

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 1, 2007

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting commenced the Spring Semester. It was called at 5:30 p.m.

Announcements

A number of paid jobs were available at the GA: Coordinator of the Graduate Women's Project; Campus Committee Liaison; Graduate Student Researcher; Departmental Liaison; and the Legislative Liaison.

Applications for the position of Student Regent were also being accepted at that time.

The Editor-in-Chief of the Daily Cal, Tiffany Hsu will send information on dealing with the paper. GA and ASUC beat reporters were introduced, Will Kane and Tamara Bartlett.

There was an opening for a grad on the ASUC Elections Council, for the upcoming spring ASUC elections.

Announcements were made about upcoming events, including the UC Student Association's Lobby Day in Sacramento, for students to lobby legislators; a workshop on depression recognition for GSIs, the Empowering Women of Color Conference, coming in March; the Bridging the Gap Conference: African Identity and Survival; the Bears Breaking Boundaries, 2007, grant competition, student-initiated research and projects; a pizza and beer night put on by the Graduate Social Club; a UC-wide Conference in March coming up in March 22.

There was an opening on the Committee on Educational Policy.

Presentation By Dean of the Graduate Division Mary Ann Mason

Dean Mason gave a presentation. This was her seventh, and last year, as Graduate Dean. She'll return to the classroom. She's worked to maintain the level of quality of their graduate programs, and to raise money. The sciences, social sciences, and humanities were tops, number 1. Through of private fund-raising, they have a \$22 million endowment for graduate student support.

Results were presented of a research project on the life course of men and women PhDs, including results from a research project, "Do Babies Matter?", and the survey the Cal PhD recipients fill out.

Introductory Remarks

Mr. Daniels gave some introductory remarks about the GA. The GA worked really hard to end on time, at 7:30, and Delegates were asked to stay until then, if possible. at. Their responsibilities as Delegates were to attend GA meetings and serve on a committee. They were there to represent their fellow grad students. In September, the GA set three Action Agenda items, their main priorities: Lower Sproul redevelopment; student families; and health care.

The Career Center Advisory Committee was trying to form a group to improve career services for grad students. And there was a spot for a grad rep on a committee to plan the ASUC's 120th anniversary.

GA Elections

Elections were held for the External Affairs Vice President and the Funding Committee Chair. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA elected Gavi Begtrup as External Affairs Vice President, and elected Ben Heuer as Funding Committee Chair.

RESOLUTIONS

By voice-vote, the GA voted to approve: A Budgetary Amendment to Fund Lower Sproul Redevelopment, funding the GA's portion of the creation of a conceptual drawing for Lower Sproul, \$8,000; and the Resolution Establishing 10 Conditions That Should Be Satisfied for the Graduate Assembly to Support, Financially Or Otherwise, the Redevelopment of the Lower Sproul Plaza Area.

The ASUC has contributed \$10,000 for the conceptual drawings.

Funding Budget Amendments

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved A Budgetary Amendment to Increase Student Group Funding. It increases the GA budget by \$15,000, to \$150,000, from the Contingency line item, reducing it to \$9,056. The GA's 06-07 budget started the year at \$120K, with \$30K added to contingency. The goal was to raise the budget to \$150K. The initial \$15K was transferred from contingency in the fall. Money accumulated over the years from unspent funds was up to \$175,000.

By-laws Revisions

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution Correcting the Funding Situation of Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees. These committees could request funding in a budget, as part of the regular budget process. Other funding requests would be on a case-by-case basis.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution Eliminating Events-Specific Restrictions on Student Group Funding. It sets Grad Events I and II at \$800 per group per semester. The Resolution puts the By-laws into compliance with current practice and would have no budget impact.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution Correcting Inconsistencies in the By-Laws - General. It corrects poor language usage in the By-laws and has the By-laws confirm to current practice to require all Delegates to serve on a committee.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution 1) Renaming the Graduate Assembly's Current Affirmative Action Policy and 2) Empowering the GA to Hold Associated Parties Accountable to This Policy. It renames the GA's current affirmative action policy and empowers the GA to hold associated parties accountable for this policy. All parties, by receiving funding or support from the GA, would agree to abide by the GA's non-discrimination policy.

The meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daniels said had a packed meeting that night. He knew some of them were new, and he hated to rush into things without giving them a brief explanation. But the Dean of the Graduate Division was present, and her time was precious, so he would do a little introduction to the GA after the Dean's talk. Handouts were available at the front.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daniels called for any objection to approving the minutes from the December meeting. THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 7, 2006 MEETING WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Daniels said they had a lot of Resolutions to get to and they tabled a bunch from the December meeting. He would ask for a motion to be made to extend the meeting time from 7:30 to 7:40. If that motion wasn't made, that was fine and he'd end the meeting at 7:30. They just wouldn't get through some things they'd like to finish that evening. A motion to extend meeting time by ten minutes, should it be needed, was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daniels said the GA had a number of jobs available, and they'd go through them quickly. These were paid jobs. Ms. Hsueh said a position was open for a female graduate student, Coordinator of the Graduate Women's Project. The current GWP Coordinator held the position for two years and was finishing her dissertation that semester. The position works to improve the lives of graduate women on the Berkeley campus. If interested, people could send an e-mail to manager@ga.berkeley.edu for an application, which was also available in the GA office at Anthony Hall. The position was for 15 hours a week with a stipend of \$840 per month. They hope to hire somebody who will be there for the next year or two. Mr. Daniels called for any questions.

Ms. Cementwala said there were two positions open in Academic Affairs. The Campus Committee Liaison position was a misnomer, because the person was really chief-of-staff in Academic Affairs. It entailed eight to ten hours per week. Unfortunately, the last CCL was sucked into the vortex of his science lab that semester and couldn't continue, Mr. Agarwal. But he has agreed to help train the next Committee Liaison. The position helps appoint grads to campus administrative committees, to represent grad students and the GA. So it was a critical role for the function of the GA. But the position could do so much more. In his tenure as CCL, Mr. Daniels worked tirelessly to get the RSF Fee Referendum passed, so they could thank him for helping to get RSF fees at \$10 that semester. So the options in the position to make change were immense. It averaged eight to ten hours a week, but sometimes they'd work two hours, and sometimes 20. So it was really flexible. She couldn't recall the exact amount of the stipend, but it was between \$5-600 a month. People could talk to her after the meeting or send her an e-mail.

Ms. Cementwala said people will get an announcement soon about a new position, at least for that semester, the Graduate Student Researcher. It involved working with her as well as Dean Mason, a little, specifically on issues of student families and student parents. They were looking for someone with good research skills, enthusiasm, initiative, and devotion to the issue. Mr. Daniels called for any questions about these positions.

Ms. Jones said that as the Departmental Liaison, she would prefer someone to take over her position. It was 10 to 12 hours a week, with a stipend of \$600 a month. They get to work closely with Mr. Daniels in organizing meetings, choose the food options, manage communication with Delegates and Officers, and between the University and grad students. There were also various other projects people could choose to get involved with. People could talk to her about this if they were interested. Mr. Daniels said this position was probably the most important link between departments on campus and the GA. It's the way the GA communicates with Delegates, and how departments theoretically communicate with the GA.

Mr. Daniels said another position, the Legislative Liaison, worked under the External Affairs VP and was 10 to 12 hours a week and paid \$5-600 a month. Its primary job was to work on the GA's lobbying efforts with the Legislature in Sacramento. That meant they went to monthly Board meetings of the UC Student Association, the Systemwide student government. The main event for the Spring Semester was the Lobby Conference at the end of February. Students from UC schools will go to Sacramento one weekend that semester to get training on how to lobby and then actually spend Monday lobbying legislators and their staffs on important issues. All these jobs were a way to get more involved in the GA and find out if it was or wasn't something they'd like, and to get paid for it.

Mr. Daniels said that if they were interested, they could check off on the feedback forms the jobs they were interested in.

Mr. Daniels said another job that was available was Student Regent, and yielded time to Ms. Allbright. Ms. Allbright introduced herself and said she was one of the ASUC Senate representatives to the GA. Last year she worked in the OSL on Student Regent recruitment and she was asked to make this announcement. One Student Regent votes on The Board of Regents, which controls the entire University of California. One Student Regent votes and then there's also one Regent designate, who sits as a non-voting member on the Board of Regents to learn how to become the upcoming Regent in the following year. The current Student Regent was Maria Ledesma, from UCLA, and the Regent-Designate was Ben Allen, from UC Berkeley Law. Student Regents get free tuition for two years, an office and a parking space at their home campus, and also get to travel for free to all the Regents meetings, which she's heard were fabulous to attend. If people were interested in applying, she had some applications, and people could go to studentregent.berkeley.edu. There will also be an information session next Wednesday, February 7, from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. in the Senate Chamber. Applications were due on February 22 in California Hall. Last year Ben Allen turned his application in a few minutes late, but he still got the position. However, this year the applications were being time-scanned, so he would not have been so lucky. So she would ask people to please turn applications in on time. She would leave applications at the front. People could go to the Web site if they had questions.

Regarding the availability of elected positions in the GA, Mr. Daniels said that as they knew, there were two elected positions on the GA Board they need to fill, the External Affairs VP and the Funding Chair. The GA will hold these elections later that evening. Mr. Daniels said that as they mull the positions they heard about that evening, he would ask them to also consider running for election.

Mr. Daniels said they had the distinguished Editor-in-Chief of the Daily Cal for another announcement. Tiffany Hsu introduced herself and said she was the Editor-in-Chief of the Daily Cal. She didn't want to take up too much time, so in lieu of the usual media training she did for the ASUC, she'd send a briefing sheet to Mr. Daniels that would cover how to contact a reporter, how reporters can contact them, quotes, getting quotes read back, anonymity, complaints, etc. If they had any issues they wanted the Daily Cal to deal with, they could go through her. They could reach her at editor@dailycal.org. They could also go through the University Editor, Cristina Bautista. Ms. Hsu said she also wanted to introduce the paper's fabulous GA and ASUC beat reporters, Will Kane and Tamara Bartlett.

Mr. Daniels said that Jessica Wren was the newly elected Elections Council Chair for the ASUC. Some of them, as grads, may not really care what happened with the ASUC; and there was legitimacy to that position. But he did want to let them know that pretty much every election since he's been there, referenda to increase students' fees, to pay for various services, have been on the ballot. Graduate students have traditionally not played a role in the elections process. So grads' fees, for these fees at least, have been determined by the undergraduates. So over the years that has been an issue. Thanks to the Memorandum of Understanding that was passed last year between the GA and ASUC, the GA now had two seats out of six on the Elections Council. They placed one graduate student on the Council, but they need to place the other, so they have representation. Ms. Allbright said this was for the Elections Council Chair Selection Committee, not the Elections Council. It's the Elections Council Chair that nominates people to sit on the Elections Council. Mr. Gupta said the Committee doesn't exist any more because they approved an Elections Council Chair, but he believed that according to the MOU, the GA had an official seat on the Elections Council guaranteed to a grad student. He would follow-up with Mr. Daniels on that.

