Vice President.

#### REPORTS

Mr. Harley reported for the Environmental Sustainability Committee. They'll work to make sure the money the GA spent was done in an environmentally sustainable way. Sustainability language has been incorporated in new language for grant applications and a document on sustainability will be given to groups that receive funds. They want to revise the Web site and work with the Office of Student Life to integrate sustainability in workshops. A student fee referendum to raise money for sustainability will probably be voted on by the students in April.

Mr. Stavrinides reported for the Foreign Students Affairs Committee. The Committee had its first meeting of the year on Friday and currently had four members. The first meeting was to organize and look at their goals and plans for the year. The goal of the Committee was to increase international student diversity at UC Berkeley and also support their current international students. They hoped to build a strong international student community and work on non-resident tuition.

Ms. Stevens-Carter, Funding Advisor, reported on behalf of the Business Manager, Ms. Hsueh. The GA had three new Project Coordinators: Maxie Mckinney, Graduate Minority Students Project; Jade Sasser, Graduate Support Services; and Lupe Niumeitolu, Women of Color Initiative Coordinator. Also, the Business Office had a successful June closing. Grant and travel allocations for '06-07 were listed on the Web, as were upcoming events. They had savings on '05-06, and most of that was carried forward to '06-07. Ms. Hsueh will meet with the Finance Chair to reassess the budget.

Ms. Ahrendt reported for GA reps on the Graduate Council. It deals with all graduate student-related issues. The Grad Council hoped to monitor non-resident tuition fees (NRT fees). The Grad Council realizes it's a problem. The real problem was with the Regents. GA reps were pushing for mandatory inclusion of students in departmental reviews.

Mr. Jiminez reported for the Funding Committee, which reviews requests and gives out money to GA groups. Funding workshops were required in order to receive allocations. The next deadline for funding was September 22, for every funding category except Travel, October 1.

Mr. Rajan reported for the Finance Committee. It passes the next year's GA budget. It hoped to gauge the impact of Resolutions the GA passes on its finances and will work on the budget development process.

Mr. Dillon reported for the Organization and Rules Committee. They'll work on revising the By-laws.

Mr. Eckerle reported, External Affairs VP. The position dealt with issues affecting graduate student quality of life outside UC Berkeley, with legislators, the Governor, Regents, and local politicians. They participated in the UC Student Association Congress in July, and decided on three Action Agenda Items for the year: get out the vote, diversity and resident tuition for international grads; and Student Compact legislation. Delegates were urged to do class raps to register voters. They also want to look at diversity trends among international students.

Ms. Cementwala reported, Academic Affairs VP. Academic Affairs sort of dealt with on-campus issues and lobbying campus administrators. Delegates were urged to sit on campus and Academic Senate committees

Mr. Daniels reported, GA President. He hoped to create a President's Advisory Council and do outreach to get Delegates from more department. The Committee on Lower Sproul will work to find out what grad students actually want with Lower Sproul renovation.

Becca Jones introduced herself, Departmental Liaison, who put together the meeting and the food..

## RESOLUTIONS

By voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution Selecting the Action Agenda Items for the 2006-2007 Academic Year. The GA's Action Agenda Items for 2006-2007, issues to focus on, included student family issues, health care, and Lower Sproul Redevelopment. Other items the Board considered were student fees, affordable housing, outreach, and recruitment and retention. Action Agenda Items were kept broad, so various issues could be rolled into them.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the resolution correcting inconsistencies in the By-laws, to make budgetary realities and funding practices consistent. Student groups will be funded \$5.00 per grad and \$1 per other persons attending events, and there will be an \$800 cap per semester for student groups for Grad Events 1 and 2.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution Nominating Joshua Templet, Michael Rosen-Prinz, and Sean Wilkoff to the Judicial Council, to serve as grad student members of judicial branch of student government. There were nine members and terms were for two years. The Resolution was amended to have the GA President solicit further nominations.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution Opposing the Parking Fee Imposed on New Student Families Moving into Smyth-Fernwald.

### GA JEOPARDY GAME

The GA played a game of "GA Jeopardy," based on a packet of GA information that was distributed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

[End Summary of the Meeting.]

-----

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Fall Semester, was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daniels said people should have three hand-outs, including the agenda packet, a colored hand-out, and a thick packet, with lots of information. They were on a very tight schedule. He knew Delegates' time was precious, particularly at this time of the year. So in order to achieve the goal of ending the meeting by 7:30, he'd be somewhat rude, and he might need to cut some people off. He would apologize for that and would ask them to please not take it personally.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daniels said they would consider approval of the minutes from the May GA meeting. They were not included in the packet and they could be accessed online, at the GA's Web site, [ga@berkeley.edu](mailto:ga@berkeley.edu). They'll expect that the minutes were approved unless somebody sent an e-mail, or called him, or objected to approval. For the sake of efficiency, they weren't given out. **THE MINUTES FROM THE MAY 4, 2006 MEETING WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Announcements

- 4 -

Taylor Allbright introduced herself and said she was an ASUC Senator for 2006-7 and was also the ASUC representative to the Graduate Assembly. Another ASUC rep to the GA unfortunately had to resign because he had to work on Thursday afternoons. Ms. Allbright said that at this first meeting, she really just wanted to introduce herself. She's a third-year undergraduate, a double major in Political Science and Gender and Women's Studies. In addition to being a Senator, she also had a job at the OSL and sat on the Board of Directors for the California National Organization for Women. She was really excited to be involved with the Graduate Assembly that year, especially since this was the first year they were operating under the new Memorandum of Understanding, and because the GA and the ASUC will continue to negotiate their relationship. It was also exciting to work with them because Lower Sproul was a very large priority for her. Since her freshmen year she's worked to get a multicultural center on campus, and that tied in directly with Lower Sproul redevelopment. ASUC Executives that year were also prioritizing Lower Sproul development. Ms. Allbright said she was really excited to work with the GA on all those things. She called for any questions.

Ms. Ahrendt introduced Gabe Harley, to talk about a group he's working with and an issue people should know about. If people were interested in this, she would encourage them to talk further with him and to consider writing a Resolution for the GA to consider. Mr. Harley yielded the floor.

Gabriel Bollag introduced himself and said he was with SOJA, Students Organizing for Justice in the Americas. That name wasn't completely accurate, since they work everywhere, internationally, and also did a lot of work on the local level. He was currently working on two big campaigns. Some of them might know about last semester's campaign, the sweat-free initiative called the "Designated Suppliers Program," something they actually got the Administration to pass, which was a big victory. So their campus will get items to sell from factories that don't use sweatshop labor, that use unions, and pay a living wage. On top of that, certain people in the Administration have tried to go back on their word a little bit in terms of some of the requirements that were already won, such as the requirement for union labor. So SOJA was trying to make the Administration stay true to the things it agreed to. It was really important because he thought the students at Berkeley want to wear sweat-free apparel. SOJA was also working on a living wage for cafeteria workers and custodians who were not paid a wage on which they could support families. There were a lot of single parents who subsist and could barely support themselves, and not a family. They get paid about \$4 less than custodians at local community colleges, like Peralta and Vista. SOJA was working really hard to convince the Administration to pay the workers a living wage. It would be great if the GA wanted to support a Resolution addressing that.

Vishal Gupta introduced himself and said he was the Executive Vice President of the ASUC and had the opportunity to chair the Senate. He would like to invite Delegates to Senate meetings, such as for announcements they wanted to make to the Senate. The Senate was comprised entirely of undergrads that year, but they represent very specific communities and had a lot of ability to do outreach. Secondly, the ASUC was hoping to hold a GA/ASUC mixer, so Delegates should look for that. He'll work with Mr. Daniels and a few GA Officers on an event and make sure they get Senators a little more exposure as to what the GA does and how important its role was, and more importantly, to just build connections. He thought Delegates could be great resources and mentors for a lot of undergraduate Senators. He wanted to thank the GA, and said that if people had any questions, he would remain at the meeting and they could ask him.

Mr. Daniels said they would cut off Announcements at that time, and if people had other announcements about events or anything else, they should send an e-mail to Becca Jones, Departmental Liaison, or find a GA Officer afterwards and they'd send the announcement out to the listserv.

