

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

May 3, 2007

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:34. It concluded the Spring Semester.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Assembly heard from UCPD Captain Mitchell Celaya. The Police Department was a 24/7 operation with 75 officers and with a variety of resources.

The Bear Walk Program, from dusk to dawn, 365 days a year, was run by Community Service Officers. The Walk service walks people home anywhere on campus to up to about four blocks away. The wait for a CSO was about 10 to 15 minutes, sometimes 20. During inclement weather they have umbrellas and a vehicle. The Night Safety Shuttle program was operated by Parking and Transportation. The UCPD's CSO program runs the Owl Service from 3 a.m. to 6 a.m., a vehicle providing door-to-door service. They'll pick people up on campus and drive to their destination, from four to six blocks away. The UCPD's booklet, "Safety Counts," had a lot of resources

Laptop thefts were a problem, and if people they didn't recognize in an area they were familiar with, they should call the UCPD so they could make contact.

The new GA Funding Advisor was introduced, Natan Tuchman.

Reimbursement receipts for Grad Events and Grants were due on May 14.

Job openings in the GA included Coordinators for the Graduate Minority Outreach, Recruitment and Retention, the Women of Color Initiative, "The Berkeley Graduate" Editor, and Chief-of-Staff.

Copies of Spring issue of "The Berkeley Graduate" were available.

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

A moment of silence was observed for the 33 students, faculty, and staff who passed away as a result of the Virginia Tech shooting, including nine graduate students.

The GA passed a Resolution in April requesting that graduate students placed on a blue-ribbon commission considering the Energy Biosciences Institute. The GA wrote a letter to the Administration and has been pushing for grad representation. Negotiations will continue over the summer

Election for External Affairs Vice President

Ms. Abel and Mr. Ortega were nominated, and Ms. Abel was elected as External Affairs Vice President.

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS (CONT'D)

A PowerPoint presentation was shown that listed the accomplishments the GA had that year.

RESOLUTIONS

A Resolution was introduced, On Regarding the Denial of Basic Civil Rights, Including the Right to Education, for Bahá'í and Other Religious Minorities In Egypt. It called for the GA to voice its our opposition to this blatant discrimination and for the President to write an opinion letter to local papers in the name of the GA.

It was noted that if the GA made such a statement, they should apply the same critical engagement with their own education and their own institution. A concern was raised as to whether it made sense to send this kind of message. Questions were raised on why the Bahá'í faith particularly special in this case.

The Assembly voted to amend the bill, to make it apply to religious minorities in Egypt rather than specifically mentioning Bahá'ís.

As amended, the GA passed the bill, by voice-vote, Resolution Regarding the Denial of Basic Civil Rights, Including the Right to Education, for Religious Minorities In Egypt.

A Resolution was introduced, Calling for Opposition to the Dwinelle Café. It called for the GA to oppose the plan for a café there, and to communicate this to the campus. The proposed café would remove conference space and facilities used by graduate groups. The idea was never brought up at faculty or group meetings, and many faculty were upset about this.

A friendly amendment was made delete to the Whereas Clause stating that the planning process was not transparent and disempowered parts of the campus community. As amended, the Resolution was approved by voice-vote.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved a Proclamation Honoring Mary Ann Mason, Dean of the Graduate Division, who was leaving the position.

Budget Amendments to Address Shortfalls in the GA's 2006-07 Budget and for the New Web site

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved amendments to the 06-07 budget to address shortfalls, totaling \$4,345.30, and to amend the budget for Web site development, \$6,082.03.

BY-LAW PROPOSALS

By-law amendments came from the Executive Board, were divided among basic changes, including title changes, grammatical corrections, re-numbering; straightforward substantive changes; and challenging substantive changes that would be vote on individually. Basic changes would be voted on as a block, as would the straightforward substantive changes, unless there was a motion to divide. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved of the above process.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the basic changes to the By-laws.

Straightforward, substantive changes to the By-laws included the following:

- create the Technology Committee;
- create the position of Budget Officer, to chair the Finance Committee;
- create a Rules Officer, to chair the Org. and Rules Committee and serve as parliamentarian;
- change GA elections from April to March;
- change attendance requirements, with removal of Delegates for missing two GA meetings in a row or missing committee meetings over two Delegates meetings;
- streamline Delegate assignments to committees;
- allow committees to make their own internal rules;
- revise the list of committees;
- clarify GA authority over staff;
- create five categories of Resolutions, including budget amendments, directed action, By-law amendments, funding procedures, and other;
- change Action Agenda Items, with the Board to present four and Assembly to choose three from them;
- clarify the GA's ability to direct Officers on actions to take;
- have Project Coordinators sign a one-year contract, encouraging them to stay for two years, and then opening up the position;
- clarify job descriptions;
- allow Officers to enter into MOUs without necessarily going through the Assembly, with oversight by the Rules Committee;
- delete By-laws relating to the Judicial Committee, with those functions to be done by the Assembly;

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved all the above straightforward substantive changes to the By-laws except for the proposal to change the date of GA elections, which failed by hand-vote 8-8-0.

Substantive challenging changes to the By-laws were considered.

Amending the process of submitting Resolutions was considered, either A) a referral process, with Resolutions submitted at a GA meeting and referred to committee, or B) introducing Resolutions three weeks ahead of time. By voice-vote, the GA approved option A).

Creating a position for project coordinators, either A) a Vice President, or B) an Officer. One-third of the GA's budget went to Projects, and the new position would supervise Project Coordinators and give them representation. The Business Manager would continue to advise Project Coordinators and oversee their budgets. The Finance Committee recommended making the position an Officer. By voice-vote the GA approved creating a Project Coordinators Officer.

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 2007-2008

Friendly amendments were made to the budget that the Finance Committee didn't consider, cost-of-living amendments to the GMORR, WOC, GWP, GMSP, GSSP, and "The Berkeley Graduate" Editor. The cost-of-living amendments to the budget were approved with no objection.

With no objection, the GA approved an amendment to move \$500 for meeting meals be moved to "Supplies, Copying, and Printing."

With no objection, the GA approved an amendment to increase the ASUC expenditure line item by \$2,000, for elections costs.

With no objection, the GA amended the budget to approve a contingency line item, from salary savings, at \$14,100.

By unanimous voice-vote, the Assembly approved, as amended on the floor, the GA'S 2007-2008 budget.

ELECTIONS

The GA elected the following Officers: Mr. Daniels, GA President; Mr. Daal, Campus Affairs Vice President; Mr. Rajan, Rules Officer; Ms. Anderson, Budget Officer,

The election of the Project Coordinators Officer was tabled.

By hand-votes, the GA elected representatives to the Graduate Council: Ms. Freedman, Ms. Crosby, Mr. Rheaume, and Mr. Wolgin. They would choose the Alternate.

BY-LAWS PROPOSALS (cont'd)

The GA considered amendments to the By-laws for the composition of the Executive Board: A) all Officers, which included the VPs, the President and one Grad Council rep, or B) all Officers, the Grad Council reps and the Grad Council alternate, and all Committee chairs.

A proposal failed by hand-vote to have the Board comprised of nine voting members, three Grad Council reps and all Officers.

A proposal failed by hand-vote to have the Board comprised of all Officers, three Grad Council reps, and the chairs of the Environmental Sustainability, International Student Affairs, and Funding Committees.

A proposal failed by hand-vote to have the Board comprised of all Officers and one Grad Council rep.

A proposal failed by hand-vote to have the Board comprised of all Officers, three Grad Council reps, and the Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Committee.

A proposal failed by hand-vote to have the Board comprised of the six Officers, and three Grad Council reps, with the Grad Council Alternate and the four Committee chairs required to attend all Board meetings as non-voting members able to remain in closed session.

By hand-vote, the GA approved a proposal to have the Executive Board comprised of six Officers and three Grad Council reps, with the Grad Council Alternate and the chairs of the Environmental Sustainability, International Affairs, Technology, and Funding Committees to be required to attend a Board meeting per month, able to remain in closed session, but would not have a vote.

ELECTIONS (cont'd)

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved Mr. Law as Funding Committee Chair.

The meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Spring Semester, was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:34 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank them for coming to the last meeting of the year. People should have copies of the agenda, the GA's budget, the Resolution packet, the budget amendment packet, the proclamation for Dean Mason's retirement, the list of substantive changes to the By-laws, and a feedback form, which was most important, as it would not only affect this year, but next year. If they'd like to make disparaging comments, they certainly did not have to add their name, e-mail address, or department.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AND THE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda and the April minutes was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2007 MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daniels said the first announcement was from a Captain in the UCPD, Mitchell Celaya. Mr. Celaya said he brought a number of items, some documents and some giveaways. He was the Assistant Chief of the campus Police Department and has been there for about 24 years. The Police Department was a 24/7 operation with 75 officers and with a variety of resources.

Mr. Celaya said that graduate students were a unique part of the campus community. As graduate students, they were there all hours of the day and night, which sometimes provided some unique challenges. But there was always someone on campus. A lot of safety services and programs tend to cater to undergrads, and grad students tend to be forgotten. But they try to have services that were really of benefit to anyone.

Mr. Celaya said the Police Department patrols in a number of forms. They have foot patrols, bike officers, patrol cars, a bomb unit, and two bomb dogs. One of their services was the Bear Walk Program. He didn't know how many grads got a chance to utilize this. It ran from dusk to dawn, 365 days a year, and was run by Community Service Officers, who tend to be students, mostly undergrad, although they did have a couple of grad students. They do a really good job, and this was one of the UCPD's most popular programs. If anything, they didn't have enough CSOs to provide this service. They increase staffing for finals and at special times during the year when they know there would be a demand. Typically, the wait for a CSO was about 10 to 15 minutes, and sometimes was about 20 minutes. But if people were on campus and knew when they'd leave, they could plan it out and call 10 or 15 minutes ahead, and ask for a walk off-campus. The Walk service will walk people anywhere from around the campus up to about four blocks away. During inclement weather they have umbrellas. They also have a vehicle. So the UCPD was doing its best to try to get people safely to their destination. The service gives people an estimate of the time they'd get there. When the CSO arrived, they usually call, so people wouldn't have to wait outside, as they were trying to provide a good safety service.

Mr. Celaya said there was also a Night Safety Shuttle program. Bus service was now run by Parking and Transportation. The UCPD's CSO program ran the Owl Service, from 3 a.m. until 6 a.m., a vehicle

providing door-to-door service. They'll pick people up wherever they were on campus and drive them to their destination, anywhere from four to six blocks away from campus. That was kind of a soft parameter, and if someone lived eight blocks away, they wouldn't say the person would have to walk the two blocks. The CSOs were really good about making sure to take people all the way there.