Mr. Daniels said that if grads were interested in elections and student fees, he believed there was still one spot somewhere for grads, and it was important to fill that seat. If people were interested, the time commitment was not significant, except for around elections time. But that was before finals, so they wouldn't have to worry about huge conflict. If people were interested, they should check that on the feedback form.

Mr. Daniels said the next announcement dealt with events going on with the External Affairs VP. Mr. Begtrup said that hopefully an e-mail went out. The UC Student Association, the overall UC System students association comprised of the GA, the ASUC, and all the other UC student governments, was having a lobby event in Sacramento February 24-26. They'll go to Sacramento State and stay at the Doubletree and will have two days of briefings about issues that affect graduate students and students as a whole. Issues will include increases in fees, accessibility, diversity, all these issues the GA talks about. The UCSA will have people who actually know something talk to the students for two days, as the students prepare to actually lobby legislators. Then on Monday, they spend all day meeting with legislators from this area. If students come from other areas, they'd meet with the legislators from their home counties or districts. And at the end of the Lobby Conference, there will be a big rally where all the UC students there show up. It's fun and interesting and people get to learn about how the UC System worked and how the budgeting process in Sacramento worked. If people were at all interested in State politics, this would be a good thing to do, especially if people care about fees going up. They all care about diversity and things like that, and this was their chance to actually do something about these issues. That's what the External Affairs Office was all about.

Secondly, Mr. Begtrup said the External Affairs Committee was meeting, and assuming he got elected that evening, he would make them do stuff, meaning he wanted people who were interested in things outside the University to join the External Affairs Committee, which will have its next meeting on Monday at 6 p.m. in Anthony Hall. They plan to have in-district visits to lobby their State and federal legislators and talk about student issues. This was an exciting time to be in External Affairs because there was optimum power, meaning their agenda would be focused and what they'd do was still up for grabs. That's why he wanted input from people. If people wanted to go to Sacramento, with all expenses paid, they should send him an e-mail, eavp@GA.berkeley.edu. They had to do that soon, by Friday. Mr. Daniels said this was really important, particularly as Berkeley was the premier campus in the System and they really needed a good turnout. They'll have a good time.

Mr. Begtrup said the Lobby Conference will be Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, February 24-26.

A Delegate asked if people who weren't Delegates could go, such as people in departments. Mr. Bergstrom said they could. The GA wouldn't pay for undergrads, but would pay for grad students to attend. If Delegates knew of any undergrads who would like to attend, they should talk to the ASUC, which will be sending people as well.

Ms. Gomez said that especially for students who live in other parts of California, it was important for them to talk to their own representatives, because the local reps in the Bay Area were very supportive and favorable to education. But legislators without a UC campus in their districts were the ones who really needed to know about higher education. Mr. Begtrup said the UC System was designed to serve the entire State of California. That obviously meant legislators at Berkeley, who realize UC was important to them. But if legislators were from other areas, it would be helpful for UC students to talk to them, especially if they were from the Central Valley.

A Delegate asked how many students he hoped to bring. Mr. Begtrup said they were looking for around 15 total. He's heard from around eight students. If they've already contacted him, they should do so again. At that point he'd like as many people as possible to attend.

Mr. Daniels there was a workshop on depression for GSIs, and a flier and an announcement. A Delegate said that as a result of a federal grant to prevent suicides on campus, CPS was offering workshops for GSIs on recognizing the signs of depression and what role GSIs had in preventing suicide for their students. A similar workshop was being offered for staff. He would highly encourage people to attend this workshop and if interested, they had to sign up for it. If they're not a GSI, he would ask them to please post the flier. And they might suggest their Student Affairs Officer attend as well.

Mr. Begtrup said he's heard about lawsuits pertaining to suicide and asked to what extent it was a liability to be trained in suicide awareness. Dean Mason said she chaired this committee and has looked at the lawsuits. The fear of a lawsuit was greatly overblown. There was one suit, the Shin case at MIT, and it was settled. There was a precedent set in California and she thought she could say pretty definitively that if one got trained in this role, they would be more responsible, would know more, and shouldn't worry about a lawsuit.

A Delegate asked if they train students and faculty too. Peggy Yang said the grant was for three years, and first targeted staff and faculty, and then students. GSIs were actually considered staff. This was part

of the reach of faculty, but they don't all merge together. The Delegate asked about the Web site. Ms. Yang said it was at the bottom of the flier.

A Delegate asked if they got an e-mail about this. Ms. Yang said they probably got one already.

Ms. Hsueh said a lot of times graduate students thinking about orals could put them into a depression. A free workshop will be held on Monday, sponsored by the Graduate Support Services Coordinator, who was funded by the GA. For this workshop they've invited Dr. Morrison, who knew how hard to was to be a grad student, especially those who had to go through orals. So she would ask them to pass the fliers around to their colleagues and to please attend.

Ms. Hsueh said the Coordinator of the Empowering Women of Color Conference will be there later on to give a report, if they had time. Ms. Hsueh said she wanted to show people the flier. The Conference will be held on Saturday, March 3, the whole day. They could go to the Web site to register. All Berkeley students could come to the workshop and the Conference. They serve breakfast, lunch, and snacks for the whole day, and it was free for all Berkeley students.

Mr. Daniels said that on the 24th is the Bridging the Gap Conference: African Identity and Survival. Ms. Hsueh said it was sponsored by the Graduate Minority Students Project. It's a whole-day conference on the 24th, and people could go to the Web site and register at gmsp@ga.berkeley.edu. Delegates were encouraged to pass this information along to everybody.

Mr. Daniels asked for a motion to extend Announcements by two minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Vishal Gupta introduced himself and said he was the ASUC Executive VP. He was joined by Annie Yeh, the Assistant to Tom Kalil, of Big Ideas at Berkeley, and they were there to tell the GA about Bears Breaking Boundaries, 2007. This was a \$100,000-plus-grant competition for student-initiated research and student-led projects. It was actually very good for a lot of graduate divisions and students doing research in different fields. Ms. Yeh would talk about the competition itself and the various grant competitions people could enter. The information session will be February 13 from 5:30 to 7:30 in the Multi-cultural Center in Heller Lounge. There will be some free refreshments and T-shirts. They'll be doing all sorts of publicity. It will be a great and exciting time for research for all students. Ms. Yeh said she was really excited about that year, because last year they had 96 admissions and 29 winners in ten different areas. For this year, they were very fortunate to have Dean Mason's support for a contest on improving student life. There will be graduate and undergrad student components. They have nine contests that year, in such areas as global poverty reduction, green cities, improving student life, ideas for student life, science, engineering and biology. They'd love the GA's help in spreading the word about this contest. She believed Mr. Daniels was willing to give them an e-mail list. She would ask Delegates to please tell their colleagues about this. It should be very exciting. Mr. Gupta said they'd send out an official letter on February 6 and he'll write their contact information on the board.

Mr. Daniels said there were two other announcements, and he would ask for a motion to extend speaking time by five minutes. It was so moved and seconded by and passed with no objection.

Ms. Harris said the Graduate Social Committee was organizing pizza and beer on Wednesday, from 6:00 to 9:00, at MLK Pauley Ballroom. She would ask Delegates to please e-mail their students. They'll have ten kegs and lots of pizza.

Elizabeth Gillis introduced herself and said she worked with the Campus Community Initiative. A UC-wide Conference was coming up on March 22, something that was started by a bunch of graduate students on the Berkeley campus. All through last year another group of grad students helped develop it and laid the groundwork for the Conference. It's being co-sponsored by Pres. Dynes, Chancellor Birgeneau, Dean Mason, the GA, and other graduate divisions. There will be a ton of panels throughout the day covering all kinds of topics, from mentoring to mental health issues. They have a whole list on the Web site. People need to register for the Conference since there's limited space and all ten campuses were involved. Busloads were coming from other campuses. Troy Duster will be the keynote speaker. He's a faculty member on campus, in Sociology, and at the Institute of the Study of Social Change and also at NYU. Also, Maria Ledesma, the Student Regent, will be graduate keynote speaker.

Ms. Cementwala said she talked a little about the Campus Committee Liaison, and one campus committee on which they actually needed a grad student representative on the Committee on Educational Policy. It meets every other Wednesday from 2:00 to 4:00. If people were interested in knowing a little more about the Committee, she and the current representative, Brad Voitek, would be happy to talk about it. It's an interesting Committee with faculty members from various departments. It was a great opportunity to fulfill their GA Committee requirement.

Mr. Daniels called for any other announcements.

PRESENTATION BY DEAN OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION, MARY ANN MASON

Mr. Daniels said the distinguished Dean of the Graduate Division, Mary Ann Mason was present with a presentation and would then answer questions.

Dean Mason said she would like to thank them for asking her to attend. As always, it was a great pleasure to see them. Some were old friends and old faces. She asked how many people were new that year to the GA, and noted that there were a lot. She asked how many were PhD students, and noted that most of them were. She asked how many Law students there were, and noted there was always a good contingent present. She asked how many were MBAs, and how many were in other professional schools, Optometry, Social Welfare. She noted that there was good representation.

Ms. Mason said this was a good opportunity, since most of them were PhD students, to tell her one joke, and asked how many PhD students it took to screw in a light bulb. And the answer was, only one, but it took him or her nine years. Although that wasn't the case at this University.

Ms. Mason said she first wanted to thank them for serving on the Graduate Assembly. This group has been great over the years, and she's gotten to know great people like Ms. Cementwala, Mr. Daniels, and Mr. Bergstrom, and to work with many of them on the Graduate Council and on other committees, including the Mental Health Task Force. She was always so impressed with what responsible, young people they were, and how effective they were in making things change. She didn't think they should

underestimate how important their voice was. When they talk to her or to the Chancellor, they're heard, and they're the grads who do that.

Ms. Mason said that this was her seventh, and last year, as Graduate Dean, her last semester. She's truly enjoyed it, but seven years was the Biblical cycle. She has truly enjoyed working with all of the 105 graduate programs. By most counts, Berkeley was both the biggest and the best graduate school in the world. They give out more PhDs and have rankings across *US News & World Report*, and NRC. It's been a hugely wonderful position, and she felt very privileged.

Ms Mason said that over the last seven years she's done lots of things, but she's had to spend a lot of time worrying about money, as deans do. And these last seven years have been pretty brutal in terms of fees going up, doubling for international students and going through the roof for Law students. It's been a very tough time. And her main concern has been to maintain the level of quality of their graduate programs. So she's done a lot to raise money at the Office of the President, the campus, and with private funders. For any of them in the humanities and social sciences, the Deans Norma Chi Fellowship was helpful.

Ms. Mason said that when she first came there, she realized there was an imbalance. There was no question that national agencies give more money to the sciences, and the social sciences and humanities often were not so well situated. And yet, their social sciences and humanities were tops, number 1, just as their sciences were number 1, probably more of them. So that was one thing she worked on. They actually greatly increased the diversity fellowships as well. Berkeley certainly had that even before Chancellor Birgeneau, and has been committed to diversity in a way that she didn't think the public really knew much about. That's because they've been quiet about it after Prop. 209. But their numbers were actually pretty good. They were better than Stanford and Harvard in doctoral programs in terms of diversity. And Berkeley could do a lot better than they were doing. That has been something she's really cared about, and something they've brought up greatly since 2000, in terms of percentages. That's made her very happy as well.