### Election of External Affairs Vice President

Mr. Daniels said that last year at the April GA meeting, the Delegates elected Ben Allen as the External Affairs Vice President. Since that time, Mr. Allen has become the Student Regent and now sat on the UC Board of Regents. Mr. Allen was a Boalt Hall Law student in his second year. Being a Regent meant he could not serve as the GA's External Affairs VP any more, so the GA had an opportunity to elect a new VP. Over the summer the Executive Board elected Matt "Tex" Eckerle as the interim External Affairs VP to perform the duties of the position until the first Delegates meeting. So the GA had the opportunity to confirm him or to pick someone else. Mr. Daniels said he would open the floor to nominations.

A Delegate asked about the position. Mr. Daniels said the position deals with off-campus issues, outside UC Berkeley. In particular, it deals with the UC Student Association, the Systemwide student government.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to nominate Mr. Eckerle. It was so moved and seconded. Mr. Daniels called for any other nominations, and hearing none, said nominations were closed. Mr. Daniels said normally, they would ask Mr. Eckerle to leave the room in order to discuss his candidacy, but since he was the only candidate, he would like to suggest confirming Mr. Eckerle by consent rather than having a discussion, for the sake of time.

Mr. Inkabi said he would like to hear briefly why Mr. Eckerle would like to be External Affairs VP. Mr. Eckerle said he's been a Delegate in the GA for three years and has worked with External Affairs and the UCSA for three years. It was something he's wanted to be involved with for a long time. He was graduating in the fall and would like to serve as EAVP at least until December.

Mr. Daal moved to confirm Mr. Eckerle by consent. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MATT "TEX" ECKERLE AS EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

### REPORTS

Mr. Daniels said that due to time considerations, Reports would be done quickly. If people had questions that couldn't be answered in the time allotted for each report, they could ask questions after the meeting.

Reporting for the Environmental Sustainability Committee, Gabe Harley, introduced himself and said he was a fourth-year in Material Science and Engineering and was studying fuel cells. He was Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Committee. To give a little background, this was a new Committee and has

only been around for a semester, and now was officially in the GA's By-laws. As to what it will do, the GA manages somewhere in the order of \$1-200,000 and had a lot of influence to make sure that money

Reports (cont'd)

- 6 -

was spent in an environmentally sustainable way. So the Committee sort of worked inside the GA, with funding, the Business Office, with student groups the GA funds, and with external groups that might be looking to implement environmental sustainability platforms by introducing resolutions at meetings. The Committee has developed a working relationship with the new Funding Advisor, Stephanie Stevens-Carter, and they've incorporated new language into grant applications pertaining to environmental sustainability, such as the things to highlight and the fact that money could be made available for environmental sustainability. They also have a document for groups that receive funds on how they could recycle paper, etc. They have worked with Ms. Hsueh, the GA Business Manager, to get mug-washing stations, using less soap and providing sponges, and they also were now buying standard 30% recycled paper for all of their paper needs. That paper was actually cheaper than what they were buying before.

As for things that have yet to be done from the last meeting, Mr. Harley said items include getting the Committee's Web site up and going on the GA Web site; working with the Office of Student Life to incorporate sustainability through the OSL's workshops and Web pages; and to come up with a plan to encourage sustainable practices within the GA's sponsored projects in Anthony Hall, and getting project leaders to follow sustainable practices. Hopefully, by the next meeting they'll have accomplished the recruiting of new Environmental Sustainability Committee members. Ms. Jones was an old member who was now promoted, if they want to call it that, to Departmental Liaison. They also need to develop areas of focus for that semester. Since they're a new group, there was a lot of flexibility. They want to meet with the Exec Board to talk about what the Committee would like to do. They'd also like to come up with a Resolution on sustainability to bring to Delegates. The GA passed one such Resolution last semester. They also plan to meet with Project Coordinators to talk about Anthony Hall supplies. As for what they hope to do by the next meeting, they want to work with the OSL to integrate sustainability on the Web site, with documentation, and create a detailed sustainability resource for student groups. A referendum will probably come up in April to increase student fees and use that money to go towards sustainable projects. They hope to raise around \$200,000, so they want to help with the planning and the publicity for that. Also, they want to work on a plan with GA project leaders to improve sustainability in the GA. The meeting times of the Environmental Sustainability Committee were yet to be determined, but food will be provided. They were looking for four to eight members. He called for any questions.

Mr. Stern asked if the Committee had any influence in decisions on how the University buys and consumes energy. Mr. Harley said the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability dealt with that, and there were ties between the committees.

A Delegate asked how this group was defined as opposed to CACS and other campus groups. Mr. Harley said the Environmental Sustainability Committee pertains more to things that go on in the Graduate Assembly, the internal GA structure, and groups the GA funds, and helps to bring Resolutions to the table. CACS reports directly to the Chancellor once a semester, and the ES Committee was a liaison with CACS.

Ms. Jones said everybody should make sure they sign in. There was a sign-up sheet at the front.

Menelaous Stavrinides introduced himself and said he was in Environmental Science and was chairing the Foreign Students Affairs Committee. The Committee had its first meeting of the year on Friday and currently had four members. The first meeting was to organize and look at their goals and plans for the

Reports (cont'd)

- 7 -

year. The goal of the Committee was to increase international student diversity at UC Berkeley and also support their current international students.

The single most important problem in terms of international students was the fact that they had to pay \$15,000 each year. And their tuition, as opposed to normal residents' never dropped. This was a major issue and has led to many less international students applying each year to UCB. There was a report recently that showed that Berkeley ranked last compared to other big universities in the State in terms of percentage of international students. One objective of the Committee that year was to build a strong international student community. One problem was that they didn't have access to international students. They know what the problems were, but they can't put a face on those problems. It would be much better if they could meet with other international students and hear from them what they thought was important for them. For example, that day he had a meeting with an international student who was a parent and was having problems with childcare, since as an international student, he wasn't eligible for the same benefits as a US student. To be a strong community, the Committee first planned to organize international student events in October or November. Their other objectives were to communicate with Berkeley administrators and raise their awareness of the problems that international students face. Their third objective was to increase the funding for international students who study here, and to increase funding options. So they're working on an International Students Ambassador Project, as a way to increase planning options for international students.

Mr. Daniels said all this will also be online, and people could view it there.

Mr. Stavrinides said their accomplishments since the last meeting was to decide on the creation of a Web site. They hope to communicate better with international students. They also plan to sending out e-mails on the SISS mailing list to recruit more members and to put together a document on why it was important to attract more international students to Berkeley. It will be a very exciting and challenging year and they look forward to bringing more members into the Committee. If anybody was interested, he would ask them to please let him know. He'd be glad to work with them. He wanted to thank them. Mr. Daniels said that if people had any questions, they could talk to Mr. Stavrinides outside.

Stephanie Stevens-Carter, Funding Advisor, introduced herself and said she was the new Funding Advisor. Susan Hsueh was the Manager of the GA, and was on vacation at that time. Ms. Stevens-Carter said she would report on Ms. Hsueh's behalf. The Graduate Assembly has three new Project Coordinators, Maxie Mckinney, in the Graduate Minority Students Project Coordinator; Jade Sasser, Graduate Support Services, and Lupe Niumeitolu, the Women of Color Initiative Coordinator. The Business Office had a successful June closing and were able to reimburse all student groups in a timely fashion, and to get most of the big ticket items paid in '05 and '06, with '05 money.

Over 550 students participated in both the New Graduate Minority Students Project and the New Graduate Student Orientation in August. Also, Ms. Stevens-Carter said she would ask Delegates to please check the GA's newly revamped Web site, [ga@berkeley.edu](mailto:ga@berkeley.edu). Grant and travel allocations for '06-07 were now listed on the Web, as well as upcoming events. If it was easier, people could stop by the GA

and pick up the applications, but they were available on the Web site. But if people wanted to speak to her and find out which application they should apply for, they just had to walk in and talk to her. She was there Monday through Friday from 8:00 to 5:00.