Mr. Celaya said there has been an issue with not having enough CSOs. But the more demand they have, the more indication there would be to put more people on. They try to gauge the number of staff needed. They have anywhere from four to six CSOs, and during finals, double or triple that number. They also ask Parking and Transportation to increase the shuttle service during those times as well.

Mr. Celaya said the UCPD had a booklet, "Safety Counts," which had a ton of resources, phone numbers, and information about how to report a crime, on identity theft, bicycle theft, services the UCPD provides, etc. For example, in light of the shootings at Virginia Tech, there was a lot of concern about safety measures on campus, for not just students, but also faculty and staff. This was a very stressful environment, particularly for students, and sometimes behavior that wasn't really a crime, if left unattended, could become something else. At Virginia Tech, the individual had some behavior issues and was sent for psychiatric evaluation. Maybe more could have been done and the person probably should have used counseling services the school had. The UCPD had a Threat Management Unit made up of two detectives who handle these kinds of cases, including stalking, workplace and domestic violence, etc. The UCPD also had a behavioral assessment team where these kinds of situations on campus were evaluated. But the behavior had to be reported. So if people saw a fellow student or employee having a really difficult time, if they contact the UCPD, that didn't mean they'd take some sort of criminal action, and they were really there to provide a service and to provide counseling, health, or academic services. They could work with the Office of Student Life, with California Hall, and a number of departments could be involved. Again, all this information was in the "Safety Counts" booklet, as well as a lot more. It also had a transit guide, a map of shuttle routes, and phone numbers for contacting safety services. The booklets were in the back, and he would ask people to please take a copy. He also brought two bags of whistles and pens. He would like to answer any questions.

Ms. Freedman said there have been constant laptop thefts in her building and asked if there the police could do anything to prevent that. Mr. Celaya said they could. They haven't been that successful in stopping this crime, although they just arrested two people at University Hall whom they believe were responsible for a number of laptop thefts. This was a unique and difficult environment to police. There was always somebody on campus and a lot of buildings were open until 10:00 or 11:00 p.m. Even though they have 75 sworn officers, they couldn't be everywhere. So they work with building staff to make sure buildings were locked down. Some buildings have card keys. They haven't ventured into video surveillance, or anything like that, which was a touchy subject for some individuals. The UCPD relied heavily upon custodial staff and people employed there, since they tend to know who belonged and who didn't. Students also know who belonged and who didn't. People "case" the area, which was target-rich, and there were people who make their livelihood by coming to campus and taking advantage of people there. So if students saw someone in an area they knew who they didn't recognize, someone suspicious, they should give the UCPD a ring so they could make contact. That didn't mean anybody would be arrested, but if they didn't have business there, they'd be asked to leave. Everybody kept stuff at their desks.

M. Begtrup asked if there was a plan to increase the use of keycards around campus. Mr. Celaya said there was. Mr. Begtrup asked if keycard usage was logged when a building was accessed. Mr. Celaya said they had that capability. They're not currently at the point where it's logged in. They know who goes

in and who was supposed to have access, but there was no hold-open alarm. They're looking to expand the program minimally to not just computer labs and research facilities, and to have one door in every building that would be card-key controlled for people to use after hours.

Mr. Purdy said his Department, Statistics, lost a perspective grad student because he didn't feel safe with things around campus. Another student has worked on analysis of certain kinds of car theft. Mr. Purdy asked how people could interact with the UCPD to discuss particular problems in departments, or with people who might want to collaborate. Mr. Celaya said the UCPD does presentations all the time, for something specific, for theft, for personal stuff, etc. Their Web site, police.berkeley.edu, has e-mail addresses if people have questions. Even if a question wasn't related to the police, they'd redirect it. They encourage departments, student groups, etc., to bring to the UCPD's attention any problems or safety issues they see. They were also open to hearing people's ideas.

A Delegate said that when people lose things, they very often did not get them back. She asked about a big, central lost-and-found, or if that could be coordinated between buildings, so people would find it easier to return things. Mr. Celaya said that would probably work with Building Coordinators. She was correct in that it was very decentralized. The Police Department had a central lost-and-found, but they kind of rely upon custodial services. If a custodian found something, they'll put it in their building, in a certain area, and sometimes, if they're really diligent, will give it to the UCPD, sometimes at the end of the week. But it was a problem.

Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank Mr. Celaya. Mr. Celaya said he would like to thank them for the time they provided him. (Applause)

Continuing Announcements, Mr. Daniels said there was a hand out regarding the next announcement, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the LGBT community. He would ask people to please consider joining this committee.

Ms. Hsueh said it was her privilege to introduce the GA's new Funding Advisor, Nate Tuchman, who started on May 1. Mr. Tuchman said he moved there from Florida. His background was in student advisement. He did his graduate degree in Higher Education Administration, at NYU. If people had any funding questions or just wanted to stop by, he'd be at the GA. Ms. Hsueh said Mr. Tuchman graduated from UC Santa Cruz. Mr. Daniels said they would like to welcome Mr. Tuchman, and they were really lucky to have him.

Mr. Tuchman said they're closing the books on May 14, and people should turn in reimbursement receipts by that date. Ms. Hsueh said that applied to Grad Events and Grants. Everything had to be turned in by 5 o'clock on May 14.

Mr. Daniels said the GA still had job openings, including the Graduate Minority Outreach; Recruitment and Retention, which was closing May 15; "The Berkeley Graduate" Editor, May 13; Women of Color Initiative Coordinator, August 15, or until filled, 15 hours a week, doing amazing events and programming; and Chief-of-Staff, open until filled, about 10 hours a week.

Ms. ElNaggar said copies of "The Berkeley Graduate" were available and she would ask Delegates to please take enough for their departments.

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Mr. Daniels said the recent shooting at Virginia Tech resulted in 33 students, faculty, and staff passing away, including nine graduate students. He asked for a moment of silence, of 33 seconds. [A moment of silence was observed.] Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank them.

Mr. Daniels said he would give a quick update on the Energy Biosciences Institute. The GA passed a Resolution last month requesting to have two graduate students placed on a blue-ribbon commission with this. The GA wrote a letter to Vice Chancellor Burnside, met with the Chancellor, and really pushed it. There were some factual things they needed to work out. The commission was not for short-term advising, but for the long term. Since the GA discussed short-term advising, they had to modify a few things. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor were concerned about that for a number of reasons. Mr. Daniels said they were still in conversation about this, although at a meeting earlier that week, the Chancellor agreed that some sort of mechanism for graduate student input was necessary. The Chancellor wanted the GA to do all the work, with such mechanisms as town hall meetings. The GA will do that any way, but they also needed something from the Administration, an institutionalized mechanism. Mr. Daniels said he'd keep the GA updated. If people would like to get more involved in strategizing about this, they should talk to him after the meeting. This would be ongoing through the summer, and the GA would love to have people involved. Letters and other material will be on the Web, probably on the "Delegates Resource Page."

Mr. Daniels said they had a busy agenda that evening. He'd ask them to not take it personally, but he'd be mean and would cut people off and keep the meeting going. The feedback form was all important. People have been there for a year and may or may not come back next year. If they don't, he would ask them to please let the GA know who they could enlist into this service in their stead. They'd also like any comments, positive or negative. Anything they say would be helpful. The feedback sheet also included job information.

Election for External Affairs Vice President

Mr. Daniels said they'd hold this election early because the candidates had to leave. People could nominate themselves or another person. The GA would hear short statements and have a short Q&A session. The candidates would then leave for a discussion off the record and a vote. He called for any questions about the process, and hearing none, called for nominations.

Ms. Freedman nominated Triffid Abel. A Delegate nominated Alberto Ortega. Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Daniels asked candidates for their statements.

Ms. Abel introduced herself and said she was a third-year Geography student. She's been the GA's Campus Organizing Director, which meant she worked under Mr. Begtrup. The main job of the EAVP was to attend UC Student Association meetings. The UCSA covered all UC campuses. She's attended some meetings that year, going on behalf of Mr. Begtrup. It was fun and she liked being involved in external affairs, and she hoped to continue. Mr. Ortega introduced himself and said he was a second-year in the School of Public Health. He'll get his Masters that year and will begin as a PhD student next year. He

hasn't been involved as he would like to in the GA, but now that he was finishing with his Masters, he'd have a lot more time. There were a lot of things he'd like to get involved with, including diversity and interactions with the City of Berkeley. He didn't think graduate students were involved enough in the City, especially with development. So many stores on Telegraph and Shattuck were closing, and nothing but tacky stores were opening. He would like that to be a priority for students.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions. A Delegate asked if both candidates could commit to weekend-long meetings at the UCSA, and asked about their sense of the UCSA's role in student life. Ms. Abel said she could commit, and already has. It was a big time commitment, but was definitely worth it. It's the only time student representatives from all UC campuses got together to talk about things that affected all of them. The UCSA lobbies legislators about things that all students care about, such as lowering fees and non-resident tuition. Since grads tend to work many, many hours a week, and tend to be disparate, the UCSA was important because it could speak for all grads.

Mr. Ortega said he had the time commitment for the position. He thought the UCSA's role was very important for grads and had a tremendous impact on students, giving them an overall stance and more of an impact, making sure all the schools were on the same page.

A Delegate asked what other obligations they had in the 2007 school year. Ms. Abel said she wasn't teaching next year and just passed her orals last week. (Applause) So she had some time. Mr. Ortega said he'd stop an internship if he got the position.

Ms. Anderson asked how much prior experience they had for this kind of work. Ms. Abel said the only experience she had was that year, supporting Mr. Begtrup and attending UCSA Board meetings. She felt she knew the position very well. Other than that, she didn't have any other experience. Mr. Ortega said his experience was mostly as the GA representative from Public Health. He's been one of the officers there for over a year, working with students, administration, and other parts of campus. He hasn't had prior experience with lobbying.

A Delegate asked what they saw as the biggest current problem with the UCSA. Ms. Abel said she felt the biggest push was to lower student fees. Because UC campuses had more undergrads, the UCSA mostly represented undergrads. A large group of grads were pushing to get more graduate student issues on the table. She thought that was the biggest problem. There will hopefully be improvements next year because people have been dedicated to this, spending a lot of time on it. Mr. Ortega said he didn't know enough about the UCSA to really give an accurate answer.

Mr. Stavrinides said the UCSA's position on student fees was to be against any increase. Some students felt that should change, and that the UCSA should not be against all increases. He asked what they felt about that. Ms. Abel said she agreed with that. The Education Fee should be lowered, as it was basically tuition, which California students were not supposed to pay. But a lot of the fees students pay were self-assessed. So students at Berkeley chose to pay more fees than at other campuses. She would like to see a much more flexible stance from the UCSA, and a lot of other people involved in the UCSA would as well. She would not like to see an all-out ban on fees, but to have the government actually pay what it had committed to pay for students' education. On top of that, students would pay for extraneous things, such as for student activities. Mr. Ortega said he agreed with most of what was said, and he would like to add that he wasn't opposed to having more increases in fees. But he thought there should be a more transparent process as far as how it was done. And overall, students should really know why fees were being increased, and there should be more consensus among them.