Thirdly, Ms. Mason said they've done a lot of private fundraising, and have about \$22 million extra in endowments for graduate student support. It's not all about raising money, but that was important. The way they can remain strong was by being able to attract people like those present, who were the best and brightest in the world. She didn't care about money in a large, intellectual way, but living in Berkeley was very expensive, and they were not overpaid. It's a really tough place to be. So whoever took her place will also, hopefully, do his or her bit to keep graduate education as good as it was, the best in the world.

Again, Ms. Mason said she couldn't tell them how much fun she's had, and how much she's enjoyed working with all of them. She was going to go back and teach the campus, so she would be there, and would see them. She was really looking forward to getting back into the classroom again because in spite of it, she thought most of the professors on this campus really loved to teach. Faculty talk about how they're overburdened with too many students, but people miss it when they're gone for a couple of years. It was really just about the most fun thing, to teach and to have graduate students to work with. So she was looking forward to that again.

Ms. Mason said she wanted to share with them briefly a couple of current projects dealing with student life. Although she talked a lot about money, she really cared about the quality of life for graduate

students as well. And they've worked on that in various ways, at the Jackson House, when she first came there, housing at the Hillegas-Parker Co-op House for graduate students, which they did as well. And she really cared a lot particularly about graduate student work-life issues, and student-parent issues, in part because it's an area she's researched in the past, but really, she was inspired by the fact that when she first became Graduate Dean, for the first time in history, 51% of all graduate students were women. This was an incredible leap, because when she was a grad student, only 10% of her PhD program, and about 11% of her Law program, when she got a JD, were women. Things have changed greatly. She went to her first Deans' meeting and she was the only woman there. The faculty were still only 23% women.

Ms. Mason said she's looked at the life course of men and women PhDs, which has been a research project for the last several years. She sees there are difficulties along the way. So part of the things she wanted to do was to make sure that the pipeline remained open for women as it did for men, and that student parents, all along the way, as both students and as young faculty members, were treated in a way that made it possible for all of them to have a full life and not just work, work, work. Their life really didn't have to be all this difficult all the time. Those who were studying for their orals didn't believe it, but it got better.

Ms. Mason said the presentation she'd give was one she gave in the spring to the Council of Graduate Schools nationwide. It was based on the survey that Berkeley grads filled out. She asked how many filled out the Work-Life Survey, and said she wanted to applaud them, and thank them. They got a good response. This data was the basis for really changing any kind of policy or programs. That's what they've found in terms of their projects working with faculty, and now she would tell what they've been doing with grads' responses. They have been very important.

First, nationally, as the screen showed, many institutions have many more graduate student parents than Berkeley did. Altogether, in all Masters institutions, close to half the students, 36% of women and 47% of men, were student parents. But these were often part-time students who were older. But at doctoral, research universities, essentially R1 schools, where Berkeley was, the numbers were much lower, and for Berkeley, at 20-23%, it was actually somewhat lower. Berkeley's demographics were a little bit different, and Berkeley was a little younger, and the school, of course, did not have any part-time programs.

The other reason student parents were growing on this campus as well as nationally was because the grad student population was getting older. From 1985 to the year 2000, the average length to get a PhD went up a couple of years. And then the average year to get tenure at any R1 university went up to close to 40. That was a significant number. Many grad students were in their 30s, and she thought the 30s were make or break years for men and women, but even more for women. They had to make their career in their 30s, and it was all front ended. They had to get tenured, and in law school had to become a partner. Everything happened in that decade. And it was also the make-or-break year for reproduction in women's lives. So she thought there was a real gender issue in terms of how professions were still in the 19th Century model.

Ms. Mason said they started a project in 2001, "Do Babies Matter?" And they do matter. Several articles and lots of data to come out of this. And it's gotten a lot of national attention, and brought them a Sloan Grant, to change policies relating to faculty parents and to put better policies in place. It just started last year and includes two semesters for childbirth; modified duty; and for faculty, a year off the tenure clock for every child; and a number of other things.

They started their survey looking at the best possible employment databases and surveyed doctored recipients. For those present who get a PhD, which was most of them, they'll have to fill that out this survey. They would not get a degree without filling it out. They also continue to survey 10% of PhDs every two years, until they're 76, if they're lucky enough to be one of them, with a phone call every two years, and will bug respondents to death. People just capitulate and finally fill it out. But it allows researchers to really see the whole employment scope, men and women PhDs, from the moment they get their PhD, and whatever they do, to follow them through their lives, even if they don't go into academia. For those who do go into academia, they found that the biggest leak in the pipeline for women was between getting the PhD and taking their first job at an R1 university; and it was a huge leak. Married women were 21% less likely than single women to enter a tenured track position and women with babies were 28% less likely than women without any children, single women, to enter a tenured track position. So this was really the critical time, and it usually happened about the age of 32. And then people wait a few years, and then there's really no way to get back. It sounded grim, and it was grim, but they're working on getting it better.

Ms. Mason said there was also a leak in the pipeline for women later on. Women were 27% less likely to become an associate professor, i.e., to get tenured, and 20% less likely to be a full professor, and to stay at the associate professor level. The UC System was much better than that, and women and men get tenured at pretty much the same rate. That wasn't true at other places.

Based on this, Ms. Mason said they really spent a lot of time looking at attracting women in the door. The pool problem at Berkeley was difficult. They don't get so many women applying for jobs in Chemical Engineering, and they do better in English literature than chemical engineering. The goal was to be able to reach out and say that if a grad came to Berkeley, they could still have a family, which was the base of their family-friendly policies, and the basis of their grants. But this particular database, which they spent a lot of time with, and wrote about in a lot of publications, really didn't address the PhD years. So they know more about grads after they get their PhDs than they do before. So this was the first ever work-life survey that's been taken of PhD students, that all of them very kindly fill out. And it was an 18-page survey. Grads got chided a few times if they didn't answer it. They looked for a 50% rate response rate, which made it legitimate by social science standards.

Ms. Mason said that more women than men filled it out, slightly, 50% of respondents were women, and only 45% of the doctoral student population overall. They're 50%, but the professional schools, like Law, actually have more women than men, as does Education and Public Health. So that pushes the number up a bit. Altogether, on this campus, 13% of women and 10% of men were parents. That's much lower than the national average. But it's a snapshot, because they took everyone from their second year until they finished their PhD. If they took them at the time they graduated with their PhD, that number would be more like 15-17% of their doctoral students who graduate. She thought she told people at the beginning of the year, when she did the reception, that they should look around, because one out of five will find their life partner there, and one out of ten will have a child before they graduate. It's actually a little higher than that. Thirty-two percent of women and 29% of the men were married, so they don't need to go to the graduate social. And 8% of women and 11% of men were partnered, and they didn't need to go either. That left half of them who definitely needed to go to the social. Four percent of women and 1% of men were divorced and not remarried, and women were, on the average, one year older than men. That actually happens nationwide, and she wasn't sure why that was.

Ms. Mason said she was just giving a few of the interesting results. One question that was really quite interesting was that most of them were really not too happy with the career-life balance; and women more

so than men. The good news was that most of them actually like their programs. They think the quality of their degree programs was pretty good. They like working with their fellow PhD students. One thing was actually better than she expected, in that 17-19% like their faculty advisor. She wouldn't know that in the Graduate Division because she heard nothing but difficulties. So that was good news. The bad news was that about half had a real complaint with not having a career-life balance, time for self, etc.

The next screen showed what she thought was most telling. This particular survey started with their second year, so they also surveyed first-year students. At the start of their PhDs, about half of them, both men and women, wanted to become a professor at a Research 1 university, basically like Berkeley. And then, as they got into it, from their second year on, that number shrunk considerably, and for women, a lot more than for men, from 46% to 31%; and for men, from 51% to 41%. A good portion of them always wanted to teach at teaching institutions, and a good portion of them always wanted to go into government. But their experience at Berkeley pushed them much further into the business/government/other category. Particularly for women, there was a difference between sciences and non-sciences, what they call "the physical sciences/engineering/technical programs. That was even a greater drop, because at the begin of this, more women than men want to go into an R1 professorship. But they shrink very rapidly down to 25%; and men shrink pretty rapidly as well, down to 32%. And everyone decides that it would be better to go into industry, since they probably had that option, or government. So they got a loss in all the fields, although more pronounced in science and engineering. In the humanities this was less pronounced.

There were a number of reasons people wanted to leave, for those of did, a good percentage, without realizing their original goals. They didn't really like their experience as PhD students. That was troubling, and it included a lot of things. But the second major reason for women were issues related to children. That wasn't the case for men. That was only 16%. And the next for women related to issues around spouse and partner. And that was not the case for men. So it was more of a gender kind of response, the student parent issue. And as they saw from their earlier pipeline, that was the group who were leaving and not leaking out of the pipeline after getting their PhD. Students were changing their minds somewhere from their second year on.

Ms. Mason said the next screen showed some anecdotes. They got some wonderful remarks, colored pink and blue; and they could figure out which was which. Men say: "I feel unwilling to sacrifice a healthy family life and satisfying personal life to succeed in academics, and thus, industrial options have become more appealing." Ms. Mason said that was definitely an engineer. "Fed up with narrow mindedness of supposedly intelligent people who are largely workaholic and expect others to be so as well." Ms. Mason said that was a disgruntled male grad. "I look at the lives of professors I see every day and I want to emulate none of them."

As for anecdotes from women, they said things like: "I really want to be a mom. This seems like an extremely difficult goal to align with the goal of being a faculty member at a top university in engineering." "Since beginning my doctoral work I have become convinced that very few, if any, female professors are able to have stable, fulfilling family lives of the sort that I wish for." "Academia is not very supportive of women. There are challenges at every step of the way in terms of having to make choices. I want to be able to have a family, have children, and enjoy being a mother and life, which are close to impossible when one chooses academia." The clock was ticking and it did not stop for anything or anyone. Ms. Mason said that clearly, they have a problem with role models.

Ms. Mason said the next screen was of people who were already married or partnered with children. She asked if any in the room had children, and said they would see themselves in the screen. They're working 101 hours a week and were doing a second shift, 37.3%, and they're working a lot at that second shift, 23.9 hours. People with leisure time were down, working 72 hours a week. The bottom part was very interesting. Definitely women with children put less time into their studies. Men with children were somewhat less, but not significantly less. And both men and women with children were actually working a little bit more. That employment was probably their GSI/GSR time. So there was no question about it, and they had a pretty rough life; which she didn't have to tell them. The interesting part was that those numbers like almost identical to the UC faculty, which were surveyed as well. It continues to be a double load for women, and for men as well. That's why these initiatives were not just for women, but for fathers as well. Because it's clear that women with children, and men with children, probably need some extra time in order to finish. They just can't put in the same number of hours.