Reports (cont'd)

- 8 -

For the '05-06 budget, the entire savings was put into the '05-06 spending allocation. Thanks to the '05-06 Finance Committee, the Delegates, and everyone in the GA office, they were able to put a break on spending, and she was happy to report that the GA has preserved the bulk of its saving and carried it forward to the '06-07 year. However, they still have to be diligent in their cost analyses and concerned with their spending. She and GA Project Coordinators were working on '06-07 reports to the Dean that they plan to present to Dean Mason in October. Finally, Ms. Hsueh will meet with the Finance Chair to reassess the budget and see whether or not funds could be reallocated to replace some of the cutbacks in existing projects and increase student group funding. She will also present a couple of adjustments to the Finance Committee. All those will be voted on later at Delegates meetings. Ms. Hsueh was looking forward to seeing everyone in October. Ms. Stevens-Carter called for any questions. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank her. (Applause)

Rebekah Ahrendt introduced herself and said she was the Alternate GA representative on the Graduate Council. The Grad Council met once a month. It had 12 members from the Academic Senate, meaning professors and such, and three student members plus one alternate. The Grad Council was sort of the parliament that reported on all graduate student-related issues. The Grad Council also reviews department and sees how programs were going and additionally, determines what normative time was for programs. So the Graduate Council did a lot of important things, and it was nice that grad students had a voice there. There were some interesting discussion at the last meeting about non-resident tuition fees (NRT fees) and their future. This was something the Grad Council hoped to monitor. Dean Mason attends all Grad Council meetings and she was quite concerned about the way NRT fees were imposed. As was just mentioned, non-resident tuition severely affected the number of applications from incoming grad students from other places. The Grad Council realized this was a problem. The big problem was the fact that it was the Regents that were dragging their feet. But this was something the Graduate Council was aware of, as was the Academic Senate and the Committee on Committees. The Regents weren't moving, so the campus will continue to work on this.

Ms. Ahrendt said some members of the Graduate Council also expressed concern about the lack of student input in their departmental reviews. This especially came up because it was her Department that was reviewed on Monday, and Ms. Ahrendt said she happened to be there, and they were very surprised to hear all the things they didn't get to hear in that report. Departments are reviewed by an external committee that was actually on campus for just one day. These committees have not, so far, made a huge effort to talk to students about what departments were really all about. So GA Grad Council representatives were pushing for mandatory inclusion of student voices in the review process. She called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about the model for non-resident tuition at other state schools. Ms. Ahrendt said she couldn't answer.

Mr. Stavrinides said a big problem with the UC System was that there was a 40% fee increase in the last five years, and that was why there was such a big decrease in international students. Ms. Ahrendt said there will be no fee increase that year, and the hope was to see a kind of progressive decrease.

Ms. Salaymeh asked what was being done to increase the representation of grad students on committees. Ms. Ahrendt said that was something they'd continue to monitor. The discussion got heated, and a couple of members of the Grad Council felt there was really a severe insufficiency with the review process. The

Reports (cont'd)

- 9 -

Ms. Salaymeh asked about including grads in regular search committees. Ms. Ahrendt said that was a good idea. Mr. Daniels said was a separate person to push. The Delegate said they would have to push for the Dean to make that more of a concerted effort in all departments, rather than in a select few, like Rhetoric, or other departments that have grad students on certain committees, and allow them to vote. Ms. Ahrendt said that was really department-by-department.

A Delegate asked if they were working on any ways to facilitate the actual process of getting residency. A lot of people in his Department managed to do everything that was required, but did not receive notification on time. And there were problems with fellowships or with funding. Ms. Ahrendt said that was an issue they could bring up because that was handled by people in Sproul.

Javier Jimenez introduced himself and said he was from Comparative Literature. He was the Funding Committee Chair. The purpose of the Funding Committee was to give out all the money the GA had to give out to groups. They had a process set up for that. The Funding Committee meets and reviews the applications, and basically allocates funds for all the student groups that Delegates or their departments might be a part of. He had a couple of points from their last meeting. The Funding Advisor was with them, the person at the Business Office who worked with groups one-on-one to get them supported through the funding process. Ms. Stevens-Carter put on funding workshops, which were really important, especially for that year. The GA was mandating that anybody applying for money had to go to a funding workshop. They noticed a lot of problems in applications from previous years and felt everyone needed to better understand the funding process. Ms. Stevens-Carter was their first line of response to tell people about different and different funding categories that people could apply to, in order to maximize groups' funding from the GA that was available for student groups. The big activity of the Committee was to review the funding for Round 1 applications and to allocate funds for that Round. The Executive Board, in absentia of the general Delegate body, approved those allocations. The allocations were included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Jimenez said he would pass around a sign-up sheet for the Funding Committee. It was a Standing Committee of the GA, which was why he was an Officer. Without the Funding Committee, the GA could not function as it did. Committee members were needed to review applications and give out money. He was looking for about eight people. According to the By-laws, people on the Funding Committee actually get preference for funding their groups when it came to reviewing applications.

Mr. Daniels said people should write down on the sheet that was going around the committee they were interested in. One responsibility of Delegates was to sit on a committee. If Delegates wanted the student groups they were members of to receive money, he would ask them to please join the Committee. Otherwise, it wasn't guaranteed.

Mr. Jimenez said that as far as things they accomplished since the last meeting, one was to update the Web site. The person hired by the GA did the entire Web site, and it contains all the new deadlines and forms. The next deadline for funding was September 22, and that deadline was for every funding category except for Travel, which had a deadline of October 1. By the next meeting the Funding Committee will have reviewed Round 2 of funding applications, if people join and get trained. Also, the GA that evening will hopefully amend some of its By-laws to make sure the GA's practice followed what was in the By-laws.

Reports (cont'd)

- 10 -

Mr. Inkabi said there was an issue last year to have the application process online for funding. Mr. Jimenez said last year was a very big online year for the GA, which was great, and something the GA wanted. Unfortunately, the Funding Committee Chair from last year was not the person who was the owner of that task, and so it got transferred to him. They were now trying to talk to the person who worked on that last year and make sure they get things updated, and move forward.

Mr. Daal asked about the Travel Grants. Mr. Jimenez said those were grants that graduates were eligible for, and it was for travel to conferences and other professional endeavors. Grads can simply apply, and the GA didn't require a faculty member to write a letter for them, as was previously needed. The selection was done by lottery, which made things easier. People hand in their applications, and the winners get picked out of a hat. So the Committee didn't actually meet to decide on allocations.

Mr. Inkabi said he would like to clarify what the issue was. It was decided last year that funding applications for student groups would be an online process. He believed there were funds allocated for that process, and the GA got as far as having a beta version of the online process. What he was asking was for the Funding Committee/Executive Officers to look into that issue and find out how far that process went, if money was left over, and if the process could be completed. Mr. Daniels said he wanted to thank Mr. Jimenez.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Nish Rajan introduced himself and said he was the Chair of the GA's Finance Committee. The Finance Committee was basically an almost solely internal committee. It passes the next year's GA budget. So last year's Finance Committee passed this year's budget. The Committee's work usually tends to be sort of end-loaded, with a lot of work coming in the spring. This was going to be an exciting year because they'll try to work with the Organization and Rules Committee to amend the By-laws to allow for flexibility for the Business Office to run its finances and do the work the GA needed to do, making sure the Funding Committee had all the money it needed and also giving Delegates a little oversight into how the budget was spent. So it will be an interesting year. Being on the Finance Committee was a great way to learn about the GA and how it spent its money. So he would ask them to please join the Committee. They presented the current budget with some of the updates to the Exec Board and they met with the Org. & Rules Committee to discuss current restrictions on budget expenditures inherent in the By-laws. As for things not accomplished since the last meeting, these were things they'll do, more in the fall. There was another item they wanted to do by the next GA meeting. There were a lot of GA Resolutions passed last year, and a big question was how they actually affect the GA. Often times, once these Resolutions were passed, they became modified within GA doctrine; but not exactly. So the Finance Committee hoped that in its new, expanded role, it will be able to gauge the impact of those Resolutions on GA finances and gauge how long the GA could actually implement the

Resolutions. That will be part of what the Committee does that year. They will also work on the current budget development process. Normally, budgets come with line items that Delegates approve. They'll try to change that around because sometimes they have to move money between line items, something that will come up that semester. They'll take those two things and work with the Org. & Rules Committee to codify them into the By-laws.