Mr. Vallee said he understood the UCSA will gather that summer for a congress to pick three Action Agenda items on which to focus its resources for the year. He realized it was a bit early, but he asked if they had a sense of the three main items they would like to see supported and would advocate for at the congress. Ms. Abel one item to be laid on the table was to lower and hopefully wipe out, eventually, non-resident tuition. Included in that would be giving international students a chance to gain residency, like students from the US have. Lowering fees in general was important. She'd take a minute to think of the third item. Mr. Ortega said he thought health care was very important. There's been a lot of discussion of what needs to be done, how it would be paid for, and what could best be achieved at that time. A single-payer system might be too much to ask for at that point. But some compromise could be reached among bills currently being proposed. Another Action Agenda Item would be to continue with the increase of diversity. Ms. Abel said her third item would deal with a complaint she heard most from people in her Department, which was housing, especially graduate housing, including for families. Grads work full-time, and it was hard to get a second job to actually allow them to live by themselves. So she would at least like the UCSA to talk a bit about housing. She wasn't sure that could be successfully addressed at the UCSA level and might be better campus-by-campus, but she was interested in improving the housing question.

A Delegate woman on asked if Ms. Abel would drop something next year since she passed her orals. Ms. Abel said she had three more years of grad school and was mostly just doing research at that time, with fieldwork during the summer and lab work during the school year. She didn't have to teach any more. The Delegate asked Mr. Ortega if, as a first-year PhD student, he anticipated having a lot of course work. Mr. Ortega said he didn't, and said they've already started some preliminary work for his PhD project; so he thought he had things under control.

Mr. Daniels said that seeing no further questions, he would ask the candidates to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After a discussion off the record and a vote, Mr. Daniels said the Delegates picked Triffid Abel as the next External Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS (CONT'D)

Mr. Daniels said they were all busy, and he would apologize for making them go through this. He would also ask them to please fill out the feedback form if they leave. It's been an amazing year working with them all. He actually thought they accomplished a lot, and he hoped they did as well. In case they didn't, he put together a list of accomplishments the GA as a whole has accomplished that year: a panel discussion on depression and anxiety; advocacy on EBI; the Afro-Brazilian dance workshops; Bay Area Hurricane Katrina Commemoration activities; brown bag workshops for applying to graduate school, to demystify the academic job search, for dissertation writing, on how to establish the advisor/advisee relationship, money and graduate school, strategies for survival, on race, gender, and academics, on academic writing, and on public speaking; a complete re-do of the By-laws; the Dean's reception for new graduate students; a dissertation-writing workshop; Diversity Day; a prospective student reception; EWOC Conference; ES incorporated into funding workshop; ES Web site up and running; Faculty Mentorship Award; fall "Back to School" social; fall "Berkeley Graduate"; fall GA open house; financial management workshop; Ford Foundation Fellowship Preparation workshop; funded 100+ grad groups; funded

almost 40 grads' travel costs; Fullbright-Hays Fellowship workshop; GA open house; having reusable plates; graduate student survey of Lower Sproul; graduate women's panel on experiencing depression and anxiety; Graduate Women's Resource Guide; great attendance and participation at Delegates meetings; international student reception; Javitz Fellowship preparation workshop; Latino faculty social; National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education; New Graduate Minority Orientation; New Grad Student Orientation; Oktoberfest; oral qualify exams workshop; personal statement help desk; Poetry Is Not a Luxury event; quorum at most GA committee meetings; reception honoring graduate diversity; Semana de la Raza; sent nine grad students to Lobby Day; spring GA open house; student spring "Berkeley Graduate"; spring fiesta mixer and reception; spring pizza and beer party; student-parent e-forum; successfully revoked new parking fee at Smyth-Fernwald; summer "Berkeley Graduate"; tax preparation workshop; third annual "Bridging the Gap" Conference; three proposition measure debates; Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion Search Committee; wine and cheese party at Art Museum.

Mr. Daniels said he got carried away with PowerPoint. But for everybody who participated, attended, or helped out, he wanted to thank them so much. The GA got a lot done that year, and he thought people did an excellent job. He asked them to please applaud themselves. (Applause)

RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolution was authored by Sarah Edwards

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE DENIAL OF BASIC CIVIL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO EDUCATION, FOR BAHÁ'Í AND OTHER RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN EGYPT

WHEREAS, according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, access to education is a fundamental human right; and

WHEREAS, the Government of Egypt is a signatory to this and other human rights instruments; and

WHEREAS, it has come to our attention that the Government of Egypt continues to systematically deny access to basic civil rights, including higher education to Bahá'í students and other religious minorities in Egypt on account of their faith; and

WHEREAS, we, as graduate students in an institution of higher education, feel moved to speak out against the denial of such access to fellow graduate students in Egypt;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we express our deep concern and voice our opposition to this blatant discrimination and extend our hopes that attention be focused on urging the Government of Egypt to comply with the obligations of international human rights instruments to which it is a party.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President of the Graduate Assembly use the following letter and submit a similar opinion letter to local papers in the name of the Graduate Assembly.

Ms. Edwards said the Resolution expressed the GA's concern that religious minorities were being denied access to basic civil rights, including education in Egypt. It was a symbolic Resolution, but international

attention, particularly from the academic community and the graduate student community, has proved effective in raising awareness and influencing decisions in the past. So that's why they have the proposed Resolution.

Shawna introduced herself and said she was there last year as well. She first wanted to thank them for the last Resolution that was passed on a similar subject, which Ben Allen helped to co-sponsor. As Ms. Edwards said, these Resolutions were really effective. International attention, especially from academic institutions around the world, did have an impact. The Resolution the GA passed last year dealt with Bahá'í students in Iran, who were outright banned from schools, at both the primary and graduate levels. Last year in the fall, after 20 years of outright denial, they were admitted into universities. So she would like to thank the GA, and said a lot of that came from these kinds of statements.

Unfortunately, though, on the back end, universities have received memos that Iran was saying that once they find out students were part of this religious minority group, they try to expel them. That indicated that continued focus and attention on these issues was always necessary to kind of keep things moving forward. This particular Resolution dealt with students and others who had civil rights violated in Egypt. She called for any questions.

Ms. Anderson asked if they were voting on what was in the agenda packet or on what was being passed around. Shawna said the packet of information that was going around presented more information about how the denial of education happened in Egypt and its affects. Every citizen needed an ID card that was issued by the state, and to get one, they had to check one of three recognized religions, Judaism, Christianity, or Islam. If one was not a member of one of those, they were non-citizens and couldn't receive schooling.

Ms. Schild said the Resolution stated that the GA would use "the following letter." Information about the student ID card was in the letter that would be sent on behalf of the GA. Mr. Daniels said the letter was a template, not word-for-word. There could be different phrasing, but the content would be same.

Ms. Anderson moved to call the question and end debate.

A Delegate said that although Resolutions like this were symbolic, they allowed for a critical engagement about international policy and supported civil rights groups. If the GA made such a statement, they needed to apply the same sort of critical engagement with their own domestic situation with regard to education and more specifically, within their own institution. Last night she was up until 4 a.m. with some of her students who were working on retention and recruitment issues, with Pacific Islanders and Pilipino American students. They had a very tough battle that they were still fighting within this institution to demand that their financial needs be met. They faced a cut in resources for next year to do the work that they're trying to do and to bring underrepresented minorities in the State to a higher level of higher education. That was the responsibility of the State and the institution, and they were not doing that. So the students were trying to do it themselves. The Resolution was important, and she wasn't saying the GA shouldn't advocate for this. She felt that part of their responsibility was to also advocate for the same sort of critical engagement with what was happening in their own institution.

Ms. Ahrendt said that the speaker could write a Resolution about that. The speaker said that as a person of color, she didn't feel it should be her responsibility to bring it up and then do the work. But if somebody else in this group wanted to take that up, she would support it. But she's done this work so many different times. And it wasn't just a person of color that needed to do it. But it needed to be recognized.

A Delegate said she felt pretty uncomfortable with this whole idea, being a native New Yorker and having good friends who were Iranian. She agreed with the first comment that they have their own issues in their own country, which, at that moment, was incredibly hostile in unfortunate ways towards other countries. She just didn't know if it made sense to send this kind of message.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded.

On a point of information, Mr. Rajan asked why the Bahá'í faith was particularly special in this case. Mr. Daniels said that Mr. Rajan was raising an objection to calling the question. Ms. Ahrendt said she would withdraw her motion to call the question. Mr. Rajan said Hinduism wasn't included, and he'd assume that Hindus could go back to India. He asked if it was that Bahá'ís didn't have a particular place to go, and why this was any different from the situation with Filipinos at UC Berkeley. Shawna said that was why the Resolution mentioned "religious minorities in general." But she thought that was a good point. They could certainly change it just say "religious minorities." A lot of this came out of a situation with a Bahá'í couple who couldn't get their children birth certificates. So while it was important to particularly pinpoint this group, it did have implications for other groups. She thought the letter made it clear this applied to all religious minorities.

Mr. Rajan said he supported that. He asked if the Bahá'ís mentioned were born and raised in Egypt and were Egyptian or if they decided to convert, and if that was why they were being persecuted. Shawna said she was not aware of how they joined the Bahá'í faith. The Egyptian Constitution had a provision for the freedom of conscience, so people could choose whatever faith they wished. But only certain faiths were recognized on ID cards.

Ms. Freedman asked about tabling the Resolution until after elections. People could argue all they'd like if they'd like to stay. She moved to consider the three Resolutions on the agenda after the elections. The motion was seconded. Objections were raised. Ms. Freedman said she would withdraw the motion.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to table the Resolution for the time being until they could have a presentation that more fully highlighted the issues. Mr. Daniels said the motion was to table the Resolution until September meeting. The motion was seconded.

Shawna said there was some time sensitivity with these things, and to wait another five months or so would lessen the ability to have an impact in raising awareness, because a lot of time will have passed and the issue would get swept under the rug.

An objection to tabling the Resolution was raised. Ms. Ahrendt said she would withdraw the motion to table.

Ms. Schild said she would like to propose an amendment, and amend the title of the Resolution, to strike the phrase "Bahá'í and other," to read, "Resolution Regarding the Denial of Basic Civil Rights, Including the Right to Education, for Religious Minorities In Egypt," and to strike the phrase "Bahá'í students and other" from the third Whereas Clause, to read as follows:

"Whereas, ... the Government of Egypt continues to... deny access to... higher education to religious minorities in Egypt..."

The amendment would keep the specific Bahá'í-related information in the letter. The motion to amend was seconded.