Ms. Mason said the next screen showed what other universities were doing. Everyone was very generous in giving a list to help graduate student families with housing. It was cheap and easy to hand out a list. As for health insurance and allowing students to add dependents, they didn't have that on there, unless they wanted to pay for it. The campus asked all their health care providers for student dependents, and the insurers came up with, as usual, impossibly high amounts, \$4-5,000. But the good part was that although she wouldn't have thought it, changing that he was, Gov. Schwarzenegger now really loved immigrant children. So Healthy Care in Alameda County for low-income people now actually applied not just to domestic graduate students, but to international students as well. So they are able to make matches. That was Gov. Schwarzenegger's doing, and she wouldn't have thought he would have done that. And then, down the line, the screen showed what other universities give dependent health care insurance subsidies. Only 5% do it, including Rice and Stanford. For paid maternal leave policy, Berkeley was about to join the ranks of schools that offered that.

Based on their survey, in part, they put through for all of them paid childbirth leave. This will be passed, hopefully, on Monday, at the Graduate Council. It's been passed by the Chancellor, who will fund it, and through the deans. So starting probably next semester, six weeks of paid maternity, not paternity leave, will be available for women on a GSI/GSR or on fellowship. There were also some new infant/toddler pre-school slots at the new Haste. St. Child Development Center. One-third of the slots were devoted to students and UC families. She had handouts about that.

Ms. Mason said that "Stopping the Clock" has been in place for about a year. These were extensions for academic milestones, to give extra time, stopping the clock for student parents for things like NSF and other grants that were time dated. It's campus policy that student parents can stop the clock. The campus also had family student housing, Albany Children's Center, the Student Parent Center, a breast-feeding support program, and a graduate student-parent grant. Those were continuing initiatives. Dean Mason said she hoped they will help make graduate school more family friendly. Grads may not be in a position to have, or may not be dying to have children at this moment, but it was nice to know it was a possibility, if they were concerned about that. And clearly, there are people who were. She expected the paid childbirth leave will perhaps precipitate a little baby boomlet on campus, which she was looking forward to. This has been something she's really cared a lot about.

Ms. Mason said she had to plug her book, which will come out in May, Mothers on the Fast Track: How the New Generation Can Manage Career and Families. She wrote it with her daughter, who did all the interviews, of people who dropped out; women who were graduate students; Diane Feinstein; media

people; lawyers; doctors; everyone in the basically higher status, male-dominated professions, as well as PhDs. At the end of it, Ms. Mason said she thought the thing her daughter got most out of it was that all the mothers said that their partner was perhaps the most important ingredient, negatively and positively. So Delegates shouldn't marry a jerk, because a partner could do more to impede their career, probably for men as well as women, than almost anything else. But a partner who says, "Your career is as important as mine is," and accommodates in whatever way necessary, made all the difference. So again, people shouldn't marry a jerk, men or women.

Dean Mason said she had some hand outs, "Families Matter: A Quick Guide for Graduate Student Parents." And there was also the online newsletter and the UC faculty family-friendly Web site, which had everything in one place.

As a social scientist, Ms. Mason said it was really very gratifying to be able to do research and actually see it applied. That was system that really happened in social science. Most of the work she's done has been with children in the law, and she's written a lot law and policy pieces. She would get a respectful hearing and then nothing would change. But it has been gratifying to have research that has actually paid off.

Ms. Mason said she would mention one other project, although it was really meant for faculty members and started just about a year ago. They got matching funds for this. Professors could now leave an endowed fund in their own names, and there was now a "Mary Ann Mason Endowed Fund" for students in Social Welfare. The Law School had some endowed funds, as did the Business School. For faculty emeriti, it was \$10,000 to establish an endowed fund, which was a huge bargain because for the public, the amount had to be at least \$50,000. They have raised altogether, more than \$2 million; and it was still going on. So she would ask Delegates to tell their professors that they could have their own fund in their own name, a bargain they couldn't pass up. And the clock was ticking, because this promotion will be over in June. But it's been very successful. The Chancellor and the Provost, e.g., have contributed.

Ms. Mason said that was all she wanted to tell them about with regard to her current projects, which will continue until she stepped down. She knew they had questions for her.

A Delegate asked how they could get the figures, or the PowerPoint. Ms. Mason said they could e-mail her, at graddean@ucberkeley. They don't have this on their own Web site, although it's on the CGS Web site. There was actually a lot more that she didn't show them, and people were welcome to all of them.

Mr. Inkabi said that one thing he's heard about from some of his colleagues in Engineering was that the culture in academia was still very messed up with respect to women having children while they were going through school. What really stood out for him was the total workload figure for women with children, and how that was so much higher than for men or for women who didn't have children. He asked if there were any alternatives or things the campus was thinking about doing that might help with that. Ms. Mason said it was very much like with their faculty family-friendly initiatives. People could put things on the books, but people had to change the culture, and sometimes it was sort of doing one thing at a time. It was really up to departments, deans, and chairs, to set the models. In some departments they've been very good, such as with Chemistry, where both the dean and the chairs have been very good. They would have to accept the fact that it's going to take students a little longer, and accept the fact that everything will take a little longer for the first few years. The argument was that the school wouldn't want to lose their best and brightest students. But even more, as universities became successful, other

universities get on the bandwagon and everybody has faculty family-friendly. A Berkeley grad student went to the University of Illinois and was having her second child, and usually grad students, women, ask her if they should tell or not tell they were pregnant. The student had no choice but to tell because she was very pregnant, and the University of Illinois said they had great programs. They gave her the first semester off with modified duty, and so they got her because they were family friendly. All the big nine presidents, including those of Harvard and Yale, came to Berkeley two years ago and they all set their benchmarks and were moving in that direction.

Ms. Mason said she just launched survey to go all over the country because people want to be able to attract students with childbirth leave, stopping the clock, etc. So it was hard to change culture, and it wouldn't happen over night. The deans and chairs of departments were really critical to this.

Mr. Purdy said he had an anecdotal opinion that departments whose students were more mature had more services and more consideration for students who were married and had children because they have come from the workforce, where that kind of infrastructure was already in place. He asked if she noticed anything like that in her analyses. Ms. Mason said that was a good point. Berkeley students were not too mature compared to other universities. The average age of entry of all graduate student on the Berkeley campus was actually 28. That was old, but that wasn't doctoral students, and was largely due to having a bifurcated population. There's a very old group in Law and an old group in Business, and an old group in Public Health. And they come back after having work experience, for the most part. But in the PhD program, they're more likely to be 24 or 25 when they start. So they're not as mature. The mature group were the post-docs, and the post-docs have even worse statistics in terms of women dropping out. But UC as a whole now did give dependent care, and gave a lot of benefits to post-docs to try to give them at that point. And Mr. Purdy was right in that it was really a matter of age in terms of whether or not people had families. If they've had previous work experience, they're going to ask for and demand more. So the post-docs have been very successful in that regard.

Ms. LePak asked if she'll be returning to the School of Social Welfare. Ms. Mason said she would be. She also teaches mental health law.

Ms. Ahrendt said she hoped Dean Mason's successor continued with these projects. Ms. Mason said she hoped so, and she had someone she'd like to succeed her. She's trained that person and Ms. Mason said it was very important to her that they do continue these. And fundraising had to continue as well. The agreement with BP Amoco on alternative fuels for \$500 million that was reached that day will really help. Even if it doesn't go to grads directly, much of that money will go to grad students. What she's learned in fundraising was that nothing succeeds like success. People love to give money to things that already have money, and don't want to give money to a loser. So once they look as good as they did, and convince the public and Sacramento, then they're more willing to give money. So fundraising was really important. Student life issues were truly important to her. She just instituted one of the associate deans to work half-time on student life. So that will continue on without her and will be really important because that was part of the portfolio now.

Mr. Stavrinides said he knew she was concerned with international student issues and asked if she planned to make international student-parents eligible for the graduate student-parent grant. Ms. Mason said she didn't, and that was a major problem. They do give additional money to SISS for student welfare issues. They've gone back and forth on whether they should actually earmark it for graduate-student parents because it was a lot of money. But it could be used for that. People they have argued that it

should be discretionary. She asked if he felt that was a real problem for international student parents. Mr. Stavrinides said he did. He knew someone who went through SISS and back to the University because they didn't have anything specific for student parents. So he thought it was a big issue. Ms. Mason said she would like to thank him for mentioning that. It's one thing she hasn't really paid much attention to in a couple of years and she'll go back and revisit that and see if international graduate student parents were actually getting some of that, because that was meant to be the case. International students could have a lot of problems, and SISS didn't want to have their hands tied. But she agreed that at least part of it should go to student parents. She wanted to thank him for mentioning that.

A Delegate said she was also from Engineering, and she was wondering what she was doing to educate the faculty on the issues that their students face, because it did seem that a lot of things just kind went over their heads, and they don't get it. Ms. Mason said the women of Engineering invited her to a meeting. The problem was, she was preaching to the choir. More than speak up, she has, in fact, she yelled a lot about these issues to deans and such. The current Acting Dean, Dean Doyle was very good and understood these issues. Again, it's not that easy, and it's step by step. She could name at least ten professors who she thought have become very attuned to this in Engineering, and it's working at it one-by-one. Ms. Mason said paid student-parent leave will be good because women would not feel nervous about telling their PI they're going to have a baby, and it would just be automatic and they'd get reimbursed. It would mean that it wouldn't be a loss for them. But she was right, it was difficult, and it was a hard culture.

Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank her very much. (Applause)

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Mr. Daniels asked everybody who was new to the GA that semester to please raise their hands. He would like to welcome them and would give them a quick rundown on what the GA did. As they probably knew, the Graduate Assembly was the student government for grad students. They represent all the departments, and Delegates individually represent their departments, their classmates, as well as their own individual, unique needs from the communities they come from. It was really important that they attend meetings and stay as long as they could because they represent those communities or departments, and sometimes were the only representative the GA had from them. He knew they're all busy and knew it was really important that they do their work and hang with their families, partners, or friends, but if they could stay until 7:30, the GA worked really hard to end on time. They value their time and wouldn't go past that time.

Mr. Daniels said their responsibilities, other than representing where they were from, was to attend GA meetings and serve on a committee. They'd like to get all representatives and Delegates involved. The idea was that the student government had some sort of power and voice, and they want to push that power and voice down to the students themselves. The way to do that was not by having him lecture them, as he was currently doing, but by having them serve on very important committees. And lastly, their most important responsibility was to come at 5:00 and have something to eat.

Mr. Daniels said the reason they were there, and why the GA existed, and met once a month, was because they were the student voice and the student power for graduate students. Without the GA, there

really wouldn't be a unified graduate voice to motivate change. There were some on campus who had differing views on what student voice and student power should look like. So the GA must respectfully, but not necessarily politely, expect and demand that their student voice and student power was recognized in the way they want it to be; and if it was not, they need to make that change. That could happen in a variety of ways, and could happen at GA meetings or in their own departments, or at meetings, and if need be, it could happen in marches. He wasn't saying they were getting to that point, and was just saying they had a variety of options, and it was very important that all those things were on the table, as they make sure their needs, concerns, and issues were addressed.