Mr. Rajan said that as for some discreet things the Finance Committee needed to do, for money they receive from the Grad Division, they'll write a letter and talk about oversight, and also talk to accounting folks. For discreet projects on which he needs help, he needed help to convene the Finance Committee.

Reports (cont'd)

- 11 -

Core values for potential members include integrity, fiscal responsibility, and out-of-the box thinking. If that described any Delegates, then the Finance Committee was for them. They haven't picked a meeting time and they could be flexible with that. They just wanted to make sure the GA runs as well as it could. So he would ask people to please consider joining the Finance Committee. People could talk to him after the meeting. He called for any questions. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank Mr. Rajan for the report. (Applause)

Reporting for the Organization and Rules Committee, Pete Dillon introduced himself and said he was a second-year in the Chemistry Department, and he was the new Committee Chair. He joined the GA last spring and still kind of felt like a novice. As far as accomplishments since the last meeting, that summer the most effort he put into the GA was in thinking about what they want to accomplish that semester in terms of working with the Finance Committee, the Funding Committee, and interested members of the GA who wanted to have a guiding hand in how to make their By-laws work to the GA's best interests. The last time the By-laws were revised, except for last spring's amendment that added a sustainability measure, was the spring of 2003. In reading over the By-laws that summer, he realized that the entire graduate student body at Berkeley could be quite embarrassed about just the stylistic language that was used.

Mr. Dillon said his main pitch to the GA and why Delegates should join the Committee, if they read through the By-laws, which he doubted many of them have, they'd notice that the current version could be better. They just added the sustainability measure, which everybody in the room approved. For the most part, the By-laws facilitate their larger efforts, depending on what they see as the GA's mission. The By-laws basically help the GA to achieve and to maximize a given set of resources and improve the quality of life there for grad students. But he thought they could do better. Given their limited funding, he thought they could arrange the By-laws better. For instance, when they look at resolutions to fund graduate groups, the current By-laws basically were inconsistent with the resources available to them. So they'll amend the By-laws so the GA could operate consistently with them. They might also want to discuss content issues, such as with funding. The By-laws currently give funding preference to groups that have representatives on the Funding Committee. That would seem like a conflict of interest, which the GA might want to think about. Given the GA's shrinking budget and limited resources, if Delegates want the By-laws to be structured to allow the GA to do the most with those resources, he would ask them to join the Committee. He would send out a sign-up sheet. They'll meet a couple of times, and it wouldn't be too much time out of their busy schedules, and he thought they could make some progress. Mr. Daniels said the slide showed a few embarrassing excerpts from the By-laws. So if people wanted to change that, they should join the Committee.

Ms. Ahrendt said that one reason why the By-laws have not been amended since 2003 was because nobody wanted to be on this Committee, and people didn't realize how vital it actually was. She had to hand it to Mr. Dillon for being willing to take on the By-laws, because the last official Org. & Rules Committee Chair gave up. This was a very important task, so she would encourage people to join Mr. Dillon in helping the GA get its act together with the By-laws.

Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank Mr. Dillon for his report. (Applause)

Matt "Tex" Eckerle introduced himself and said he was officially the External Affairs VP. (Applause) The External Affairs Committee was charged with dealing with issues affecting graduate student quality

Reports (cont'd)

- 12 -

of life outside the scope of UC Berkeley. The kind of people who make those decisions were primarily State legislators, the Governor, the UC Regents, and local Berkeley politicians. If that was the kind of stuff Delegates would like to follow and be active in, they would be interested in this Committee.

Mr. Eckerle said that as to what they have done since the last meeting, they participated in the UC Student Association Congress in July, when the UCSA, the UC-wide coalition of student governments, decided on three Action Agenda Items for the school year. The first Action Agenda Item was to get out the vote. Cal undergrads and grads have been charged with registering 3,400 new voters, 10% more student voters from Cal. The second Action Agenda Item was a strategic plan for diversity enrollment, which entails getting the Regents to recognize the fact that they have a problem getting diversity at the UCs. A lot of that was because of Prop. 209. Bundled into that was getting resident tuition for international grad students. Non-resident tuition has gone up 40% over the last four years, making it very difficult to recruit international students to Berkeley and to get them to stay there. The third item was the Student Compact, an extension of Student Compact legislation that passed last year. The goal was a fee freeze for the next school year. There was a proposal to increase Cal Grants in the Legislature, AB 1315. The UCSA was also trying to increase funding for academic preparation, formerly called "outreach." It's when students, mostly in volunteer organizations consisting of college students, go to high schools and even lower grades, and try to prepare mostly underrepresented students to get into college. There's a big gap in terms of people knowing what to do in order to get admitted. The UCSA was trying to get this funded at \$33 million, which was how much it was before it got pummeled. They have initiated some research on diversity and the environment of international students, which was number two on the Action Agenda with the Graduate Division. They're looking at trends. He would like to try to find some real problems behind this issue. Also, they felt they'd organize a campus Get-Out-the-Vote Coalition and register voters.

As for things not accomplished since the last meeting, Mr. Eckerle said they could have had more people at the UCSA Conference. As for anticipated accomplishments, their next meeting was tentatively scheduled next Wednesday at 6:00 at the GA. As for things they need help with in the External Affairs Committee, they need to register voters. They would like GSIs to do class raps to their undergrad classes. The undergrads will take care of class raps at big lecture classes. A "class rap" was when someone went to a class and brought a bunch of voter registration forms and talked about why people should register to vote. The cards can be distributed for people to fill out during class, after which they're returned to the rapper, and then brought back to the GA. Jelena Simjanovic, the Campus Organizing Director, had a sign-up sheet if people would like to rap at their own classes, or classes they're in. He would ask people to please sign up. It would be very helpful. They're also working with the Union to send an e-mail to the TA list.

Mr. Eckerle said the other thing they need a lot of help with was to research trends in diversity among international students. They want to find out what the trends were, what possible solutions there were, and then take those solutions to the UC Regents and to the State Legislature, and get them to pass legislation that actually got results. If they're interested in policy or activism, they should come to the first External Affairs Committee meeting, which will be at 6 p.m. next Wednesday. That was just for the first meeting, and the meeting time was flexible. Ms. Simjanovic said that if Delegates were so kind as to rap their class, and hand out and get back voter reg cards, the cards need to be mailed to the Registrar's Office within 72 hours. So people had to make sure they get the cards back to the GA the same day. If they couldn't make it to Anthony Hall, they could send an e-mail and someone from the GA could meet them somewhere. Mr. Daniels said Mr. Eckerle's e-mail was eavp@GA.berkeley.edu. Ms. Simjanovic said her e-mail address was campusorganizingdirector@GAq.berkeley.edu. If people didn't feel comfortable

Reports (cont'd)

- 13 -

about speaking about this in public, she had a script they could read. She would ask them to please let them know which class they rapped. Also, if Delegates weren't registered to vote, she would ask them to please fill in the form that evening.

Mr. Eckerle said that by way of introduction, he would introduce his Legislative Liaison, Gavi Begtrup, who will deal with policy-makers they lobby. Ms. Simjanovic would work more with students, and together, they'll work to get students to people who make the laws. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank them. (Applause)

Mariyam Cementwala introduced herself and said she was the new Academic Affairs Vice President. Like Mr. Dillon, she often felt like a novice. She's been involved with the GA for two years and last year was a Graduate Council representative, her first-year as a Delegate from the Law School. She asked how many people were new, and noted that it was almost the full room. She would like to talk to them about a snapshot in a day of the life of the Academic Affairs VP, and would give two examples. Academic Affairs sort of dealt with the on-campus issues, lobbying to campus administrators to put forward student action items. Administrators would include everybody from the Provost to the Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor, Dean Mason, the Grad Division, the Tang Center, and the RSF. The campus was very large and complicated, so they try to navigate that Web. That was sort of the first job of the VP. The position's second job was to appoint the student voice to the myriad of campus committees and administrative committees, which were sort of assigned ad hoc by the Chancellor, and faculty Senate committees. Harish Agarwal, the Campus Committee Liaison, would ask them to consider, if they haven't already, fulfilling their committee requirement for the GA as a Delegate by serving on one of these very important campus committees.