A Delegate said she thought withdrawing the Resolution for the moment made more sense given all the qualms.

Ms. Anderson asked if the author could accept the proposed changes as a friendly amendment. Mr. Daniels said she could. Ms. Edwards said she would accept that as a friendly amendment. THE RESOLUTION WAS AMENDED AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT ADOPTED BY THE AUTHOR.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION REGARDING THE DENIAL OF BASIC CIVIL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO EDUCATION, FOR RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN EGYPT.

The following Resolution was authored by Erin Haynes:

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR OPPOSITION TO THE DWINELLE CAFÉ

WHEREAS, we believe that the highest priority of a public university is to support the intellectual and professional development of its students; and

WHEREAS the plan to install the Dwinelle Cafe, a Cal Dining service, in the midst of the many classrooms and offices of the 6th floor of Dwinelle Hall, adjacent to 370 Dwinelle, the most frequently used large conference and seminar space in the building, runs directly contrary to that priority; and

WHEREAS, the increased noise level and traffic will render 370 Dwinelle an inappropriate venue for academic events during the business hours of the Cafe; and decreased access to wet kitchen facilities and locking storage will make the space far less suitable for hosting multi-day events, even outside of Cafe business hours; and

WHEREAS the loss of full access to the only free (for departments housed in Dwinelle) or nearly free (at \$50 per half-day or \$100 per day for non-Dwinelle departments) large conference space on campus will be a heavy blow to student-organized, student-run, and student-attended events that until now have been held in 370 Dwinelle on a near-daily basis; and

WHEREAS we are concerned that Dwinelle lacks sufficient building management and janitorial staff to cope with the current demands of building operations, and that the Dwinelle Cafe project does not include provisions to help alleviate the increased demands the Cafe will certainly cause; and

WHEREAS the planning process for the Dwinelle Cafe has been characterized by a lack of transparency and the disempowerment of faculty, staff, and graduate students of Dwinelle Hall and the many other divisions and departments across the Berkeley campus that have a stake in the fate of 370 Dwinelle;

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR OPPOSITION TO THE DWINELLE CAFÉ (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly opposes the decision to implement the Dwinelle Cafe plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly Delegate from the Linguistics Department will communicate this opposition in writing to the Deans of Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and the Graduate Division by May 15, 2007.

Mr. Daniels said this Resolution was originally submitted by Ms. Haynes, whose alternate was present, Ann Weber said the issue was simple. The problem with the proposed Dwinelle Café was Room 371, which was adjacent to Dwinelle 370, the only large conference space that was free for members of Dwinelle and extremely cheap for others. For venues such as the Alumni House, for Housing and Dining, people pay \$3-400. In addition, people on campus had to compete with people who weren't from UCB, because the University used those rooms as a source of revenue from non-Berkeley groups. The 370 Dwinelle conference space was used all the time, especially by graduate groups, who could not afford the exorbitant prices other spaces charge. The proposed Café, being directly adjacent to 370, would cause a ridiculous amount of noise. Additionally, it would mean the loss of the kitchen area, adjacent to the room. Many graduate student groups could not afford catering, so they do the hard work themselves, and get up at 7:30 to make the coffee and prepare the food. The loss of that kitchen space would mean grads would also have to start paying catering fees. So the proposal to put a café at that location would cause a lot of problems for many grad groups who use that space for professional development conferences. This would affect everyone. People not in Dwinelle should be opposed to this because they wouldn't benefit from the café as it would be hard to get to and they would no longer have access to that space. What was at issue was the location and the fact that the University would rather have a space to make money from beverages than to have a space where graduates and other groups could hold academic events.

Ms. Freedman said Dwinelle was right next to a lot of other places to eat on Sproul. Ms. Weber said that was correct, about a one and-a-half minute walk from the Free Speech Movement Café and a similar distance to MLK. There were a lot of other places that people could go. That was another reason to support the Resolution.

Mr. Begtrup asked what was currently in that space. Ms. Weber said 370 was a very large room with movable chairs and audio-visual facilities. Adjacent to it was a long room with a kitchen facility at one end. It's traditionally been used for registration, book sales, and refreshments. They couldn't have registration and book sales in the back of the room where a conference was being held because of the noise.

Mr. Begtrup asked about the wording of the Resolution saying the planning process was characterized by lack of transparency, and if that was really true. Ms. Weber said it was. It's been documented that the person responsible for this has said different things on different occasions, and hasn't given people all the facts. People were still under the mistaken impression that the café would be closed if an event would be held. But when seriously asked, the person responsible said that wouldn't be economically feasible. At one point she said the café would be limited to faculty and grads, but then said she didn't know where people got that impression.

Mr. Begtrup asked if the planning for this space has been unusual for the campus norm. Ms. Weber said it was, and said the person decided to do it without bringing it up at meetings with faculty, or at group

meetings. Many faculty members were upset about this because they're supposed to be consulted about academic space. So there were irregularities, although perhaps not that affect any graduate students per se.

Mr. Begtrup said he wasn't a big fan of claiming things in Resolutions that weren't exactly true. If students felt they've been disempowered, that was unfortunate, but he didn't think grads were generally empowered in these decisions. That didn't mean their voices shouldn't be heard, but that statement didn't help the Resolution if the planning process followed regulation.

A Delegate said that one thing that was not at all transparent with this process was a survey that was sent out to the departments and to some undergrads in November, to assess people's interest in having a café somewhere in Dwinelle. But there was no question as to whether people were willing to give up access to 370. And the responses to that survey were taken as a vote for the café. So that seemed a little badly designed. People also expressed negative responses and comments in the survey, but the person denied receiving any negative comments, even though people who went through the survey results said there was at least a 50-50 split.

Mr. Wolgin said his Department, History, didn't hear anything afterwards. Most people he talked to didn't know they were going ahead with this. It was being done without anyone's knowledge. So whether the process was followed differently from how it should have been done, since it was such a viable and useful space, he thought the GA needed to do something about it.

A Delegate said she was from the Slavic Department, and their facilities were directly below this room. When people set up for conferences in 370, it was difficult to hear in the conference room. This Resolution was the first her Department was informed of this café. She checked the Web site to see if there was any notification, and there wasn't any information that she could find as to what hours were being proposed for the café. Dwinelle has been a hot spot for theft on campus, and there were issues of campus safety, which they talked about in the Academic Affairs Committee earlier that year. Having a café and increasing access to the office side of Dwinelle would result in safety issues. Again, because they haven't been consulted on this, they don't know if that has been addressed.

Ms. Anderson said having a survey was standard campus operating procedure. She asked if a friendly amendment would be accepted, to delete the statement about the planning process, because while the process was awful, it was standard. Some people had concerns about the process being characterized by a lack of transparency if that was not really the case, and was just how things worked there. If there were people who had an objection, perhaps they could take out the last Whereas Clause. Ms. Weber said that didn't make the clause false, the fact that it was standard operating procedure. Also, the results of the survey were misrepresented.

Mr. Begtrup said that for the Resolution to be effective, they didn't want people to reply that the process was simply how these things worked. That wasn't the problem, and people didn't want the café because it would screw up their conference space. That was the real problem, and that's the issue they should stick to. He thought it would help the Resolution to not have that language in there.

Ms. Weber said they would accept that as a friendly amendment. **THE RESOLUTION WAS AMENDED BY THE AUTHOR AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.**

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR OPPOSITION TO THE DWINELLE CAFÉ, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

PROCLAMATION HONORING MARY ANN MASON

The Delegates of the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley Hereby Proclaim:

Our Deepest Gratitude and Heartfelt Congratulations to Mary Ann Mason on the Occasion of the Celebration of the End of Her Tenure as Dean of the Graduate Division.

WHEREAS Mary Ann Mason, a scholar and teacher in her own right and esteem, has faithfully and selflessly given seven years of dedicated service in her capacity as Dean of the Graduate Division; and

WHEREAS, in these seven years, Dean Mason has championed, with vigor and zest, the causes that matter to the daily academic and personal lives of graduate students at UC Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, in these seven years, Dean Mason has "moved mountains" to increase affordable graduate student housing, to fulfill the promise of family-friendliness at UC Berkeley, to defend and guard the right to an affordable graduate education, and to improve the overall quality of life of every graduate student on this campus through her countless initiatives such as:

- Initiating the opening of the Ida Louise Jackson House in 2004, the first facility solely dedicated to housing graduate students at UC Berkeley;
- Creating more affordable housing, for instance, through the student cooperatives network by opening the doors of the Hillegass-Parker House to graduate students;
- Chairing the Mental Health Task Force and vociferously advocating for improvements in graduate student mental health programs and services at UC Berkeley;
- Instituting a parent grant for international students who currently do not receive any funding for child care during the academic year;
- Supporting the creation of an international students' network by funding international students' receptions;
- Instituting the brilliant Faculty Name Fund Initiative, by which faculty have given \$10,000 or more for graduate student fellowships, which raised over \$2.7 million and will now raise even more through the Chancellor's commitment to match funds; and

WHEREAS, in addition, the conversion of 440 Stephens Hall into today's inviting Graduate Student Lounge transpired in Spring 2006 due to the vision, support, and efforts of none other than Dean Mason; and

PROCLAMATION HONORING MARY ANN MASON (cont'd)

WHEREAS the passage of the Childbirth Leave Policy at UC Berkeley, giving six weeks of funded maternity leave to graduate women, came to fruition this academic year, in no small measure, due to the scholarship, advocacy, and personal commitment of Dean Mason; and

WHEREAS, when the Graduate Assembly has needed an advocate to stand with us in speaking with one voice to the campus administration -- be it regarding realizing a Graduate Student Center, funding child care for student families, ensuring the affordability of housing for graduate students, or campaigning for any other vision and mission of the Graduate Assembly, Dean Mason has never failed us in writing the much-needed letters of support, providing the encouraging words, or just putting her word in for us; and

WHEREAS, Mary Ann Mason has managed to do all this while maintaining her commitment to her first passion -- teaching and scholarship -- in her seven-year tenure as Dean, still teaching in the School of Social Welfare, still mentoring students, still writing articles, still publishing books -- the latest, Mothers on the Fast Track, to be released this spring; and

WHEREAS the list of Dean Mason's positive contributions that have touched the individual lives of graduate students is impossible to fit into one Proclamation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Delegates of the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley, gathered here today on Thursday, May 3, 2007 that We, the Graduate Assembly, present to Mary Ann Mason with this Proclamation of Deepest Gratitude and Heartfelt Congratulations and a Plaque Honoring our Beloved Dean for her selfless service, her vigorous advocacy, and her devotion to improving the lot and lives of graduate students and their families.