Mr. Daniels said he had a quick quote from the GA's Mission Statement, "to engage and empower grad students to work together for academic, political and social change." They have academic concerns, concerns with social life, personal life concerns, and also political concerns. So this was the forum for graduate students to get those addressed.

Mr. Daniels said the Chancellor will be coming next month to speak about important issues. The GA usually hears reports, and had PowerPoints to present. But given their time crunch, they wouldn't hear them that evening. The presentations were online. If Delegates had questions about what each individual officer was doing, he would ask them to please talk to them or send them an e-mail. People should check out the GA's Web site. They have all their e-mails online. Delegates set GA policy, not necessarily specifically what to do from one second to the next, but generally, what the GA thought should happen. That semester the GA was redoing its By-laws.

In September the GA set three Action Agenda items, their main three priorities. They include Lower Sproul redevelopment, which includes Eshleman and the Lower Sproul area; student families; and health care. Those were their main foci, but that didn't mean they don't look at other issues. Those were just the ones they spend the majority of their time on. Mr. Daniels said he would ask for a one-minute extension. A motion to extend by one minute was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daniels said that most importantly, they need to hear from Delegates about what they want. Unfortunately, he couldn't meet with all of them individually, so if there was an issue of concern they had, he would ask them to please bring it to the GA's attention. The feedback forms were really important and let them know who came, what they thought of the food, a variety of things.

Quickly, Mr. Daniels said the Career Center Advisory Committee was for people interested in improving career services for grad students, and he would ask them to please check that box. The Career Center has been trying to form a group and has been having trouble. Also the ASUC's 120th year anniversary will be held in March, or the fall of next year, and they need a grad student to represent them and make sure the ASUC didn't just represent undergrads, but grads as well. So he would ask Delegates to please check that if they were interested. It would involve a one-hour meeting, maybe once a month, a low time commitment, and would serve as their committee responsibility.

In addition, Mr. Daniels said the GA will also consider Resolutions and budgets. He wanted to thank them for attending. He knew their time was precious. If there was an issue that wasn't addressed, or if they didn't like how meetings were run, or if there was anything they thought could be improved upon, he would ask them to please talk to him or send him an e-mail. They really hope that next year, obviously, will be better, more active, more engaged, and more influential than this year, and they could only do that as a collective body.

GA ELECTIONS

Mr. Daniels said they would hold elections for the External Affairs Vice President and the Funding Committee Chair.

Mr. Daniels called for any nominations for the External Affairs Vice President. A Delegate nominated Gavi Begtrup. Mr. Daniels called for any other nominations. A Delegate nominated Philip Wolgin, who respectfully declined. Mr. Daniels said that seeing no other nominations, nominations were closed. He asked Mr. Begtrup to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

A discussion was held off the record. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE GAVI BEGTRUP AS EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. (Applause) Mr. Daniels said he would like to congratulate Mr. Begtrup.

Mr. Daniels said the next position up for election was the Funding Committee Chair. This Committee allocated funds for student groups. The GA has had the pleasure having Johanna Franklin serve as interim Funding Chair, given that Mr. Jiminez, who served them wonderfully last semester, decided to resign over the Winter Break. Mr. Daniels said he has not been able to convince Ms. Franklin to stay on, or at least run for the position, so they need to nominate new people. A Delegate nominated Ben Heuer.

Mr. Daniels said it was important to have competition for the positions.

A Delegate nominated Mike Rosenfeld, who respectfully declined. A Delegate nominated Ms. Franklin, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Daniels said that seeing no other nominations, nominations were closed.

Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Heuer to make a quick statement about why he was interesting in the position. Mr. Heuer said he wanted to get more involved in the GA and this position would allow him to do that. It seemed like a very interesting job. It was a lot of responsibility and something he was willing to take on. He would like to have their vote. He was in Law.

A Delegate asked if he was on the Funding Committee. Mr. Heuer said he wasn't, and was on the Academic Affairs Committee.

Ms. Franklin asked if he understood the time commitment. Mr. Heuer said he did. He believed there were monthly meetings. Ms. Franklin said there were also two Executive Board meetings, and having to deal with student groups. Mr. Heuer said he had class on Thursdays at 6:00 and could be present at the beginning of GA meetings, but otherwise would have to leave. So he'd need to do things the first half hour of the meeting.

Ms. Cementwala asked why he hasn't come to meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee. Mr. Heuer said he couldn't go to the last one because he was studying. Ms. Cementwala asked if he understood the time commitment he'd be getting into. Mr. Heuer said he did.

Mr. Inkabi asked if he's ever gone through funding training for student groups. Mr. Heuer said he hasn't.

Ms. Franklin asked if he's been involved in the funding process at all, such as writing an application. Mr. Heuer said he has written an application.

Mr. Inkabi asked whether, if elected, he was committed to getting the application process online. Mr. Heuer said he would be, if somebody would help him with that.

A Delegate asked what made him think he could do this job. She asked if he and Ms. Franklin talked about the position, because it was important to know what he was getting into and what it would involve, and whether he'd be good at it. Mr. Heuer said he just recently found out about the opening, so he didn't have that much time to talk about it with people. He thought he could do the job.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Heuer to please step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. A discussion was held off the record. A motion to extend time for elections was made and seconded and passed with no objection. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE TO APPROVE BEN HEUER AS FUNDING COMMITTEE CHAIR FOR THE REST OF THE 06-07 SCHOOL YEAR PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Daniels said he would like to congratulate Mr. Heuer. (Applause)

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Daniels he was distributing Resolutions. There weren't enough to go around, so he would ask people to share them. Some Resolutions were being distributed as a packet, and if people wanted to separate them into separate votes, they would need to make a motion to do so.

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Daniels:

A BUDGETARY AMENDMENT TO FUND LOWER SPROUL REDEVELOPMENT

To amend the 2006-07 Budget to change the "Lower Sproul" line-item (#5500) under "Dues & Subscriptions" from \$1,000 to \$9,000. This would fund the GA's portion of the current effort to create a conceptual drawing by the end of the semester. This amount will come from the unused funds from the 2005-06 year. This allocation is contingent upon the ASUC Senate and the ASUC Auxiliary appropriating the expected level of funds.

The following Resolution was authored by the Graduate Committee on Lower Sproul

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING 10 CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD BE SATISFIED FOR THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY TO SUPPORT, FINANCIALLY OR OTHERWISE, THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE LOWER SPROUL PLAZA AREA.

WHEREAS, the Lower Sproul Plaza area and its surrounding buildings are in need of substantial seismic and infrastructure renovations, and the space desperately needs to be redesigned to meet the current and future needs of student services, student activities, student government, and the businesses that serve students; and

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING 10 CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD BE SATISFIED FOR THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY TO SUPPORT, FINANCIALLY OR OTHERWISE, THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE LOWER SPROUL PLAZA AREA. (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the current Lower Sproul Plaza area offers little services that cater to or meet the needs of the graduate student population on campus; and

WHEREAS, for too long graduate students have only felt community within their own departments; and

WHEREAS, graduate students would be required to pay any student fee passed by the student body at large to pay for the Lower Sproul Plaza Redevelopment even if there are no services for graduate students; and

WHEREAS, if nothing is done about seismic concerns for the buildings in the Lower Sproul Plaza area the Chancellor will unilaterally raise life safety fees and redesign the building as he sees fit; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Committee on Lower Sproul was established to propose these 10 conditions and they initiated a successful survey of graduate students for that purpose;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that in order for the Graduate Assembly to support, financially or otherwise, the redevelopment of the Lower Sproul Plaza area, the following 10 conditions should reasonably be satisfied:

- 1) The existence in the Lower Sproul Plaza (LSP) area of a Graduate-Focused Facility (GFF).

Graduate students need a place to call their own. A significant majority of graduate students surveyed said that they wanted a centralized facility that serves graduate students. There is no accessible location on campus for graduate students from all departments that caters specifically to and meets the needs of graduate students. In other words, there is no place on campus that fosters a pan-graduate community. Furthermore, graduate students at UC Berkeley are not the only ones in need of such a facility. Yale University, Stanford University, and the University of California at Los Angeles all have facilities specifically designed and which cater to the graduate student body. Graduate students, as dispersed as they are on campus, would frequent the facility. Each week more than 60% of graduate students walk through the greater Sproul area. In other words, using the facility would not require most graduate students to change their daily routine.

- 2) Proportionality between the ASUC and the GA in all aspects of the project; this includes, but is not limited to student fees, commercial revenues, student group space, general meeting space, and student government space.

The LSP and its surrounding buildings are not suited for and do not cater to the needs of the graduate student body. Since graduate students are expected to contribute their fair share in student fees to any redevelopment project, it is only fair that we receive the same share of the resources in and generated by the redevelopment.

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING 10 CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD BE SATISFIED FOR THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY TO SUPPORT, FINANCIALLY OR OTHERWISE, THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE LOWER SPROUL PLAZA AREA. (cont'd)

- 3) The existence of spaces to socialize and study -- i.e., a graduate-focused cafe and a graduate-focused study area, both with late night availability -- in the same building as the GFF.

There are few locations on campus for graduate students to meet with, to get a quick bite to eat or a coffee with, to study with, or to socialize with other graduate students outside their department. The locations that do serve this purpose certainly do not cater specifically to the interests of graduate students. This would be a tremendous benefit to the non-academic side of graduate student life on UC Berkeley's campus and would further a sense of ownership over the GFF amongst the graduate student body. Indeed, graduate students ranked the need for a graduate student lounge and a graduate student cafe first and third, respectively, out of eighteen possible choices.

- 4) The existence of academic spaces -- i.e., GSI offices, teaching rooms, but not general-use classrooms -- and meeting rooms in the same building as the GFF.

There is a dearth of GSI offices on campus. Having one's own space helps improve the ability to pursue the academic responsibilities of being in graduate school -- i.e., teaching undergraduates and pursuing one's own research. Indeed, it was the second highest ranked need (out of eighteen choices) for those students surveyed. These spaces would also have to be in the same building as the GFF in order to maintain a sense of ownership among graduate students over the GFF. The existence of academic spaces as part of the redevelopment may also allow State money to fund part of the project, thereby minimizing the financial impact of construction on students.

- 5) The existence of a Career Center satellite office for graduate students in the same building as the GFF.

The career services on campus for graduate students simply do not meet the need that exists, in part because of the Career Center's location. While more than 60% of graduate students travel through the greater Sproul area, the same cannot be said for Bancroft Way between Shattuck Ave. and Fulton St. Therefore, it is not surprisingly that the fourth highest ranked need (out of eighteen) for those students surveyed is the existence of a career center satellite office. Having a satellite office near the rest of the graduate spaces and services in the GFF will service two purposes: (1) it will provide graduate students with greater access to a vital student service and (2) it would further support the sense of graduate student ownership of the GFF.

- 6) The existence of childcare facilities, with service priority given to graduate student parents, in the same building as the GFF.