As for two examples of what Academic Affairs does, there was a long report on the Web. Ms. Cementwala said she meets a lot of people. She and Mr. Daniels climbed up a 19°-high incline to meet with grad and undergrad residents living in the 74 units of Smyth-Fernwald, on Dwight, and talked to them about a new parking fee that was suddenly imposed last year and went into effect this year. Originally, people who lived there didn't have to pay for their parking. Often, these people, student families who have kids, already found it pretty hard to get affordable housing in Berkeley; and now they have to pay \$1,080 for parking, a big surprise to them and something they were very upset about. So one job of the AAVP was to put forth students' concerns to the campus Administration. So she wrote a letter to the Chancellor. The good news was that there was some movement on this issue. They hope the fee will be rescinded over the next few weeks, or at least reduced significantly for Smyth residents.

Secondly, to give an example of sort of the social aspect of Academic Affairs, Ms. Cementwala said she met that day with Mike Weinberger, the Director of the RSF, and talked to him a little about what they could do to attract grads. One idea Mr. Weinberger had was to open up the RSF for grad students, as a “Grad Night,” and doing some fun activities.

Ms. Cementwala said the Academic Affairs Committee was a great way to get involved. There will be a sign-up sheet for people to join. The Committee will have two tasks that year. They're going to dig up dirt on all the campus administrators. They need information about them, what makes them tick, what makes them react, how to convince them to take the athletic deficit seriously. If they come to the Committee meeting, they'd understand what she was referring to.

Reports (cont'd)

- 14 -

Ms. Cementwala she would turn the floor over to Mr. Agarwal, who would talk about campus committees. Mr. Agarwal asked how many people there would be spending a good chunk of their adult lives at a university; and he asked how many understood how the University worked. A list of campus committees was going around on a sign-up sheet. They're comprised of groups of administrators, faculty, and students who meet, usually about once a month, and discuss and decide upon various policy issues. It's a great way to learn about the campus and get involved, and a great way to bring up any beefs they might have with various administrators about anything, from public art to Warren Hall.

Ms. Cementwala said she had office hours and there were various ways to reach her, which they could find out about on the Web. The Academic Affairs Committee meeting will be the last Tuesday of the month, 5:30 in Anthony Hall. (Applause)

Giving his report as President, Mr. Daniels said he did a few things over the summer. The building where the GA was located was called “Anthony Hall.” They put up some pictures, cleaned the floors, and organized the paperwork. He met with a few people over the summer. He didn't do a lot. They didn't completely finish work on Anthony Hall. One thing that he wanted to create was a President’s Advisory Council, an idea suggested by the GA President two years ago. He didn't get a chance to do that, and he didn't get a chance to update the Web site.

As for what he planned to do by the next meeting, Mr. Ding said that not all units, departments, and schools had representatives at the meeting. A lot of people were present, which was great, but there were 105 departments and degree programs, and not all were there. So clearly, they need to do a better job of doing outreach to them. So that was one thing he'd do before the next meeting. He also planned to finish meetings with each person in Anthony Hall, finish updates, and then work on committees.

Mr. Daniels said he didn't introduce himself, and said he was a joint degree student, in Law and Public Policy. He spent the last two years in the Law School and then quickly ran away to the Northside of campus, the Public Policy School, where he was located at that time. That, briefly, was his background.

Mr. Daniels said that Lower Sproul, the area they were in, included the Martin Luther King Student Union, Cesar Chavez, and Eshleman Hall, the building they were in, which was highly earthquake unsafe. This area was going to be redone, and it might occur while first-year students were still there. But the main reason for continuing students to care about this was because the odds were that the campus will

charge additional student fees to re-do Lower Sproul. And if that happens, grads need to be able to tell the Administration what they want, whether it's a new grad student center, a childcare center, or a pool, e.g. The Committee on Lower Sproul will work to find out what grad students actually want. So first- or second-year students who work on this might, in the future, be able to come back and see something that was, in part, due to their work. So this was really a way to leave a legacy that students don't get in other capacities. The Committee will meet on Mondays, and the time was always flexible, either 6:00 or 7:00. If people have questions, they could ask him later.

Mr. Daniels said he would introduce Becca Jones, the Departmental Liaison, who put together this wonderful meeting and the food. (Applause) Ms. Jones said they'll play a little game that year to encourage Delegate attendance at all the meetings. Every Delegate was allowed one alternate. So if Delegates couldn't attend a GA meeting, they were asked to send the alternate. Alternates were also welcome to

Reports (cont'd)

- 15 -

attend general meetings. For Delegates who attend every meeting, or send an alternate, they will have a party at the end of the year, with wine, cheese, and chocolate. So that was an incentive to try to get people attend every meeting. Mr. Daniels said they only meet once a month, or four times a semester.

Mr. Inkabi asked if they could ask a question. Mr. Daniels said a motion could be made to extend speaking time, but he would rather they didn't do that because they were already ten minutes behind schedule.

## RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Daniels said Resolutions were the way the GA expressed itself, or a way to change their By-laws. Four Resolutions will be proposed that evening. If they don't get to a Resolution, it would be considered at the next meeting, unless there was a motion to extend time. And again, he would rather not do that, although it was up to the Assembly.

### RESOLUTION SELECTING THE ACTION AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE 2006-2007 ACADEMIC YEAR

WHEREAS, graduate student families face unique difficulties at the University of California, Berkeley;  
and

WHEREAS, the quality of graduate student family life on campus is a primary considering for perspective graduate student families; and

WHEREAS, health care costs have dramatically increased while health care coverage has consistently declined; and

WHEREAS, the quality of health care is of significant concern for perspective graduate students; and

WHEREAS, the redevelopment of Lower Sproul Plaza is at a crucial juncture between moving forward successfully or becoming mired in bureaucracy; and

WHEREAS, it is likely the redevelopment of Lower Sproul Plaza will need to be financed by student fees, and currently the Lower Sproul Plaza area is highly underutilized by the graduate student body on campus;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Action Agenda Items for the Graduate Assembly for the 2006-2007 academic year are (1) student family issues, (2) health care, and (3) Lower Sproul Redevelopment, and the elected official are directed to focus their attention in these areas.

Mr. Daniels said the GA had Action Agenda Items, just like the UC Student Association. There were many, many important issues on campus, but unfortunately, they had to choose three. The Executive Board that year chose student family issues, health care, and Lower Sproul redevelopment as the main

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 16 -

issues for the Exec Board to focus on. There were brief justifications in the Whereas Clauses, but they don't encompass all the reasons these items were chosen. He asked if anybody on the Executive Board would like to speak to any of these issues in particular, or if they should just open the discussion up to questions.

Ms. Ahrendt said she would like to amend the Resolution. In the second Whereas Clause, "considering" should be amended to "consideration," to read, "... is a primary consideration..." In the fourth Whereas Clause, "perspective" should be amended to "prospective," to read "... prospective graduate students." And in the Resolved Clause, "official" should be amended to "officials," to read "... elected officials..."  
THE AMENDMENTS WERE ADOPTED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Daniels said the Executive Board was the group that chose these three, and if people wanted to know why, it could be explained.

A Delegate asked if the "redevelopment" of Lower Sproul meant making it pretty or actually retrofitting the buildings for earthquakes. Mr. Daniels said it was the latter, only because Lower Sproul was somewhat developed. The term the campus used was "redevelopment." That could mean retrofitting buildings or tearing down buildings and creating new ones. The Delegate asked how this would work with the list of priorities the campus had for buildings. Mr. Daniels said the GA would work to make this a higher priority.

Mr. Gupta the campus was using Life Safety Fees, which could be increased by the Chancellor at his discretion, to retrofit Eshleman and MLK. The Lower Sproul project was potentially somewhere in the vicinity of \$100 million. So it was really important to emphasize the importance of the project and get it on the Chancellor's capital campaign, meaning the Chancellor could emphasize it to donors who would sponsor different projects for buildings. Essentially, this entire space could be redone, with a number of really important new facilities, including a space for grad students, a multicultural center, a space for the ASUC, for all student groups on the campus.

Mr. Purdy asked if the GA will get updates on this at every meeting. Mr. Daniels said that was the hope, if people do their jobs correctly. Mr. Purdy asked if there was a plan for the next meeting. Mr. Daniels said that was a good request. The effect of the three Action Agenda Items has, in the past, sometimes been very strong and sometimes fairly weak. One reason they have the Delegate body and have reports

was to make sure that people were doing what they said they'd do. And if Delegates feel the Exec Board hasn't outlined a plan for the year on health care, e.g., by all means Delegates should raise a stink and let the Exec Board know.