Mr. Rheume said there was a long list of established accomplishments in the Resolution, but as Dean Mason mentioned, when she came and addressed the GA earlier that semester, he had to ask himself whether it was appropriate for the Dean of the Graduate Division to spend University funds to conduct a survey and to then use the data for her own, personal book. And, in fact, it wasn't her own book, as her daughter's name was also on the title. He thought it was wonderful that Dean Mason did all those other things. But before they give Dean Mason their extremely heartfelt congratulations, he wondered if it was an appropriate use of University resources in her position as Dean to support her own research.

Ms. Freedman said that while in the sciences they publish all their research in journals, the idea of writing a book was probably completely foreign to them. In the humanities and social sciences, researchers sometimes publish articles, but a lot of times also publish books. That was what professors did, and that was part of their scholarship.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROCLAMATION HONORING MARY ANN MASON PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ADDRESS SHORTFALLS IN THE GA'S 2006-07 BUDGET

To amend the budget by increasing the following line items in order to cover shortfalls:

The Departmental Liaison stipend (+\$820.00)

The Grad Student Support Services Project program/events (+\$1,890.00)

The ASUC (+\$1,635.30)

For a total of \$4,345.30. These shortfalls shall be covered by a reduction in the following line items:

The Executive Order stipend (-\$2,710)

Contingency (-\$1,635.30)

For a total of \$4,345.30

BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR THE GA'S NEW WEB SITE

To amend the budget to create a line item entitled "Web site Development" under "Operating Expense" of the Web Project portion of the 2006-07 budget, and to authorize \$6,082.03 for this line item. This amount will come from the carryforward and, if necessary, from the GA reserves.

Mr. Daniels said that with no objection, they would combine the two amendments, with the GA to only have one discussion and one vote.

The first budget amendment was to address budget shortfalls, since due to staffing issues, they had some under-estimates and over-estimates. So the first budget amendment described the changes. The second amendment was about the new Web site. The pros and cons were included with the background information on what the Web site would include.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ADDRESS SHORTFALLS IN THE GA'S 2006-07 BUDGET AND THE BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR THE GA'S NEW WEB SITE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

BY-LAW PROPOSALS

Mr. Daniels said they'd do their best to get through this quickly. There were basic changes that they'd vote on in a block, include name changes, grammatical corrections, re-numbering, re-ordering, things like that, very non-substantive changes. And then there were substantive changes to the By-laws, which would be described individually, but voted on as a block. If anyone objected to a particular change and would like to discuss it or vote on it, they'd take it out of the block and vote on it separately. And then lastly, there were the more challenging substantive changes that they'd discuss individually and vote on

individually. He'd ask to discuss things substantively, not technically in terms of wording, because if they discussed the wording of the By-laws, they'd be there all night. He would distribute the proposed By-laws and the current By-laws. They only made 20 copies of each, so he would ask people to please share. When they agree to the substantive changes, in addition, they'd also agree to have the Executive Board put those changes into wording. However, to do this whole process, they need the Delegates to approve that process. He called for any questions about the process or anything else.

Mr. Purdy asked if he could briefly summarize the changes. Mr. Daniels said the ones on the first three pages were the straightforward, substantive changes, and then the ones on the back of the last page, which had the options, were the more challenging ones. He said they would go through each individual substantive change.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to approve the process by which to consider the By-laws passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels said the basic changes include things like changing the titles: changing "VP of Academic Affairs" to "VP of Campus Affairs"; "Foreign Student Affairs Committee" to the "International Student Affairs Committee," and other similar semantic, cosmetic changes. They'd vote on the basic cosmetic changes.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BASIC CHANGES TO THE BY-LAWS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said different people would talk about the different proposals for substantive changes to the By-laws.

Mr. Daal spoke on the creation of the Technology Committee. He said they wanted to create a Technology Committee Chair to grow the Web resources for the GA and to keep their Web page up to date. Some perks might include giving Delegates have their own e-mail address, maybe an online discussion board, and perhaps giving grad groups their own Web sites. The Chair of the Technology Committee would chair a Committee whose charge would be to maintain and create these types of policies.

Mr. Rajan spoke on By-law changes for the Budget Officer. He said the proposal would not only change the name of the current Chair of the Finance Committee, but would create a new officer position, the Budget Officer. The reason was more than cosmetic. It would make this position an Officer and give what was currently the Finance Chair more responsibilities. What the Finance Chair would normally do would now be expected of the Budget Officer. It would be a stipended position and would solidify the roll of the Finance Chair of the GA. Mr. Rajan said he felt the Finance Chair was integral, and changing it to the Budget Officer made that clear. People always confuse him with the Funding Chair, and this should help.

Mr. Dillon spoke on the Rules Officer. He said that the Organization and Rules Committee Chair would be elected to this new position. The position would involve a bit more accountability. The person would chair the Rules Committee, but would also maintain parliamentary procedure at Delegates meetings, keep on top of the By-laws, which need fixing, and make sure the GA ran according to the rules.

Mr. Begtrup spoke on the proposed change to the timing of elections. He said GA elections their By-laws currently call for elections to take place in April. The proposal would move elections to March. Continuity among officers was a big deal, passing on the knowledge of what was going on. And for him, this was a big deal, to get training for the next External Affairs VP, and getting them to UCSA meetings. Officers elected in March would still take their position in June, but it would give time for a transfer of knowledge. It seemed like a smart way to do things.

Ms. Ahrendt spoke about proposed changes to attendance requirements. Delegates may be removed if they miss two Delegate meetings in a row or miss their committee or working group meetings over a period spanned by two Delegates meetings. Currently, Delegates could miss three Delegate meetings and nothing really happened. The proposed change was not really punishment, but to make sure everybody was involved and that every unit had its voice represented at the GA. The By-law would give power to the Assembly to remove Delegates and ensure that those units that were not being represented would be able to elect or appoint a Delegate who would turn up. It was really important that everybody have a Delegate who attended.

Ms. Cementwala spoke on Delegate assignments. She said every Delegate was supposed to serve on a committee. That was sort of in the By-laws, although those By-laws were in a mess. The proposed change would streamline the process. They came up with a priority list of committees. Every time they wanted to appoint somebody to something, they wouldn't need to waste the Assembly's time, have an agenda item, and have people formally appointed. That wasn't something the GA really did much at that time anyway.

Ms. Anderson spoke on proposed changes to committee and working group procedures. Committees currently mostly make up their own internal procedures, but the By-laws will occasionally, randomly, include something about what one committee or another was supposed to do. The proposal would simply say that committees were in charge of making up their own internal rules.

Ms. Cementwala spoke about the proposed change to the list of committees. The By-laws include committees that didn't exist, such as the GSI/GSR Committee, or the Affirmative Action Committee. It was important to keep the By-laws up-to-date and to prioritize their committees, both campus-wide and within the GA. The proposal included a revised list of committees, and the proposal would basically make that update in the By-laws.

Mr. Dillon spoke on proposed changes to stipended staff. By-laws currently state that the Delegate Assembly could order the Business Officer, Ms. Hsueh, to do something when, in fact, Ms. Hsueh was an ASUC employee, meaning that she had no accountability to the GA as her employer. The proposed change would clear things up. Mr. Daniels said Ms. Hsueh's check was from the Auxiliary, and the checks of other staff were from UC Berkeley. Even though the By-laws state that the GA had legal, binding authority with the Business Officer, that was not the case. The proposed change would clarify that.

Mr. Daniels spoke on proposed changes to Resolution specifications. People had no idea of what Resolutions could or could not do. The proposal would create five categories of Resolutions, including budget amendments, directed action, By-laws amendments, funding procedures, and other, to really give them more meaning. When the Assembly discussed what a Resolution could or could not do, the GA would know what it was talking about.

Mr. Harley spoke about proposed changes to Action Agenda Items. He said that in the past, the Executive Board would pick three Action Agenda Items for the whole year and let the Delegates know what they chose. The amendment would have the Executive Board present four topics, with the Delegates to choose three of the four at the first meeting. Mr. Daniels said they'd present at least four, if not more, and Delegates would choose three.

Ms. Anderson spoke on the proposed change regarding directed action. It would state that the Assembly could direct any Officers to do what it wanted, within reason. There was currently nothing in the By-laws stating that Officers represent the GA, and no formal explanation of how they represent the Assembly. If an Officer advocated in one direction and the Assembly felt differently, the proposed amendment would make Officers advocate according to the Assembly, since the Officer represented them. It was also helpful in negotiations, since it would allow people who were advocating to say they spoke for the Delegates.

Mr. Daniels said the challenging substantive changes would be considered next.

Ms. Freedman spoke on proposed changes to Project Coordinators. They currently sign a one-year contract and were encouraged to stay for two years, although there was nothing that formalized that. So Coordinators would serve for one year with an option to serve for two. After two years, the position would be open and posted to everyone. Project coordinators could reapply at that point and go through the application process.

Mr. Daniels spoke on proposed changes to job descriptions. He said the amendment would incorporate job descriptions for positions, and they wouldn't have to go to the Delegates every time the GA wanted to change or update something. Currently, some job responsibilities were in the By-laws, and some weren't. The change would make job descriptions clear in the By-laws.

Ms. Cementwala spoke on proposed changes to Memorandums of Understanding. She said this proposal was important. The GA thought they'd get \$32,000 from the Grad Division, but got \$20,000 because of issues of communication and differences between the GA's expectations those of the Grad Division. MOUs allow the GA to enter into long-term agreements, to be overseen by the Rules Committee. Mr. Daniels and other Officers could, on the GA's behalf, enter into these agreements, and they wouldn't have to go through the entire Assembly. That would be efficient, but there would still be oversight through the Rules Committee. This was critical because over the long term, this change could help the GA solidify its relationships with the Grad Division, the ASUC, etc.

Mr. Daal spoke on proposed changes to the Judicial Committee. He said the GA had a Judicial Committee that has never been called together in the five years of his experience in the GA. The J-Comm was supposedly important because it took up six pages out of a 27-page document. The proposed change would get rid of the Judicial Committee because they think its task would also be served under the authority of the Delegate Assembly.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions regarding the proposed substantive changes to the By-laws.

Ms. Jenkins asked if the first one, the creation of a Technology Chair, change would create a stipended position. Mr. Daniels said it was proposed as a stipended position, but nothing in the By-laws mentioned that either way.

Mr. Ortega asked about the purpose of the Judicial Committee. Mr. Daal said it was very well laid out in the By-laws. It was supposed to resolve disputes and conduct judicial review. Ms. Ahrendt said it would consider internal legal disputes, which sometimes happen in the ASUC, such as a dispute between Delegates or committees. But that hasn't happened in a long time.