Graduate student parents have the twin challenges of succeeding as students and as parents. The graduate students surveyed recognized this fact by ranking it fifth out of

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING 10 CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD BE SATISFIED FOR THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY TO SUPPORT, FINANCIALLY OR OTHERWISE, THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE LOWER SPROUL PLAZA AREA. (cont'd)

eighteen possible options as to what should be included in the new LSP area. The existence of childcare facilities in the same building as the GFF would go a long way towards allowing graduate student parents to successfully meet these two challenges. It would also further support a sense of graduate student ownership of and connection to the GFF. During times when graduate student parents do not need childcare services, such as on Friday and Saturday nights, the childcare facilities could be opened to student and non-student parents attending performances at Zellerbach Hall, thus generating revenue to support other graduate student activities and minimizing the financial impact on students.

- 7) The existence of an affordable dining facility and a bar/lounge which caters to a graduate student clientele in same building as the GFF.

The current dining facilities and the one bar in the LSP area primarily serve and cater to the undergraduate student body. An affordable dining facility and a bar/lounge which focus on graduate students would draw a significant proportion of the graduate student body as customers. Graduate students ranks an affordable restaurant fourth (out of eighteen) in a survey of what ought to be included in the new LSP. A restaurant and a bar would, as would many other conditions, further create a sense of ownership over and connection to the GFF among graduate students.

- 8) Meaningful improvement in the quality and frequency of safety measures -- e.g., increased better lighting, greater police presence, increased bike security -- in the LSP.

If the LSP area is going to be a hub of graduate student life and if graduate students are to feel a sense of ownership over the GFF, then students must feel safe, especially late at night. Currently, this is not the case as can be seen by the fact that the graduate students surveyed ranked it as the eighth most important item(out of eighteen) to be included in the new LSP area even though few graduate students currently use the services in the area. While this condition would benefit all students, it is clearly significant enough to graduate students and important enough to the success of the new LSP area for the Graduate Assembly to insist that it be met.

- 9) Meaningful improvement in the aesthetics and the recreational attractiveness of the outdoor spaces in the LSP.

Another characteristic which the new LSP area must possess is that of attractive and pleasing outdoor spaces. The current space is now used primarily as a thoroughfare and as rehearsal space for undergraduate dance groups. In contrast, the space has incredible potential to be a significant outdoor meeting space for all students, including graduate students. Every week over 60% of graduate students pass through the greater Sproul area. If there were an attractive plaza, graduate students would use it. (This issue was ranked ninth out of the eighteen on the survey.) While this condition would benefit all

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING 10 CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD BE SATISFIED FOR THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY TO SUPPORT, FINANCIALLY OR OTHERWISE, THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE LOWER SPROUL PLAZA AREA. (cont'd)

students, it is clearly significant enough to graduate students and important enough to the success of the new LSP area for the Graduate Assembly to insist that it be met.

- 10) Any and all newly constructed or renovated buildings should be green and sustainable; in particular, all buildings should be powered from renewable sources to the extent possible, and LEED certified.

New buildings at University of California schools are already required to meet minimum LEED certification and exceed California Energy Code Title 24 by 20%, and are recommended to strive for LEED silver. In addition to recognizing this commitment to green and sustainable construction, the Graduate Assembly expects the new LSP to be at the forefront of green and sustainable design, architecture, construction, and operation. These additional environmental conditions arise from the graduate student social conscience and our recognition that our choices in building materials, energy efficiency, water conservation, and energy source have significant positive impacts on not just local but global environments, green house gas emissions, and on climate change. In addition, enhanced building efficiency (lighting, heating, cooling, etc.), water conservation, and use of renewable energy reduce the long-term cost of building operations by lowering utilities costs and reducing the impacts of energy price fluctuation.

Mr. Daniels said that for those who participated in Lower Sproul focus groups, he would like to thank them very much. And he would like to thank those who filled out the survey. The Graduate Committee on Lower Sproul put together ten conditions for GA support of Lower Sproul redevelopment, which were included in one of the packets that was distributed. These ten conditions would set a precedent for the Graduate Assembly and for graduate student participation and support of any Sproul referendum or other actions that needed graduate student support. The first condition was a graduate-focused facility. This meant that if, in the eventual design of the redevelopment, there was no graduate-focused facility, then the GA would not support it and would recommend that graduate students not support it. And in any negotiations the GA took part in, these conditions would be their guiding principle. The point was to have these ten conditions as part of their support.

Mr. Daniels said the money aspect of it was for the following. If the redevelopment was part of the capital campaign, it would be open to alumni donations, which would decrease the need for funding for the project. For that to happen, they need to get a conceptual drawing done by the end of the semester. The campus has contributed \$90,000 to pay for an architect, and the other \$25-30,000 needed to be collected by students. The GA's portion was \$8,000. So if the amendment goes forward, that would be the GA's portion this year. The amendment to the budget would add to money for the survey, \$1,000, up to \$9,000, for the conceptual drawing. That's the brief description. He called for any questions. People could make comments, speak on the combination of the budget amendment and the Resolution, or they could go to the next one.

Ms. Gillis asked if they needed to pay this money in order to have a say. A Delegate said the way she saw it was that the campus needed a partner, and to see that the students were partners. That included

filling out the survey, attending focus groups and administrative meetings, and showing they're willing to pay some money. The campus agreed to pay \$90,000, she didn't know what flexibility they had, and assumed that was the limit the campus felt comfortable with. The assumption was that the students could front another \$25-30,000, and the GA's portion was \$8,000. Ms. Gillis asked about the other student money. Mr. Daniels said that would come from the ASUC and from the ASUC Auxiliary.

A Delegate asked what would happen if this was voted down. Mr. Daniels said that was unclear. The ASUC and the Auxiliary might pay the entire amount and forgive the GA, which would continue to be part of the planning; or they could say the GA, having shown it didn't want to be a part of this, would therefore not consider grad needs in the way they did before. It would help in grads' negotiating position to make sure the facility paid much more attention to grads than it currently did.

Mr. Purdy asked who the money would be given to. Mr. Daniels said he believed the money would be transferred to the Capital Projects unit of the University, which will pay the architect. The architect was the one making up the conceptual drawings.

Ms. Gillis asked if the \$8,000 would come from unused funds from last year. Mr. Daniels said the GA received four sources of funds: student fees, money from a Coca-Cola contract, unspent money from all previous years, and money from the Graduate Division. The Graduate Division money didn't exist that year, but unspent funds, which the GA had initially thought was at \$77,000, turned out to be more than \$170,000. With that, and from adjustments in the other aspects of the budget, and budget amendments made previous to that year, they have between \$50-70,000 in the bank that was not allocated. That's where this money would come from.

A Delegate said that it seemed that there was no guarantee even if they spent this \$8,000 that anything would happen. Mr. Daniels said that was correct, and there was no guarantee. This was probably a five-year process between now and when a new area would be constructed, and there would be no guarantee. The campus could completely change its mind and say it's not on the capital campaign and decide to dissolve the program committee, and the GA would be at a loss. There were no guarantees.

Ms. Franklin said there was also a pretty good guarantee that it would get through, and it was pretty likely something would come of this. She asked if it was the case that if the GA didn't chip in a bit at that time, no one would listen to them. Mr. Daniels said contributing money would increase the likelihood that they would be listened to. No one could predict what the ASUC or the campus would do, but this contribution would certainly help with both the existence of a redevelopment and in its eventual outcome, something that would benefit grad students more than the current facility did.

Ms. Allbright said the ASUC Senate on Wednesday allocated \$10,000 for this project.

Ms. Ahrendt asked how many people actually attended a focus group. Mr. Daniels noted that a lot of people raised their hands, and said they were awesome. Ms. Ahrendt said she felt the focus group was really fascinating and just the fact that they got that together was a real achievement, thanks to Mr. Daniels. Ms. Ahrendt said she had been a little suspicious of this whole project at the beginning, but having been involved in that conversation in the focus group, and actually hearing people talk about what kinds of spaces they would be interested in. They gave input and feedback, and the GA came up with ten conditions, things that grad students would like to see. She thought this was very positive, and she would strongly recommend that they do pass this Resolution.

A Delegate asked if the \$10,000 the ASUC approved matched the percentage the ASUC was supposed to approve, relative to the GA's percentage. She asked how much was asked of the ASUC. Mr. Daniels said that \$10,000 was requested of the ASUC, and that amount was allocated.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE COMBINED BUDGETARY AMENDMENT TO FUND LOWER SPROUL REDEVELOPMENT AND THE RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING 10 CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD BE SATISFIED FOR THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY TO SUPPORT, FINANCIALLY OR OTHERWISE, THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE LOWER SPROUL PLAZA AREA, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

FUNDING BUDGET AMENDMENTS

The following Budgetary Amendment was authored by the Finance Committee:

A BUDGETARY AMENDMENT TO INCREASE STUDENT GROUP FUNDING

To amend the 2006-07 budget to change the "Grants, Funding (incl. Travel)" line item from \$135,000 to \$150,000, and to reduce the "Contingency" line item from \$24,056 to \$9,056.

Mr. Daniels said people should have a copy of the Funding Budget Amendments. It was hastily put together when the Finance Committee became aware of the unspent money the GA had. Last year the GA increased its budget from \$120,000 to \$135,000 and they proposed to increase it given that they didn't have the same budget constraints for this one-time expense. So the Finance Committee wanted to present this budget amendment to the GA. The money would be taken out of contingency, not out of the unspent funds. The reason they felt comfortable doing that was given the size of the unspent funds. Contingency was a line item in the budget that was already included, and that included \$30,000 they didn't need to put towards other funding. They didn't want to touch that last semester because they didn't think they had a lot to spare, given that they weren't getting money from the Grad Division. But now, with the unspent funds that they have, the Finance Committee felt more comfortable taking this money out of contingency and putting it towards funding.

Mr. Daniels said that Mr. Rajan was not present to articulate this, and Mr. Daniels asked if there was anybody present from the Finance Committee who would like to speak on this.

Mr. Purdy said that this, then, was sort of an obligation that the Funding Committee made. Mr. Daniels said that last year the Finance Committee wanted to allocate \$150,000 for funding. However, the budget didn't allow that, so Fi-Comm reduced the budget to \$120,000. Additionally, they included \$30,000 in a Contingency Fund as a buffer for uncomfortable times. If it turned out those funds weren't needed, then the expectation was that that would increase the funding allotment to \$150,000. It was only increased to \$135,000 last semester because of concern about needing that extra contingency. This semester, the GA

clearly did not need it, so the Finance Committee wanted to give the second \$15,000 to bring the total funding of the budget up to \$150,000.

Mr. Purdy asked about the unspent funds, and said it sounded like there were commitments. Ms. Hsueh said that when the GA made allocations to different groups and offices within the GA, they tried to set a limit. They didn't want to spend all the money they received. Each year there's money left over, and over many years, they accumulated up to \$175,000. Each year they try to set aside some money, and also try to target the amount they think they'll receive from the Grad Division, and earmark money from the Grad Division. But that didn't all materialize. They tried to be tight-fisted for overspending, so they currently have some unallocated funds that was sitting there. They always allocate \$150,000 at the beginning of the year. But starting in 06-07, they decided to budget \$120,000. Then, in the middle of the year they decided to increase that by \$15,000, and now, this semester, they want to increase it another \$15,000 and restore the amount to \$150,000. Money they set aside for contingency would go down to \$9,000, but they still have a pot of money from all the unspent money from previous years. That money was still sitting there. They feel comfortable using that money to fund all their programs, even though they didn't get money from the Grad Division. They've come to the point where they feel comfortable and want to have the budget at \$150,000. That's about twenty percent to one-third of all the money they received that they want to give back to student groups.