Ms. Salaymeh asked if they could add an Action Item at that time or later. Mr. Daniels said there were only three for the year, so to add one would mean they'd have to amend the Resolution and remove one. They could also table the Resolution.

Ms. Gomez, Law School asked what last year's three Action Agenda Items were. Mr. Daniels said they were autonomy from the ASUC, affordable housing, and faculty and student diversity.

Mr. Freedman asked if these items were supposed to be the top priorities for grad students in general, or if they were three things they've come up with out of everything the could deal with. Mr. Daniels said it was a mix. Certain things like student fees, e.g., were always an important issue, and something the GA

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 17 -

would will always work on. Some things were more achievable than others. This was a compromise between what the Exec Board felt grads cared about and what was achievable in the year that they'd all be there. But by all means, if there was something Delegates didn't feel applied to them, or something they felt was more important, a motion could be made for the GA to discuss.

As a point of information, Mr. Daal said the By-laws mandate that the GA come up with three Action Agenda Items every year. So three were chosen, with the GA to vote on them at the first GA meeting.

Ms. Ahrendt said another reason the Executive Board compromised on these three issues was because the childcare initiative was something that Ms. Cementwala was already working on as a continuing item, with some progress already made on it. Health care was something of a new item because it was going to become a crisis for a lot of students, with fees, which have just gone up again at Tang. So they had a continuing item, a new item, and something that could really be dealt with that year, the Lower Sproul initiative. The Board decided to have a variety of issues with differing timelines as to when they'd be completed.

A Delegate asked if they could hear some other items the Board considered. Mr. Daniels said they also considered student fees, affordable housing, outreach, and recruitment and retention.

Mr. Daniels said someone could always make a motion to call the question, and approving that motion would mean the GA would immediately vote on the question.

Mr. Stavrinides asked if they could include something about international students, since it was such an important year. There was a request to eliminate non-resident tuition and he thought there would be big support for that issue. Mr. Daniels asked if he would like to make a motion to amend. Mr. Malineos said he would like to hear other ideas, and maybe consider something better. Maybe they couldn't exclude any of the current three items, but maybe they could include health care and student family issues together, and have international students and non-resident tuition as another item.

Ms. Anderson said one issue that didn't make the list was housing, and one reason was because the Board realized that a lot of the affordable housing they wanted to fight for was for student families, so that was already rolled into the item on family issues. Ms. Ahrendt said international students came up as well,

and those issues could definitely fall within the health care item, and special problems faced by international students, such as not being able to get certain health care. So the GA could deal with international students' problems specifically within these issues. But international student issues were definitely on their mind, and were also being considered by the Grad Council as well.

Ms. Cementwala said she thought it was always difficult to choose Action Agenda Items. The Resolutions that GA passed were sometimes precisely on issues on the Action Agenda Items can't cover. What they try to do each year with Action Agenda Items was to keep them a little broad, so various issues could be rolled into them. For instance, "health care" consisted of mental health, the Tang Center, increased fees, and dependant care. It was really hard to have agenda items that also reflect a sense of continuity because the GA and its leadership often change from year to year; and administrators don't change. And the progress the GA has often made in previous years was to have talks on affordable housing at a certain key, and to then fail to raise it up a pitch because they switched Agenda Items. That often diverts the Administration and allows them a way to essentially back pedal on progress that's already been made. That's partly what the Exec Board kept in mind when they chose these items. She thought international

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 18 -

students' issues were critical to the campus and she knew how sensitive Dean Mason was on those issues, and how hard she was working on them. Ms. Cementwala said she thought the GA could definitely incorporate those issues into the work of the GA, both through Resolutions as well as people in the GA working on issues as they come up, even though they were not necessarily on an Action Agenda Item. Sometimes the Chancellor will start a committee that somebody from the GA needed to sit on, or work on, in an area that didn't quite fit into the three items. That happened all the time. She thought international student issues were something they could roll into the work of the GA without necessarily having it as an Action Agenda Item.

Mr. Jiminez said he thought the issue of international student fees fell under the issue of student fees in general; and the GA was always working on student fee issues. Even though members of the Exec Board weren't international students themselves, they were actually in touch with international students all the time. And they also look to the International Student Committee to bring things to the GA's attention, because this was a continuing issue, something the GA was always committed to. These were just three items they dealt with, but it didn't mean they wouldn't deal with all the other issues that come up. For instance, the RSF issue came out of the blue. So they'll work on other things as well.

Mr. Eckerle said that for External Affairs, international student issues were a priority, and for that, the Regents were the main issue. The GA itself didn't really deal with the Regents, except through the UCSA. Between the International Students Committee and the External Affairs Committee, they could accomplish a lot that year.

Mr. Daal moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE, AS AMENDED, THE RESOLUTION SELECTING THE ACTION AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE 2006-2007 ACADEMIC YEAR PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

RESOLUTION CORRECTING INCONSISTENCIES IN THE BY-LAWS

WHEREAS, the current budgetary realities and funding practices of the Graduate Assembly are not consistent with Titles 16.8.8, 16.10.2, 16.10.3, and 16.10.4 of its By-laws; and

WHEREAS, Title 16.8.8 reads: "Total funding for refreshments for each single event may not exceed five dollars (\$5.00) per person expected to be in attendance," (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS, Title 16.10.2 reads: "Funding in this category is limited to three hundred dollars (\$300.00) per Graduate Student Group per semester," (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS, Title 16.10.3 reads: "Funding for regular group meetings may not exceed twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) per meeting," and is in practice violated; and

WHEREAS, Title 16.10.4 reads: "Funding for each separate event shall not exceed four dollars (\$4.00) per graduate student in attendance plus two dollars (\$2.00) for each other person in

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 19 -

#### RESOLUTION CORRECTING INCONSISTENCIES IN THE BY-LAWS (cont'd)

attendance. Funding for non-graduate-student attendees shall not exceed one third (1/3) of the total funding per event," (emphasis added) and is inconsistent with the stipulation in 16.8.8;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following amendments be made to the By-laws of the Graduate Assembly, where bold-face wording is incorporated only here in this Resolution for easy of reading:

16.8.8. Total funding for each single event may not exceed five dollars (\$5.00) per person expected to be in attendance.

16.10.2. Funding for **Graduate Events #1** is limited to three hundred dollars (\$300.00) per Graduate Student Group per semester.

16.10.3. Funding for each separate event shall not exceed **five dollars (\$5.00)** per graduate student in attendance plus **one dollar (\$1.00)** for each non-graduate student in attendance. Funding for non-graduate-student attendees shall not exceed one third (1/3) of the total funding per event.

Mr. Dillon said that in the interests of time, he and the Funding Committee Chair, Mr. Jimenez met to discuss the fact that currently, the way money was distributed to groups was in violation of GA By-laws. So they decided they should amend the By-laws. There were three quick changes. One was the deletion in 16.8.8 of the phrase "for refreshments." Instead, student groups will be funded \$5.00 per person. Mr. Jimenez said the second issue was that this year there will be an \$800 cap per semester for student groups for Grad Events 1 and 2. The \$300 amount was already in the By-laws, but the GA wasn't following it. Now they're just restricting it to just Grad Events 1, which were basically meetings. So that would be a factor. Groups will be able to spend \$300 on meetings and \$500 for Grad Events 2. Mr. Jimenez said he and Mr. Dillon were trying to compromise something that was already in the By-laws that was actually a cost saving, because they keep losing money each year and have less money to spend on student funding

Mr. Dillon said the last amendment was to article 16.10.4. It reads that funding for each separate event shall not exceed \$4.00 per grad student and \$2.00 for each other person in attendance. To be consistent with the funding in 16.8.8, they say the total of \$6.00 in funding per person in attendance would be partitioned into \$5.00 per grad student and \$1.00 per other person.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions. Mr. Young asked about Grad Events 2 and if there was a Grad Events 3. Mr. Jimenez said the brochure he handed out had the projects that the GA has made a priority, and the last page had the different funding categories. Rather than funding meetings through special events, such as a speaker, a speaker series, or a colloquium, i.e., it was for events that were not just for the group, but for the entire graduate and campus community. There was not Grad Events 3, but grants and other resources were available to Delegates.