A Delegate asked if the Budget Officer would become stipended. Mr. Rajan said the Finance Officer has been stipended, and the Budget Officer would be stipended as well. Mr. Daniels said that nothing in the By-laws required that anyone got paid. This proposal would just change a Chair whose only responsibility was to chair a committee to not only include that, but to also undertake other fiscal responsibilities of the GA. The Delegate asked what the Budget Officer's other responsibilities were. Mr. Rajan said the main problem was not having a clear definition of what the Finance Chair was expected to do. People just do what they thought was right for the fiscal health of the GA, and what this position has done has varied greatly from year to year. Last year the fiscal health of the GA was in a state of great flux, and it was actually a lot of work to come up with the budget that year. He had a budget from last year to work with, and he tried to focus on things that would make the budget more efficient. There were other things the position could do, such as helping the President write a proposal to Dean Mason. The job description was pretty good, but there was a lot of responsibilities a Budget Officer could take up. Creating a new position like this, if nothing else, would solidify those obligations.

Mr. Begtrup said that if the rules about directed action were approved, and the Budget Officer was approved, the GA could assign things. Currently, the GA couldn't really assign things to the position, because it was just a committee chair.

Mr. Harley said there was an issue last December between the Funding Advisor and a student group, and the question came to the floor for the GA to debate. He didn't feel the floor of the GA was really the place to discuss that, and asked if that would have been handled by the Judicial Committee. Mr. Daniels that was being referred to was a funding appeals process the GA went through, which was a separate path in the By-laws than the Judicial Committee. The Funding Committee decided to revoke a group's funding and the Delegates considered whether or not to reinstate that funding.

A Delegate asked about the difference between Officers and committee chairs. Mr. Daniels said chairs just chaired a committee, whereas an officer would continue to chair the committee but also have other responsibilities. The Delegate asked if all Officers also chaired committees. Mr. Daniels said they did.

Mr. Daniels said that seeing no other questions, he asked if people would like to pull any section out for a separate discussion. A Delegate asked to take out the proposal for a Technology Chair. Mr. Daniels said that seeing no debate, they would take that out.

A Delegate asked to remove the proposal to change the timing of elections.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the straightforward substantive changes, except for the Technology Committee and Chair and the change to the timing of GA elections. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE STRAIGHTFORWARD SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES, AS DIVIDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Daniels said they would discuss the proposal to change the timing of elections first.

Mr. Work said it seemed that before they create a new committee, they should put something in the budget to fund it. The GA ran into that problem in the fall. If nothing was added to fund it, there was no point to creating a committee. Mr. Rajan said the Technology Committee had a stipended position that was budgeted at \$1,190 a year.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BY-LAW CHANGE AMENDMENT CREATING THE TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said they would next consider the By-law change regarding the timing of GA elections. The Executive Board felt that a month and a half was enough. If they moved elections up to March, a lot of people would be more unsure about their schedules for that next academic year. A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

The motion to approve the change in the By-laws, to move GA elections from April to March, failed by hand-vote 8-8-0.

Mr. Daniels said they would next consider the challenging substantive changes. The first was the Resolution process. There were two options. Option A) was a referral process. A Resolution would be submitted at a Delegate meeting and would be referred to committee for discussion and analysis, and then re-introduced at the next Delegate meeting for a vote. Option B) would have Resolutions introduced three weeks ahead of time, instead of one week. The pro and con arguments were that the referral process would take more time whereas the early introduction process would take less time, still get information out, but wouldn't allow for committee analysis.

Ms. Cementwala asked about time sensitive Resolutions. Mr. Daniels said that for both processes, a two-thirds or three-fourths vote by Delegates could override the process and immediately consider a Resolution at meeting it was introduced.

Mr. Harley said he favored a third option. Having bills go through committee after being referred at a Delegates meeting was probably best. But committees might not meet, which would mean it could take a long time for something to come to the floor. So his option would be for Resolutions to just go directly to committee, and then to the floor at a Delegates meeting.

Ms. Anderson said she believed most committees have monthly meetings. She liked the idea of the President deciding which committee to refer a bill to and allowing Delegates to object.

Ms. Schild said she would propose a friendly amendment, to introduce Resolutions at a GA or Executive Board meeting, after which they would be sent to committee for analysis. That would provide a possible venue to fast-track something.

Ms. Anderson said it was already in the By-laws that the Executive Board acted for the Assembly when there were pressing issues that needed to be addressed between Delegate meetings. If something wasn't a pressing issue, a bill should go through committee.

Mr. Begtrup said that Mr. Daniels mentioned that a Resolution could come to the floor and be considered with a three-fourths approval. He asked where that came from. Mr. Dillon said that was in the By-laws, 6.3.2.6.

A motion was made and seconded to call the question and vote on the referral process, option A. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REFERRAL PROCESS, OPTION A, TO HAVE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AT ASSEMBLY MEETINGS AND REFERRED TO COMMITTEE, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said it was 7:30 and he'd ask for a motion to extend the meeting time by 30 minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels said they would next consider the Project Coordinator position. In the past, this position has been supervised by Ms. Hsueh. The proposal would have the position supervised by a graduate student. The two considerations was to have this position be a vice president, on par with the other two Vice Presidents, or an Officer, which would be on par with the Rules and Budget Officers that the GA just approved. The responsibilities would be the same while the differences would be in terms of the ability to commit time to the position and the pay. An officer would probably have less time than a VP.

Ms. Schild asked how many budget coordinators there were. Mr. Daniels said there were six, and they work 15 hours a week.

Ms. Hsueh said she reports to Nad Permaul, Director of the ASUC Auxiliary, and they were both UC Berkeley employees. She worked with all committees and attends meetings. She could voice opinions and give recommendations, but she didn't have a vote when contentious issues arose. She's reviewed the By-laws and they had a lot of inconsistencies. One-third of the GA's budget was dedicated to grants and funds, and the Budget Chair and Funding Chair could vote. Another one-third of the GA's budget went to projects. Project Coordinators had no representation except for her. And she couldn't vote. So she was advocating to have a Vice President for the Project Coordinators. Project Coordinators were stipended employees, and the new position would also be a grad, would supervise Project Coordinators and attend Board meetings and have a vote. On the other hand, she was still the Manager, oversaw the budget, and made sure the GA was spending money wisely and wasn't overspending or going into a deficit. So far they've tightened their belt and have been doing very well. And hopefully that will continue. She would continue to advise all Project Coordinators, oversee their budgets, and make sure the GA spent money wisely. But she would like Project Coordinators to have a voice on the Executive Board.

Ms. Anderson said that in the past there has been some friction between Project Coordinators, the Assembly and the Exec Board, and she thought creating a new VP position would improve these relations and make this a really good relationship. Projects were one-third of the GA's budget and an important part of what the GA did.

Mr. Daal asked if the position had to be a Vice President, and if it could be an Officer with a vote on the Board. Also, the proposal would create another paid position.

A Delegate said she would like to hear a Project Coordinator about this. Mr. Daniels said he spoke with the Project Coordinators. The Delegate asked any Project Coordinator what they saw as the benefit of the proposal, if they thought this would make Projects more effective, and if they were concerned that money would be taken out of programming and basically put into overhead. Ms. ElNaggar said she was okay either way.

Mr. Begtrup said Projects were a big part of the GA that most Delegates weren't that aware of, and Projects were interested in having a voice in the GA. And from the GA's point of view, they should be interested in this position so they had were more of an idea what was going on with the projects. But the question was whether they'd be represented by an Officer or a VP. Both positions would have the same power and a vote on the Executive Board. He favored having the Project Coordinator be an Officer. It was less of a monetary commitment because if the position was a VP, it would also have a Chief-of-Staff. They were also uncertain as to how much work there would be. If they need to add another stipend position, he thought they could transition into that later. If they look at the structure of the GA, there was a bit of a sense of symmetry. They had a President and VPs for Campus Affairs and External Affairs, and he didn't know if a Project Coordinator fit into that.

Ms. Jenkins said she was a member of the Finance Committee. The budget that year took a cut, and it was the general consensus among Fi-Comm members that it was not wise to fund two new positions at that point. They felt having this as an Officer would be enough.

Ms. Anderson said another reason to have a Vice President was because the ideal person to fill this position would be a Project Coordinator, most of whom work as much as a Vice President. It would be a big cut in their work to be a VP, and it would be harder to attract Project Coordinators.

Mr. Harley asked how many hours a month Ms. Hsueh spent dealing with this. Ms. Hsueh said it varied, and was between 5 and 15 hours a week.

Mr. Daniels said the job description they've been working on could include things like evaluations and grant writing for outside sources of funding. So it wouldn't just have to be Ms. Hsueh's 30% time, but it could, depending on the position they chose.

Ms. Cementwala said one-third of the GA budget was spent on funding and the position was the Funding Chair. The GA also spent one-third of its budget on Projects, and she was completely convinced that they should have a voting representative on the Executive Board to serve as the voice of Project Coordinators. Given meetings they've had in the past where this has come up, as somebody who has been involved in the GA for three years, she was completely convinced this position needed to be a Vice President. The GA had to be fiscally cautious and they were already going through a major overhaul of their By-laws that year, bringing new waves of changes. They needed to be cautious in the way they spend their money and in the changes they make. It was completely understandable to have a voice. People who work on these Projects, in paid positions, spend about 15 hours a week. In addition, a VP would be paid. A VPs typically work between 15 and 20 hours a week, with about 17 hours on average. In addition, VPs also get a chief-of-staff. The External Affairs VP essentially had two different people, one of whom was essentially a chief-of-staff, and worked about 10 hours a week.

A Delegate said that for the Project Coordinator VP, they're asking for roughly 27 hours a week. For a new position, that seemed excessive. After a year went by and they evaluated what the position did, and

saw how much time it really took, she thought they'd have a better sense. Ms. Hsueh said she spent 5 to 15 hours a week on Projects. To add two positions at 27 hours a week total seemed a bit off the charts. If she were to vote, she'd vote for the PC Officer option.

Mr. Wolgin said he agreed that the Project Coordinator Officer seemed better. He asked if they could pass this and revisit the issue in, say, December, and look at this again, regardless of what the GA approved that evening. Mr. Daniels said they could.

A Delegate said a lot of this came from the Exec Board, since it was probably the part of the GA this would affect the most. But from the Finance Committee's perspective, if they decide to make the position a VP, the GA should compensate the position at the same rate as other VPs. The Committee as a whole was a little uncomfortable allocating over \$22,000 for something that was brand new. A lot of areas in the budget were already being underfunded, and they didn't feel it was necessary to spend so much money on this position.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE OPTION B) AND CREATE A PROJECT COORDINATORS OFFICER, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said that unless anybody objected, they'd postpone discussion on the composition of the Executive Board until after elections.

Mr. Harley asked if the Environmental Sustainability Committee would be affected. Ms. Ahrendt said it wouldn't, and said that wasn't changed. The ES Chair would be appointed by the Committee.

Mr. Freedman asked if they could elect everybody at that time. Mr. Daniels said the Chairs of the ES and Student Affairs Committees would not be elected at that time.