A Delegate said her Department's major event already took place. It felt a little unfair to those who have already had their events because there would now be extra money in the pot for students who haven't done their events. She asked if there was any way this money could go to next year's budget instead. Ms. Hsueh said there was still one more round of grants. The Delegate said that and her department's event, however, was done. Ms. Hsueh said they still had two more rounds, and another grant with a February 16 deadline. When students apply for grants, they never receive 100% of the request. Sometimes they get 80%, and sometimes they drop to 50%. But now they have this money coming in, and maybe instead of cutting 50% they may cut less. Whatever was not spent goes back to the GA for next year. They'll look at how much was unspent and will decide how much money they want to allocate. So Delegates shouldn't worry about money was not spent. They'll reassess things for next year, 07-08. If they've already done their program, maybe other groups could get a little more money than her group.

Ms. Tom said they specifically do uniformly distribute funds and actually allocated the \$15,000 in the fall to cover events, and the amendment was to vote whether they should allocate \$15,000 for the spring. They tried to be fair.

A Delegate said that what they were saying was that there \$15,000 in additional funding in the fall that only applied to fall grants. So if the GA voted the amendment down, people who applied for spring grants would actually have less funding available than groups had that applied in the fall.

The Delegate said that her event was that week, so they missed the only round that semester where the additional \$15,000 wasn't available. Ms. Tom said they tried to do it uniformly.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING BUDGET AMENDMENT, TO INCREASE THE FUNDING LINE ITEM FROM \$135,000 TO \$150,000, AND TO DECREASE CONTINGENCY LINE ITEM BY THE CORRESPONDING AMOUNT, MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said they would move on to By-law revisions.

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Wolgin and ORC members:

RESOLUTION CORRECTING THE FUNDING SITUATION OF STANDING AND AD-HOC COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, the By-laws of the Graduate Assembly do not currently address the funding needs of standing and ad hoc committees; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly created the Foreign Student Affairs Committee (FSAC) and the Environmental Sustainability Committee (ESC) without considering their need for funding, inadequately endowing these committees with the resources necessary to complete their goals; and

WHEREAS, the issue of committee funding goes beyond the FSAC and the ESC to all current and future standing and ad hoc committees; and

WHEREAS, standing committees, such as the Organization and Rules Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Funding Committee, currently receive funding through the "Operations" section of the Executive Office's budgetary allowance;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following amendments be made to the By-laws of the Graduate Assembly, to correct the issue of funding, and to allow all current and future committees access to funding. These amendments will be introduced as a new clause in the By-laws (following clause 12.8.2 and preceding clauses 13).

12.9. Funding of Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees

12.9.1. In the event that a standing or ad hoc committee requires funds for special events (as opposed to regular operations, meetings and events), the committee may request funding through the Finance Committee, with a budget submitted by March 1 of the preceding academic year.

12.9.2. In the event that a budget cannot be submitted by the March 1 deadline, the committee may only apply for funding from the Finance Committee on an event-by-event basis.

12.9.3. All committee funding requests are subject to review by the Finance Committee. Status as a standing and ad hoc committee does not guarantee funding from the Graduate Assembly.

Mr. Dillon said that for an overview, last semester, he and a few Organization and Rules Committee members worked to select from the Charter and the By-laws of the GA things that were inconsistent with current practice, with the best value of time invested per unit gained, to put their time into. So what they have before them was four recommended amendments to the GA By-laws they came up with. Should two-thirds of the voting members that evening, on greater, on each one of these individual Resolutions,

agree to make these amendments, then they will pass. They could go page by page. He said the first Resolution would be introduced by Ms. Tom.

Ms. Tom said that last year the Delegates voted to approve two new committees the Environmental Sustainability Committee and the Foreign Student Affairs Committee. But in the process of creating those Committees, they didn't think about the budget. So the Resolution would create a uniform process by which all standing and ad hoc committees apply for funding. Any standing or ad hoc committee that wanted funds for any special events, anything that was not food related, would be required to submit a budget by March 1 in the preceding year, when everyone else was required to submit a budget. Any committee that did not meet that deadline would be funded on an event-by-event basis by the Finance Committee the following year. Finally, any standing or ad hoc committee that did not necessarily qualify for funding could apply for funding from the Finance Committee every year. She called for any questions.

Ms. Ahrendt said ad hoc committees were never fully defined in the By-laws, and the standing committees weren't really either. She knew there will be further revisions to the By-laws, but asked if it would be a good idea to pass the Resolution when they haven't properly defined what their committees were. Ms. Tom said she would defer to the Chair. Mr. Dillon said he would agree that the manner was confused and not organized correctly, but there's a heading, "standing committees," and below was the sentence "the following are additional standing committees," with the implication that the proceeding committees were defined. In the By-laws, he was sure that ad hoc committees were defined as committees formed in one year with a lifetime of that academic year. In his personal opinion, he thought they should go forth with this. It would definitely be a consideration as they move forward.

Mr. Stavrinides said the Foreign Student Affairs Committee wasn't created last year. He didn't know when it was created, but it was active about five years ago, or so. Mr. Tom asked if they needed to amend that. Mr. Stavrinides said his statement was just for clarification.

Mr. Daniels said they would consider the Resolutions as a packet, and unless somebody wanted to make a motion to divide them, they'd vote on all of them, up or down, at the end.

Ms. Cementwala asked if they were required to separate out amendments. Mr. Daniels said he didn't know of any By-law passage that said they had to, and for the sake of time, they would do that, unless someone wanted to move to overrule the Chair's decision.

Mr. Dillon said the next Resolution would be introduced by Mr. Inkabi.

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Inkabi and ORC members:

RESOLUTION ELIMINATING EVENTS-SPECIFIC RESTRICTIONS ON STUDENT GROUP FUNDING

WHEREAS, the current budgetary realities and funding practices of the Graduate Assembly are not consistent with clauses 16.7.2 and 16.10.2 of its By-laws; and

WHEREAS, clause 16.7.2 reads: "Graduate Events: This category covers three types of events: (a) regular meetings of a Graduate Student Group; (b) regularly scheduled events such as guest

RESOLUTION ELIMINATING EVENTS-SPECIFIC RESTRICTIONS ON STUDENT GROUP FUNDING (cont'd)

speakers, seminars, or colloquia; and (c) a single special event such as an orientation, conference, organizational session, departmental picnic, or party,"; and

WHEREAS, clause 16.10.2 reads: "Funding for Graduate Events #1 is limited to three hundred dollars (\$300.00) per Graduate Student Group per semester;" and

WHEREAS the application for Graduate Events I & II funding reads: "Maximum is \$800 per group, per semester. (Total includes Grad Events I and Grad Events II combined);"

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

16.7.2. Graduate Events: This category covers *two* types of events: (a) *Graduate Events I that covers* regular meetings of a Graduate Student Group; *and* (b) *Graduate Events II that covers* regularly scheduled events such as guest speakers, seminars, or colloquia and a single special event such as an orientation, conference, organizational session, departmental picnic, or party.

16.10.2. Funding for Graduate Events is limited to *eight* hundred dollars (*\$800.00*) per Graduate Student Group per semester.

Mr. Inkabi said that last September, the GA had a Resolution that was aimed at basically correcting inconsistencies in the By-laws. That Resolution changed funding of this category from a limit of \$300 for graduate student groups per semester, and changed that to limit funding for Grad Events #1 to \$300 per group per semester. For clarification, "Grad Events #1" referred to providing funding for regular meetings of the graduate student group, including meeting material, food, printing of copies, stationery, rental of venues or equipment relevant to meeting needs, food, supplies, etc. Essentially, what happened was that the interpretation of the GA at the time was this \$300 needed to be specified for Grad Events I or II, which wasn't consistent with their current practices. The Resolution basically provides the flexibility for student groups to pick whether they want Grad Events 1 or 2. The GA was saying it had no preference for that as long as the total was \$800, which was the current limit.

Mr. Inkabi said that as for other changes, they're modifying 16.7.2 to essentially spell out the current practice, whereby they have two categories, Grad Events I and II, not a series of three. This change was consistent with the worksheets that the Funding Committee uses. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked if this would just expand the categories for groups. Mr. Inkabi said it shouldn't. Up to the September Resolution, the practice was that any student group could apply for funding up to \$800 per semester, whether for a meeting or colloquia. What this would do was to restrict it. The purpose of the September Resolution was not to restrict the funds so that they could save money, but to clarify the current practice. So essentially, there should be no budget impact.

Ms. Franklin said there would be no budget impact at all. Student groups could choose how they wanted to spend the \$800. So all caps would be same, and there should be no budget impact at all. Mr. Inkabi

said the current state the By-laws had no upwards limit. In practice there was an upper limit. This Resolution just made it official in the By-laws.

Mr. Daniels said he was entertain a motion to extend speaking time by five minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Begtrup asked why there was a distinction with Grad Events. Ms. Ahrendt said they discussed that, and nobody knew. Mr. Begtrup asked if anybody had an idea where those two types of events arose, especially since they were trying to change it to an \$800 category. Mr. Inkabi said he didn't know why the GA had Grad Events I and II, and that's been the practice for as long as he's been involved in the GA.

Mr. Dillon said they had two more Resolutions, and he would introduce the third one.

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Wolgin and ORC members:

RESOLUTION 1) RENAMING THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S CURRENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY AND 2) EMPOWERING THE GA TO HOLD ASSOCIATED PARTIES ACCOUNTABLE TO THIS POLICY

WHEREAS, clause 14.2 of the By-laws currently states "the Graduate Assembly does not discriminate on the basis of race, gender, religion, color, ethnicity, age, political persuasion, country of origin, sexual orientation, or disability, and is an affirmative action employer and appointer;" and

WHEREAS, although clause 14.2 refers to a policy of affirmative action and non-discrimination, the current title for clause 14.2 is "Affirmative Action;" and

WHEREAS, the title "Affirmative Action and Non-Discrimination" is more fitting the stated policy; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has a stated policy of affirmative action and non-discrimination, but no power to mandate or enforce compliance by entities receiving its support, financial or otherwise;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following amendments be made to the By-laws of the Graduate Assembly, where italicized writing is included here only as a point of reference.

14.2. Affirmative Action and Non-Discrimination

14.5.2. At least one (1) notice of opening must be published in the Daily Californian. Such notice must be of reasonable size and specificity, contain opening and closing dates for application, describe how to apply, and indicate the affirmative action *and non-discrimination* policy of the Assembly. Additional notice should be given when possible, including announcements at departmental and Graduate Student Group meetings, before the Assembly, and by sending notices to department offices for posting.