A speaker asked if they were getting rid of 16.10.4. Mr. Dillon said that will be covered by the amended 16.8.8, where the language will be "total funding," which will not exceed \$5.00 per person expected to be

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 20 -

in attendance. It gives discretion to the group to spend in excess of \$25 for regular Grad Events 1 meetings in case more than five people attend. But there would be a total of \$300. Mr. Daniels said the old 10.3 and old 10.4 were being combined in the new 10.3. Mr. Jimenez said the old 10.3 disappears and the old 10.4 becomes 10.3.

Mr. Friday asked if the current process was an \$800 cap on Events 1 and 2, with groups able to choose if they want to spend perhaps all \$800 on Events 2 under the new By-laws. He asked if that was possible. Mr. Jimenez said it was because the limitation was only for Grad Events 1.

Mr. Daniels called for any other questions and hearing none, called for a motion. A motion to call the question on the Resolution and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION CORRECTING INCONSISTENCIES IN THE BY-LAWS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

RESOLUTION NOMINATING JOSHUA TEMPLET, MICHAEL ROSEN-PRINZ, AND SEAN WILKOFF TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

WHEREAS, the Memorandum of Understanding between the ASUC and the GA passed in spring 2006 allowed the GA to nominate candidates for three of the nine seats on the Judicial Council;  
and

WHEREAS, there are currently two spots available for graduate students; and

WHEREAS, graduate students need representation on the Judicial Council to ensure fair decisions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly nominates Joshua Templet, Michael Rosen-Prinz, and Sean Wilkoff to the Judicial Council.

Mr. Daniels said that as part of the Memorandum of Understanding between the GA and the ASUC that was passed last year, the GA can nominate three names to the ASUC President to sit on the Judicial Council, the judicial body of the ASUC. The GA already had one member sitting on the J-Council, Carmel Levitan, and they need to fill the two additional spots. The ASUC requested three grad students for each opening. Mr. Daniels said they did their best to recruit, but they only got three students. They were great, however. There were little blurbs in the agenda packet as to why they were interested in the position. Two were Boalt students and one was a Haas student. The Resolution simply states that the GA was putting their names forward.

Mr. Rajan asked if they were present. Mr. Rosen-Prinz and Mr. Templet introduced themselves. Mr. Rajan said that Mr. Wilkoff was a first-year, Ph.D. student at Haas, and was not an MBA.

Mr. Daniels said people could ask the candidates any questions.

Mr. Inkabi asked how the J-Council searched for nominees. Mr. Daniels said the Council didn't do the search. An e-mail was sent out and he went to the Law School and talked to a number of people at the

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 21 -

Policy School about this. These were the names that kind of filtered through, people who were willing to make the time commitment and had an interest.

A Delegate asked who would choose from among the nominees. Mr. Daniels said the ASUC will confirm the appointments and choose which among the three will sit on the Council. The Delegate asked if the slots were for grads. Mr. Daniels said they were.

Mr. Stern asked about the J-Council. Mr. Daniels said it's the judicial branch of student government. It mainly dealt with things around the election, such as whether referenda were written clearly, whether candidates violated any By-laws in the campaign, etc. Also, the J-Council will also re-do its procedures that fall. Ms. Gomez said that any violation of the By-laws was forwarded to the Judicial Council, which decides on the issue. It was really important to have grad students on the Council. It used to be entirely undergrads, but made decisions that affected grad students. So having the grad perspective was really important.

Mr. Young asked how many were on the Judicial Council. Mr. Daniels said there was a total of nine. There were two vacancies for the GA to fill.

A Delegate asked if there were only three spots for grad students, or if more than three spots could be taken by grads. Mr. Gupta said that in the past, there hasn't been very much GA interest in the J-Council. Last year the ASUC and the GA passed an MOU that mandated that three spots be filled by grads. If the GA didn't feel them, then the ASUC would seek to fill them. But the ASUC President was more than willing to nominate grads for the other six vacancies. They're not specifically reserved for undergrads, to his knowledge. The Delegate asked only two of the nominees will get selected. Mr. Daniels said there were only two vacancies, and if more vacancies open up, they can nominate people for those positions as well.

Mr. Chen asked how long members of the J-Council serve. Mr. Daniels said they serve for two years.

Ms. Stalcup asked why the person they were voting to nominate for the J-Council was not present. Mr. Daniels said that was his mistake, because he didn't tell the nominee to come.

A Delegate asked if the GA would go through this procedure again if there's another vacancy. Mr. Daniels asked if they didn't get an e-mail and said he'd make sure he did a much better job of outreach. This was somewhat his mistake in terms of not making sure the word got out to more people. So he would apologize, but would do more outreach in the future.

Ms. Salaymeh asked why they couldn't postpone this, and allow people to make nominations. Mr. Daniels said there was a timeline. Ms. Salaymeh asked when nominations were due. Mr. Gupta said that by the third or fourth Senate meeting, the GA must submit its nominations, and otherwise, the ability to make nominations for these vacancies would be open to all students. If the GA President wished to work with Pres. Gabriel and the ASUC, he thought Mr. Daniels could probably attempt to extend the time it took to fill GA positions for the J-Council. Mr. Daniels said he would be happy to table this motion and do a better job of recruiting, if that's what Delegates wanted.

Ms. Salaymeh moved to table consideration of the nominations. The motion was seconded. An objection was raised. Mr. Daniels said they would have a discussion on whether or not to table the motion. Mr.

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 22 -

Eckerle said he thought it would be more efficient to ask at that time if anybody would like to be a nominee. As far as he was concerned, anybody could run, and he didn't think it had to be these three.

A Delegate said nominees didn't need to be in the GA, and could come from the entire student body.

Ms. Constantinides said that for future reference, maybe other people might be interested. Mr. Eckerle said that if they tabled the bill at that time, he was afraid the GA wouldn't be able to pass a Resolution before the deadline.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if a Resolution had to be passed or if the GA could simply consult with the people who were interested and then forward names to the ASUC for confirmation. Mr. Daniels said it was not mandatory that Delegates pass a Resolution, but it seemed appropriate.

A Delegate asked if there will be other openings. Mr. Daniels said there will be spots opening at the end of the year.

Mr. Ortega asked if Mr. Daniels could submit these names within the timeframe, and then submit three more, so they end up with six nominees in total.

Ms. Moody said that sounded dangerous in case three other people don't step up. Mr. Ortega asked if they could submit the names they had, and if they get three more, to add them. Mr. Gupta said that once nominations were made to the Senate, they were required to take them into consideration. The Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee would interview them and then make nominations to the Senate. According to the rules, each J-Council vacancy needed three nominees, with one person chosen. So the ASUC President was required to make three nominations for each vacancy. It therefore seemed that the GA President would only be able to make three nominations for one vacancy and then continue pursuing other people for other vacancies.

Ms. Gomez asked if the same person could be nominated for two seats. Mr. Gupta said people could be nominated more than once. He could definitely work with the GA President on this. He didn't know the

rules of the GA, but usually nominating students did not need to be made in the form of a Resolution, a main motion. So technically, in a week or two, if more people were interested, the GA President could potentially forward those on to the Senate without approval of the Assembly.

Ms. Anderson asked if they could reword the Resolution to have the GA support these nominations and put their names forward, and then have a two-week mini search, after which additional names would be forwarded. Mr. Daniels asked if that was an amendment. He suggested an amendment, "Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly supports the nominations of Joshua Templet, Michael Rosen-Prinz, and Sean Wilkoff to the Judicial Council." Ms. Anderson said she would word it to just support these people, and if the GA ended up having six people to nominate, then they'd have six people. But if nobody else signed up, they would have the original three. Mr. Daniels said the amendment would read:

"Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly supports the nominations of Joshua Templet, Michael Rosen-Prinz, and Sean Wilkoff to the Judicial Council."

Mr. Eckerle asked if they could add a phrase stating that they charge the President to lead a search for three more nominees. Mr. Daniels said they could do that, and authorize to have the names sent on. Mr. Daal asked if could they specify that the notice be sent to the various SAOs.