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to move the discussion on composition of the Exec Board until after elections, to the end of the agenda. It was so moved and seconded and passed by hand-vote 10-8-0.

PROPOSED GA BUDGET FOR 2007-2008

Mr. Daniels said he would go through this quickly. The budget was outlined on the screen. The column on the left was the amount proposed to be allocated for 07-08. The middle column was the amount allocated for the current year. Amounts in parentheses meant the budget was cut from last year, and if it wasn't, it meant an amount was added.

Mr. Daniels said some friendly amendments were made that the Finance Committee did not consider. He'd would run through them quickly, and if there was any objection, the GA could vote on them. The first were two issues of cost-of-living. It's been the practice of the GA to increase stipends of Project Coordinators if they stay on each year. That would mean setting the stipends at \$10,150 for GMORR, WOC, and GWP; and for GMSP and GSSP, it was \$10,450. "The Berkeley Graduate" Editor was returning for a third year and would be at \$10,750.

Mr. Daniels called for any objections to the above amendments, and hearing none, said the amendments were approved. THE COST-OF-LIVING AMENDMENTS WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Daniels said that for the next amendment, Ms. Cementwala requested that the \$500 for meeting meals be moved to "Supplies, Copying, and Printing." There was no fiscal impact and it would allow her to use money differently. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE BUDGET PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Daniels said the last amendment was for elections costs. The GA had to re-budget, given its agreement with the ASUC, to pay back for past elections costs. The GA will owe \$7,500 each year, for the next four years, in addition to the elections cost that were estimated for the 2007 election, which was about \$10,000, a little bit less. So in combination, they allocated \$17,000. That would mean increasing the GA's revenue stream, from the student fee reserve by \$2,000, and increasing the ASUC expenditure line item by \$2,000. THE AMENDMENT WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Daniels said that going back to the front page, since they decided that evening to create a Projects Coordinator Officer instead of a VP, the line item for the PCVP could be deleted, as well as the line item for that VP's chief-of-staff. He called for any other line items people wanted to change.

Mr. Rajan said the Finance Committee recommended that \$8,000 in total be assigned to that position, for a stipend, with everything else zeroed out. Mr. Daniels said there would be no money for supplies or meeting meals. Mr. Rajan said the recommendation was to have the entire budget at \$8,000. There could be \$100 for discrepancy funding and \$100 for meals. He asked if this Officer needed need supplies and copying. Mr. Daniels said there was usually a Project Coordinator retreat every year. There was also \$0 for programs and events. Ms. Cementwala said she thought \$1,000 would be appropriate.

Ms. Schild asked how the retreat was currently funded. Ms. Hsueh said it was funded through the Business Office Manager's account.

Ms. Ahrendt asked what the cost was for that. Ms. Hsueh said she would think it was \$500 would be plenty. They usually have one longer retreat for the fall and a shorter one in the spring.

Mr. Rajan said he did 15 times 48 times 14, and that was \$10,080. Ms. Ahrendt asked if this would really be 15 hours a week. Ms. Cementwala said that was the question.

Ms. Freedman asked if they could send this question to the Finance Committee. Mr. Rajan said the Finance Committee already had a recommendation. Mr. Daniels said they could change this in September. Mr. Rajan said the recommendation was that the total budget be \$8,000. If they had \$1,000 for expenditures, that would mean a \$7,000 stipend for the Project Coordinators Officer. Mr. Daniels said that meant a stipend \$7,000; Programs & Events, \$500; Meeting Meals, \$400; Supplies, \$0; Travel, \$0; Discretionary, \$100; for a total of \$8,000. That would leave a difference of \$14,100.

Mr. Rajan asked if they could move the savings, the \$14,100, into a line item, Contingency. It was currently at \$0. Mr. Daniels asked if they need a contingency fund since they had a reserve, and asked about the difference between a contingency and a reserve. Mr. Rajan said a contingency fund would be easier to access. Ms. Hsueh said a contingency was something they could allocate anytime, while a reserve was more like a CD. Mr. Daniels said they'd need a vote of the Delegates either way. Contingency was an

allocated amount of money, so if it wasn't used, it would go to the carry forward account, which the GA couldn't use for an entire year. The reserve was unchanged, and Delegates and money from that account could be taken anytime they wanted. Mr. Rajan said that a contingency in the GA's budget would be a surplus realized at the end of next year. Mr. Daniels said that if they didn't use it, they couldn't use that money in 08-09, whereas they could money in the reserve. Mr. Rajan said a reserve was meant to be something of a more solid go to it when contingency was depleted. Mr. Daniels said that a contingency, then, of \$14,100. So they'd have that. THE AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED WITH NO OBJECTION. He called for any other changes or amendments, and hearing none, called for a motion.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE GA'S 2007-2008 BUDGET, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

ELECTIONS

Mr. Daniels said they would first consider the position of President. He called for any nominations. With Ms. Cementwala chairing the meeting, Mr. Daal nominated Mr. Daniels. Ms. Freedman nominated Mr. Daal, who respectfully declined. Ms. Freedman nominated Mr. Begtrup, who respectfully declined.

A Delegate asked if he had any ideas for the Action Agenda. Mr. Daniels said that would be student life, graduate empowerment, and effectiveness, mainly meaning to empower committees and really create a broader base of support, including getting Delegates more involved in day-to-day processes and decision making. Health care will be a huge issue. They had a relatively good health care plan in comparison to other places, but that didn't mean it was efficient. And lastly, diversity. He didn't think the GA as a group were particularly racially diverse, didn't think they represented all departments on campus, and didn't think they did a very good job with outreach. Faculty diversity was atrocious, and that was something they could work on. Those were his four points.

Ms. Cementwala asked Mr. Daniels to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. A motion was made and seconded to approve Mr. Daniels as GA President by acclamation on the condition that he do the Chicken Dance when he returned. THE MOTION TO ELECT MR. DANIELS AS GA PRESIDENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. Ms. Cementwala asked to have Mr. Daniels returned to the room, and said she would like to congratulate him. She said the condition of the election was that he do the Chicken Dance. Mr. Daniels did the Chicken Dance. (Applause) Mr. Daniels he would like to thank them.

With Mr. Daniels chairing the meeting, he said the next position up for election was the Campus Affairs Vice President, formally known as the Academic Affairs VP. He called for any nominations.

Ms. Anderson nominated Miguel Daal. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Daal to make a statement. Mr. Daal said he was interested in matters dealing with academic affairs. He was on the Executive Board and has been involved with the GA for five years. Next year will be his sixth year. So he was well versed in the organization. He was on the Graduate Council. He talked to his advisor

about running for this position, and the advisor said it was okay. One thing he was particularly interested in was advising and making sure graduate students got good advising. Seeing no questions, Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Daal to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MIGUEL DAAL AS CAMPUS AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Daniels asked to have Mr. Daal return, said he would like to thank him. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said the next position up for election was the Rules Officer.

Mr. Wolgin nominated Mr. Rajan. Ms. Ahrendt nominated Mr. Dillon, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Daniels asked to extend the meeting time by 30 minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Rajan to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE NISH RAJAN AS RULES OFFICER PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Daniels asked to have Mr. Rajan return, said he'd like to congratulate him. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said the next position to consider was the Budget Officer. He called for any nominations. Ms. Cementwala nominated Ms. Ahrendt, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Rajan nominated Ms. Anderson. Ms. Anderson asked how many hours a week were involved. Mr. Rajan said it depended on how many hours a week they wanted to put into it. It was easy, and the position just had to make up the budget. Mr. Rajan said he would help, since he'd almost definitely be on the Committee. He put in perhaps on average ten hours a month. Ms. Anderson said she would like to continue to work on the Grad Council.

Mr. Daal nominated Mr. Ortega. Mr. Ortega said he was thinking of applying for a chief-of-staff, so he respectfully declined.

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

Ms. Anderson said she was a Math grad student.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MEGHAN ANDERSON AS BUDGET OFFICER PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Daniels said he would like to congratulate her. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said the next position was for the Project Coordinators Officer. Mr. Daniels said he knew somebody who was interested, but they couldn't attend the meeting that evening. He called for any nominations.

Mr. Begtrup nominated Ms. Jenkins, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Daniels said that hearing no nominations, he said the GA would consider this position later.

Mr. Daniels said the next position up for election was Funding Committee Chair. This, and the Technology Committee Chair, would be voted upon. Mr. Begtrup moved to table election of these positions until after the By-laws were approved, since there was no point in electing them until the By-law amendments were approved. The motion to table was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels said they would next consider the election of three Graduate Council representatives and one alternate. The GA would elect four, and from among themselves, the reps would figure out who the alternate would be.

Ms. Anderson nominated Ms. Freedman. Ms. Ahrendt nominated Ms. Crosby. Mr. Rajan nominated Mr. Wolgin. Mr. Rajan nominated Mr. Rheume. Ms. Anderson nominated Diane, who respectfully declined. Mr. Daniels nominated Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Dixon said he would like to know more about the position. Ms. Ahrendt said the Grad Council was an Academic Senate committee that oversees all issues related to graduate education, including departmental reviews and changes to programs, with three student representatives and an alternate. It had 12 members, including administrators and faculty, and met once a month for about three hours. Ms. Freedman said it met on Monday from 2:00 to 4:30. Ms. Ahrendt said there were also Executive Board responsibilities. Mr. Dixon said he would accept the nomination.

A Delegate asked if there was a stipend. Ms Ahrendt said there wasn't.

Mr. Daniels said that seeing no other nominations, they would hear candidates' statements. Mr. Rheume introduced himself and said he would like to advocate on behalf of graduate students. He was good working in group situations, as he demonstrated working on the British Petroleum Resolution the GA considered. He was from Mechanical Engineering. Ms. Crosby said she was from Performance Studies, was an observer in the GA for two years, and was looking for a way to become involved. She was looking for a little institutional knowledge. Ms. Freedman said she was in Chemistry and was a Grad Council rep that past year. She's really enjoyed it and would like to continue. Part of being a rep was to contribute to discussions about general academic affairs the Grad Council discussed, and to also deal with graduate groups that weren't departments, but were smaller, and offering graduate input to reviews of departments. It was incredibly important and she would like to continue. The one item of unfinished business on the Grad Council's agenda was one she was most interested in, changing qualifying exams, something that will be discussed next year. She would like to continue to improve that. Mr. Wolgin said he was in History. He was on the Rules Committee, re-writing the By-laws. He was most interested in student representation, especially transparency. He's been working in his own Department to get more students involved in committees. He saw a real disconnect in how students' words and actions were taken by departments and committees and what was actually done. He thought sitting on the Grad Council would be a good place to advocate for more student representation. Since the Grad Division was getting a new Dean, it was important to have good student advocates. Mr. Dixon said he was currently an undergraduate and was just admitted to the Goldman School of Public Policy. Last year he was the Vice President

for Academic Affairs in the ASUC and in that position he made nominations to committees for undergraduate spots. He has also served on nine different committees, and was a representative on the search committee for Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. So he had a lot of experience from the ASUC perspective and he would like to gain that with the GA. His main interest was in higher education policy, so this would be a great way to learn more about the graduate perspective. He thought he'd be a good voice for graduates.