16.2. Funding Eligibility

RESOLUTION 1) RENAMING THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S CURRENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY AND 2) EMPOWERING THE GA TO HOLD ASSOCIATED PARTIES ACCOUNTABLE TO THIS POLICY (cont'd)

Before a Graduate Student Group can receive funding *it* must:

- 16.2.1. file a Student Organization Registration Form with the Office of Student *Life*. This form must be renewed each semester, *[parentheses deleted]*
- 16.2.2. file a constitution with the Office of Student *Life*.
- 16.2.3. attend a funding workshop and complete and file a Funding Agreement Form with the Graduate Assembly Business Office.
- 16.2.4. *agree to comply with the affirmative action and non-discrimination policy of the Graduate Assembly. The Graduate Assembly reserves the right to revoke funding from any individual, group, or organization not in compliance with its stated affirmative action and non-discrimination policy. The Graduate Assembly also reserves the right to sever all ties with any individual, group, or organization not in compliance with its stated affirmative action and non-discrimination policy.*

Mr. Dillon said the Resolution renames the Graduate Assembly's current affirmative action policy and empowers the GA to hold associated parties accountable for this policy. Currently in the By-laws, there's a statement that the GA abides by an affirmative action policy in terms of its employment practices. There was no explicit mention that it was the GA's practice to include non-discrimination in terms of things not specifically their employment practices, as he recalled. Yet, the current language clearly intends to express that their practice was not only to be aligned with affirmative action, but also non-discrimination. The content of the amendment was the addition of 16.2.4, which says that all parties, by receiving funding or support from the GA, agrees to abide by the GA's non-discrimination policy.

Mr. Purdy asked about 14.2.5, posting in the Daily Cal of at least one notice of an opening. Mr. Dillon said that referred to the opening of a position.

A Delegate asked if 14.5.2 dealt with employment issues. Mr. Dillon said that was the case. It was for searches of openings in the Business Office.

Ms. Cementwala said that if she understood the change, what the Resolution would do was to expand the affirmative action policy for more than employment to all the other areas. In other words, when they say those who receive GA funds were also bound by GA affirmative action policy, she asked who "those" were and what that meant. Mr. Dillon said he was thinking about graduate student groups that receive funds. Ms. Cementwala said they were expanding this policy to more than employment. Mr. Dillon said that was correct. Ms. Cementwala said this had significant legal implications. If the GA purchased something from a coffee house, she asked if they would ask to not do business with it if it was not bound by similar affirmative action policies. Mr. Dillon said that would be the case with the language they were using. Ms. Cementwala asked how they would enforce this. Mr. Dillon said that was obviously was not written there. The thinking primarily was with respect to graduate student group funding. So the

intention was to follow through something with the Funding Committee, and to get something in the funding application that would say the recipient agreed to comply.

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to extend speaking time by five minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Wolgin said the last Resolution was to demand three things they were trying to do, to correct inconsistencies and bring the By-laws in line with practice, and also to reform the GA.

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Wolgin and ORC members:

RESOLUTION CORRECTING INCONSISTENCIES IN THE BY-LAWS - GENERAL

WHEREAS, clause 12.2.8 currently states "Elected Representatives have voting rights on the Executive Board unless they miss three consecutive Executive Board meetings without prior excuse acceptable to the Board, at which;" and

WHEREAS, it is embarrassing to have a section of our By-laws end in the middle of a sentence; and

WHEREAS, section 12.2.9 states that "In the event that any standing committee has fewer members than the number required for quorum, the Executive Board shall assume the responsibilities of that committee;" and

WHEREAS, not all standing committees meet every semester; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Board has neither the time nor the resources to be required to assume the responsibilities of all committees not reaching quorum; and

WHEREAS, section 10.2.3 of the By-laws states "At least one Delegate or Alternate from each academic unit represented in the Assembly must serve on at least one standing or ad-hoc committee;" and

WHEREAS, according to the President of the Graduate Assembly "the one duty of each delegate is to serve on a committee";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following amendments be made to the By-laws of the Graduate Assembly, where italicized writing is included here only as a point of reference.

10.2.3. Every Delegate must serve on at least one of the following: a Graduate Assembly standing committee, a Graduate Assembly ad-hoc committee, or, by assuming the exclusive role of Graduate Assembly representative, a campus committee of the University of California, Berkeley. Alternate Delegates are charged with fulfilling their Delegates' committee duties as necessary.

12.2.8. Elected Representatives have voting rights on the Executive Board unless they miss three consecutive Executive Board meetings without prior excuse acceptable to the Board. [phrase deleted]

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

12.2.9. In the event that any standing or ad-hoc committee has fewer members than the number required for quorum, the Executive Board may assume the responsibilities of that committee if it chooses.

Mr. Wolgin said the first part, 12.2.8, ended in the middle of a sentence. They went through the By-laws and there was absolutely no need for this line. They looked at everything else and it didn't fit, so they're getting rid of it. The second part dealt with how the Executive Board should function. As the By-laws were currently written, the Board was required to take responsibilities of any standing committee that didn't obtain quorum. But not all standing committees meet every semester. This issue came up last semester, and Mr. Daniels said the Executive Board didn't have time to take over every committee. The amendment would allow the Board to have a little more flexibility and to regulate its own time. Third, current practice had every Delegate sitting on a committee, but their By-laws say only one Delegate for each academic unit had to be on a committee. So the amendment would bring the By-laws in line with practice. It also says Alternate Delegates would be required to step in on committees their main Delegates sit on, since there were too many committees that seemed to not get quorum. This didn't preclude Alternates from sitting on committees if they wanted to.

Mr. Wolgin said they trying to reform the entire structure of the GA and the Executive Board, but they don't know how long that will take, and what it will do. But these Resolutions would start moving towards that.

Mr. Daal said he thought it was last year or the year before that they voted to change the rules, from saying only one person in a department needed to sit on a committee to everybody needing to sit on a committee. They approved some text, and he didn't recall if it was a change to the By-laws or a Resolution. Mr. Wolgin said there was nothing in the By-laws that said one Delegate per department had to serve. And the proposed amendment would supersede whatever else was done.

Ms. Cementwala moved to amend the third Resolution, on affirmative action. She thought it was a great idea, but she thought it was written too broadly. The current wording was that all who receive GA funds would be held accountable to the GA's affirmative action policy. She thought it should specifically state that the By-law applied to graduate student groups in receipt of GA funds, which should be held accountable.

Mr. Daniels said section 14 involved hiring, and section 16.2 involved funding eligibility. It stated that a graduate student group, before receiving GA funding, must do a variety of things. As he understood it, it would apply to the physical act of a contract hiring, or the physical act of granting money to a group. He didn't read it as applying anything other than those two instances.

A Delegate said the current language says the GA reserved the right to revoke funding and sever ties, but it didn't guarantee those actions.

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to extend time by three minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Franklin said the Funding Committee couldn't guarantee everything and couldn't go to every single event, and essentially check to see that everyone advertised exactly correctly. So she didn't think they

could guarantee that ties would be severed. A Delegate said she didn't think it was binding to the same degree that Ms. Cementwala was afraid it might be.

A Delegate said the language gave the GA the option not funding an event or severing ties.

A motion to divide out the Resolution Correcting Inconsistencies In the By-laws - General, and vote on the first, second, and fourth Resolutions was made and seconded and passed. A motion to end discussion and vote on dividing the Resolution passed with no objection. The motion to remove the third Resolution passed by voice-vote.

A motion to call the question on the other Resolutions, the first, second, and fourth, was made and seconded passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FIRST, SECOND, AND FOURTH RESOLUTIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE:

RESOLUTION CORRECTING THE FUNDING SITUATION OF STANDING AND AD-HOC COMMITTEES

RESOLUTION ELIMINATING EVENTS-SPECIFIC RESTRICTIONS ON STUDENT GROUP FUNDING

RESOLUTION CORRECTING INCONSISTENCIES IN THE BY-LAWS - GENERAL

Mr. Daniels said the time for the meeting had expired. The third Resolution would be considered in March unless there was a motion to extend time.

Mr. Purdy moved to extend time by one minute, to vote on the third Resolution. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. With no objection, the question was called and debate closed.

A Delegate asked if the Resolution was amended. Mr. Daniels said it wasn't. Ms. Cementwala said they clarified its limits.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION 1) RENAMING THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S CURRENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY AND 2) EMPOWERING THE GA TO HOLD ASSOCIATED PARTIES ACCOUNTABLE TO THIS POLICY PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels asked people to please turn in their feedback form; register for Lobby Day; and attend the Bridging the Gap Conference and the Empowering Women of Color Conference, for those who identify with those identities, and allies. The next meeting will be March 1.

This meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary

Present at the GA February 1, 2007 Meeting

Abigail Sedlacek	Folklore
Aileen Cruz	East Asian Languages and Cultures
Alberto Ortega	Public Health
Amy Wu	Electrical Engineering
Ann Marie Faust	MCB
Ben Heuer	Law
Carolyn Hawkshaw	German
Catherine (Erin) Becker	Chemistry
Christopher Anderson	Applied Science and Technology
Christopher Yopp	Public Health
Corie Lynn Cobb	Mechanical Engineering
Dan Work	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Danna Freedman	Chemistry
David Purdy	Statistics
Diane Wong	Astronomy
Emine Fisek	Theater, Dance and Performance Studies
Erin Haynes	Linguistics
Esther Nakogawara	Optometry
Gabe Harley	Materials Science
Jane Lo	Optometry
Johanna Franklin	Logic
Jonathon Repinecz	French
Joy Crosby	Theater, Dance and Performance Studies
Justin Virgili	Chemical Engineering
Karl Chen	Computer Science
Kate Jenkins	Materials Science
Kathryn Schild	Slavic Languages and Literatures
Keno Urquiza	Mechanical Engineering
Kevin Young	Physics
Kofi Inkabi	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Kristen Durham	ERG
Lena Salaymeh	History
Loddie Hagar	Chemical Engineering
Margarita Constantinides	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Marta Filipski	Public Health
Meghan Anderson	Math
Menelaos Stavrinides	Environmental Science, Policy and Management
Michael Perry	Integrative Biology
Michael Rosen-Prinz	Law
Miguel Daal	Physics
Philip Wolgin	History
Rachel Vandagriff	Music

Present at the GA February 1, 20

Rebekah Ahrendt	Music
Sarah Edwards	Law
Sarah Moody	Spanish and Portuguese
Sarah Tom	Demography
Scott Siera	MCB
Stella So	Transportation Engineering
Taina Gomez	Law
Triffid Abel	Geography
Zoe Harris	Health Services & Policy Analysis
Hector Huezo	Law
Prema O'Brien	Vision Science
James Battle	Medical Anthropology
Jessica LePak	Social Welfare
Taylor Albright	ASUC Senate Rep
Becca Jones	Department Liaison
Josh Daniels	President
Pete Dillon	Org and Rules Chair
Mariyam Cementwala	AAVP
Nish Rajan	Finance Chair
Susan Hsueh	GA Manager