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 23 -

"Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly President will actively solicit further nominations to the Judicial Council, to be submitted by the appropriate deadline, with the approval of the Assembly."

Mr. Gupta said he would emphasize how important it was to have a graduate presence, so if everyone in the room there who spoke for the GA could help the in doing outreach, he was sure Mr. Daniels would appreciate that.

Mr. Daniels called for any objection to accepting these as friendly amendments. A motion to call the question was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION NOMINATING JOSHUA TEMPLET, MICHAEL ROSEN-PRINZ, AND SEAN WILKOFF TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL.

Ms. Cementwala moved to extend the time for Resolutions by two minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PARKING FEE IMPOSED ON NEW STUDENT FAMILIES MOVING INTO SMYTH-FERNWALD

WHEREAS, students with families are among the most financially burdened and economically disadvantaged at the University of California, Berkeley; and

WHEREAS the Smyth-Fernwald complex, with 74 student-family residence units located on Dwight and Fernwald Streets (and higher), is one of two complexes providing on-campus housing to student families; and

WHEREAS, Smyth-Fernwald houses student families at below-market, affordable rates and provides designated parking spaces, contributing to the University's vision of becoming a more student family-friendly campus; and

WHEREAS, the designated parking spaces had previously come at no charge to student families living at Smyth-Fernwald; and

WHEREAS, the Parking and Transportation Oversight Committee has imposed a fee for a parking space for new Smyth-Fernwald residents to nearly \$1,100 annually, to be paid in one lump sum at the beginning of the school year; and

WHEREAS, the fee has made it prohibitively expensive for incoming student families at Smyth-Fernwald to maintain a car; and

WHEREAS, Smyth-Fernwald is several 19%-grade blocks away from any public transportation; and

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 24 -

**RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PARKING FEE IMPOSED ON NEW STUDENT FAMILIES MOVING INTO SMYTH-FERNWALD (cont'd)**

WHEREAS, the usage of a car is essential to alleviating the difficulties of transporting children to day-care, picking up groceries and traversing the 19-degree incline up to Smyth- Fernwald;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly, in solidarity with the Smyth-Fernwald community, opposes the new parking fee imposed on incoming Smyth-Fernwald residents.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly directs the President and the Academic Affairs Vice President to work with the Smyth-Fernwald community and student families to lobby the Administration to rescind this onerous parking fee.

Ms. Cementwala said the Resolution states that the parking fee was bad and that the GA supported the Smyth-Fernwald residents in lobbying the campus to consider doing something about the parking fees so student families weren't affected. This was also part of the GA's Action Agenda that they approved. She called for any questions.

A Delegate asked if there was any specific reason for the increase. Ms. Cementwala said there wasn't. It was just to get them into the system. It's parking near the campus and Parking and Transportation felt they could do this and didn't realize the impact it would have; and there was no oversight.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PARKING FEE IMPOSED ON NEW STUDENT FAMILIES MOVING INTO SMYTH-FERNWALD UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

GA JEOPARDY GAME

Mr. Daniels said this was the fun part, and they had 22 minutes to play “Jeopardy.” One challenge for new Delegates was not knowing what people were talking about. So the Business Office might go on about budgeting matters and people didn't know what they were talking about. The information packet and the game would hopefully help with that.

Delegates broke into teams and the GA played a game of Jeopardy.

This meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary

- 25 -

Present at the September 14, 2006 GA Meeting

Meg Stalcup	Anthropology
Yes Duffy	Architecture and City Planning
Diane Wong	Astronomy
Haroldo Silva	Bioengineering
Loddie Hagar	Chemical Engineering
Justin Virgili	Chemical Engineering
Catherine (Erin) Becker	Chemistry
Brad Goya	City and Regional Planning
Dan Work	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Kofi Inkabi	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Margarita Constantinides	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Katrina Dodson	Comparitive Literature
Karl Chen	Computer Science
Catherine Barry	Demography
Aileen Cruz	East Asian Languages and Cultures
Amy Wu	Electrical Engineering
John Lurz	English
Josh J. Weiner	English
Alberto Ortega	Environmental Health Sciences Program
Kristen Durham	ERG
Seth Shonkoff	ESPM
Kari Bessak	ESPM

Goodman	
Jenny Wells	ESPM
Abigail Sedlacek	Folklore
Jonathon Repinecz	French
Carolyn Hawkshaw	German
Lena Salaymeh	History
Luis Jalas	History of Art
Ankit Jain	IEOR
Charlene Ng	Integrative Biology
Leslie Elwell	Italian Studies
Michael Rosen-Prinz	Law
Josh Templet	Law
Henry Stern	Law
Sara Colon	Law
Julia Taylor	Law
Taina Gomez	Law
Christine Diaz-	
Herrera	Law
Monami Chakrabart	Law
Ben Heuer	Law
Sarah Edwards	Law
Sara Kani	Law

- 26 -

Tai Milder	Law
Erin Haynes	Linguistics
Gabe Harley	Materials Science
Elizabeth Withey	Materials Science
Meghan Anderson	Math
Charles Smart	Math
Ann Marie Faust	MCB
Benjamin	
Freedman	MCB
Corie Lynn Cobb	Mechanical Engineering
Jui-Shan (Grace)	
Hsu	Mechanical Engineering
Jonathan Rheäume	Mechanical Engineering
Rachel Vandagriff	Music
Rebekah Ahrendt	Music
Esther	
Nakogawara	Optometry
Emily Fisher	Optometry
Brian Kessler	Physics
Kevin Young	Physics
Miguel Daal	Physics
Candace Gilet	Phvsics

Martha Gning	Political Science
Marta Filipski	Public Health
Christopher Yopp	Public Health
Ola Friday	Public Policy
Debra Lam	Public Policy
Lucy van de Wiel	Rhetoric
Libby Smith	SIMS
Melissa Murphy	Social Welfare/Public Health
Sarah Moody	Spanish and Portuguese
David Purdy	Statistics
Joy Crosby	Theater, Dance and Performance Studies
Stella So	Transportation Engineering
Taylor Allbright	ASUC Senate Rep
Becca Jones	Department Liaison
Josh Daniels	President
Vishal K. Gupta	ASUC EVP
Pete Dillon	Org and Rules Chair
Mariyam Cementwala	AAVP
Javier Jimenez	Funding Chair
Elisa	Business Office Supervisor
Harish Agarwal	Campus Committees Liaison
Mariam ElNaggar	The Berkeley Grad
Nish Rajan	Finance Chair
Tex Eckerle	EAVP
Suzanne Singer	

Wording of Amended Resolutions

- 27 -

RESOLUTION SELECTING THE ACTION AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE 2006-2007 ACADEMIC YEAR (as amended on the floor)

WHEREAS, graduate student families face unique difficulties at the University of California, Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, the quality of graduate student family life on campus is a primary consideration for prospective graduate student families; and

WHEREAS, health care costs have dramatically increased while health care coverage has consistently declined; and

WHEREAS, the quality of health care is of significant concern for prospective graduate students; and

WHEREAS, the redevelopment of Lower Sproul Plaza is at a crucial juncture between moving forward successfully or becoming mired in bureaucracy; and

WHEREAS, it is likely the redevelopment of Lower Sproul Plaza will need to be financed by student fees, and currently the Lower Sproul Plaza area is highly underutilized by the graduate student body on campus;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Action Agenda Items for the Graduate Assembly for the 2006-2007 academic year are (1) student family issues, (2) health care, and (3) Lower Sproul Redevelopment, and the elected officials are directed to focus their attention in these areas.

RESOLUTION NOMINATING JOSHUA TEMPLET, MICHAEL ROSEN-PRINZ, AND SEAN WILKOFF TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL (as amended on the floor)

WHEREAS, the Memorandum of Understanding between the ASUC and the GA passed in spring 2006 allowed the GA to nominate candidates for three of the nine seats on the Judicial Council; and

WHEREAS, there are currently two spots available for graduate students; and

WHEREAS, graduate students need representation on the Judicial Council to ensure fair decisions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly supports the nominations of Joshua Templet, Michael Rosen-Prinz, and Sean Wilkoff to the Judicial Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President will actively solicit further nominations to the Judicial Council, to be submitted by the appropriate deadline, with the approval of the Assembly.