Mr. Stavrinides asked if they were allowed to vote for a non-grads. Mr. Daniels said they could.

Mr. Daal said that people should realize that some things discussed at meetings could not be divulged outside due to confidentiality.

Mr. Dillon said it's been discussed that it was most beneficial for grad students on campus-wide bodies to have representatives in broad disciplines.

Ms. Tom asked if candidates were in PhD or Masters programs. It was noted that Ms. Freedman, Ms. Crosby, Mr. Rheaume, and Mr. Wolgin were in PhD programs, and Mr. Dixon was in a Master's program. Ms. Ahrendt said that having representatives from PhD and master's programs could be very important, since Master's programs tend to get ignored.

Mr. Daniels said they would have four votes. He asked the nominees to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote.

THE GA APPROVED BY HAND-VOTE THE FOLLOWING FOUR GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES FOR NEXT YEAR: DANA FREEDMAN, JOY CROSBY, JON RHEAUME, AND PHILIP WOLGIN. (Applause)

BY-LAWS PROPOSALS (cont'd)

Mr. Daniels said they would next consider the Executive Board By-law proposal for the Board's composition. They had two choices: all Officers, which included the VPs, the President and one Grad Council rep; or all Officers, the Grad Council reps and the Grad Council alternate, and all committee chairs.

Ms. Anderson said the Grad Council reps sit on the Exec Board and has historically been a foot in the door, with Vice Presidents sometimes starting as Grad Council members. On the other hand, if committee chairs were included, the Executive Board could get too big and unwieldy. So she was in favor of the status quo: all Officers and all four Grad Council reps. She would like to see something in the middle, either Officers and maybe two Grad Council reps, and to not include committee chairs.

Mr. Daal said he thought it was important that Grad Council reps have a big voice in the Executive Board so there was a diversity of departments represented on the Board, which could, at times, end up being made up with a lot of Law students.

Mr. Harley asked which committee chairs would be on the Exec Board. Mr. Daniels said the Officers would be the President, the Campus Affairs VP, the External Affairs VP, the Project Coordinator VP, the

Budget and Rules Officer. Committee Chairs would include Environmental Sustainability, International Affairs, Technology, and Funding. The proposal would also include all Graduate Council members.

Mr. Work asked why committee chairs should be included on the Exec Board. Mr. Daal said the Funding Officer was now a Chair, and that person worked with 30% of the GA's budget. It seemed that the Chair of the Committee that represented the base of the GA for so many grad students should be given a vote on the Executive Board.

Mr. Harley said he felt Environmental sustainability the chair should be a voting position on the Exec Board. In 2005, the GA adopted a policy for environmental sustainability, and the best way to oversee or enforce that was to have a position. This issue will be bigger on campus, and a lot of Resolutions about it will come through. He thought it was important to have a voice in the GA for environmental sustainability.

Ms. Anderson said these chairs could still attend meetings. The idea would be to have a small Executive Board with people who represent general things, and to then have specific interests taken up by Committee Chairs. They would have a vote when something came up to be voted on that applied to them.

Mr. Stavrinides said one thing they could do to improve participation from different groups in the GA was by giving people the chance to have their voices heard at the highest level, where decisions were made. It was a different way of participating and could actually influence decisions at the level of the Executive Board. That's why he would like to see all committee chairs as members of the Board.

Mr. Wolgin said the major debate there was the differences between what the Exec Board would do. The Exec Board runs the day-to-day actions and the GA sets policy. He thought the entire Assembly should decide on bigger issues. So he would come down on the side of less rather than more.

Mr. Daal moved to extend speaking time by 19 minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Dillon said that one way to think about this was who got influence and who wanted to be there. For the last year and a half he's been on the Board, the way it's been run was that almost everything passes by consensus. Things rarely came down to a vote. In that sense, everyone attends had influence. The Exec Board was needed for decision-making on the most basic, fundamental things having to do with the GA's direction and management.

Mr. Daal said the current Exec Board was mostly voting members, with the exception of a couple of people. So he saw that as a draw, and bringing everybody in. He wanted to make sure people still continue to attend. It seemed that if a lot of people on the Exec Board couldn't vote, then maybe they'd stop showing up. That was his worry.

Mr. Daniels asked if people needed more time to make up their minds, because the merits of the question could be debated all night long. For those who have not made up their minds, he would ask what questions they had or comments they'd like to make in order to resolve this.

A Delegate said open meetings of the Exec Board were mentioned. She asked if any grad student could attend. Mr. Daniels said they could, except when the Board voted to go into closed session, at which point all non-members had to leave.

Mr. Harley said that if people couldn't make up their minds about these two options, there were other options they could consider.

Mr. Work moved to have a composition of the Officers and the three Grad Council reps. Mr. Daniels said the proposal would have the Exec Board comprised of the six Officers plus the three Grad Council reps. There would be no committee chairs. The motion was seconded. Mr. Daniels said he would only accept comments for or against the proposal.

Mr. Begtrup said that was the current situation, minus the Alternate and the Funding Chair.

Ms. Freedman said the current situation worked very well.

Mr. Harley said the bare-bones structure had the ratio that was too high of Grad Council reps to Officers. There should be two or one Grad Council reps. He also thought the Environmental Sustainability Chair should be included.

Mr. Begtrup said that would mean that chairs and such would be elected, but not be on the Board.

A Delegate said she thought there was room for capture by the Grad Council reps. She saw that at the meeting she attended. A high proportion of Grad Council reps to Officers didn't sound like a good option.

Ms. Anderson said that as an Officer now, she would still want Grad Council reps there. Three was half as many as the number of Execs, so if all the Officers wanted something, the Grad Council reps couldn't change anything.

Mr. Begtrup said the new By-laws, 12.5.1, call for Committee chairs to be elected. Also, 4.7 says chairs, unless otherwise directed by the By-laws, were elected members of the committee or work group; and if that was not feasible, then the chair would be elected by the Delegate Assembly. The Funding Committee had to make funding decisions in August, so it would not be feasible for the Funding Committee to elect a chair. In other words, the GA had to elect a Funding Committee Chair that evening. The other Committees chairs, including Technology, ES, and International Affairs, would not be elected by the Delegates.

Ms. Freedman moved to call the question on Mr. Work's proposal. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Wolgin said that people seemed to have an issue with the number of Grad Council reps on the Board, so he asked about considering two out of three of the reps.

The motion to approve Mr. Work's proposal, an Executive Board of nine voting members, to include three Grad Council reps and all Officers, failed by hand-vote 8-10-0. Mr. Daniels called for other motions.

Mr. Harley moved to have an Executive Board comprised of all Officers, three Grad Council reps, and the chairs of the Environmental Sustainability and Funding Committees.

Mr. Rajan said the Executive Board discussed about this. Funding was one-third of the GA's budget, but it had very specific rules and did not set policy for the GA in any way. The main issue he's heard of

having the Funding Chair on the Exec Board was for them to answer questions on funding appeals, which could be done by inviting people to a Board meeting. He understood funding was one-third of the GA's budget, but he didn't see where in the Funding Committee's rules and regulations, the Funding chair could dictate policy, any more than the chairs could of the International Student Affairs Committee or the Technology Committee.

Mr. Daal said he would amend to include the Chair of the International Affairs Committee. The amendment to the amendment was adopted by the author as a friendly amendment.

Ms. Anderson said she didn't like the idea of putting all these chairs on the Board. They serve very specific constituencies, and there were other committees, for GSIs/GSRs and women's committees, and she didn't like the idea of having a voting member for international students but not for women. There were so many different constituencies it would be nice to have represented. But they couldn't represent all of them, even if they had people to chair the all. And the Exec Board would have too many members. International students got together and had enough motivation to have a committee, and that meant their voice should be heard more than people who didn't have that motivation to get together and form a committee. But she didn't necessarily think they should also get a vote on the Board, and she thought they should just advocate to the Board. She thought that was also true about Environmental Sustainability. And she didn't think the Funding Committee chair would want to be on the Exec Board, as they had enough to do.

Ms. Cementwala said they just elected a Project Coordinator Officer who will theoretically represent interests of the Projects, including for women, minorities, and a number of others. She didn't know if that meant the Exec Board would have the voice of committees, and that therefore they should include chairs of Environmental Sustainability and International Students. She thought the expansion of the Exec Board into something large and unwieldy was a bad idea. They had enough meetings, and long ones. With more people on it, the Exec Board would also turn into a mini-GA. That wasn't necessarily bad, but if people wanted to get involved, they could form subcommittees under Campus Affairs or External Affairs. But putting committee chairs on the Exec Board was unwieldy.

Mr. Daniels said the Project Coordinator Officer represents interests of Project Coordinators, who program for particular communities on campus. That didn't mean the PC Officer, in their official job description, in any way represented the needs or interests of committees of color or other communities. Certainly, they could do that if they wanted to, but that was not their role per se. That was just to clarify. In reality, they may act like that, but that was not their role.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels said the question on the floor was to have a new Executive Board comprised of all Officers, three Grad Council reps (not the alternate), and the chairs of the Environmental Sustainability, International Student Affairs, and Funding Committees. The motion to approve the above composition failed by hand-vote 7-12-0.

Ms. Freedman moved to table this issue until the September GA meeting. Mr. Daniels said that would mean they'd have the President, VPs of Campus Affairs, Budget, and Rules, three Grad Council reps, one alternate, and the Funding Officer. The GA would not be following the new By-laws on this and they'd be referring to the old By-laws as to composition.

Ms. Ahrendt said the By-laws call for all Officers. Ms. Cementwala said they just passed a new Officer. Mr. Daniels said it was a moot point because the Project Coordinator was elected and wouldn't be elected until September.

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

Mr. Daniels said he would prefer to have no debate on the motion to table. A motion to call the question was made and seconded. Mr. Harley objected. He said they'd have a longer debate in September and he thought they were close to getting something done. He thought they could vote on another structure instead of doing the same thing over in September.

Mr. Begtrup said he thought it was unfair to make a decision like this with so few people present. They were trying to beat this decision into submission until it ended up into something he wasn't sure they'd be happy with in the fall.

Mr. Harley said he would withdraw his objection to call the question. Mr. Purdy objected. He said that one thing that would be different in the fall was that there would be a lot of new members of the GA who will not have had this experience in making a decision. He thought they could make a decision that evening, and should.

The motion to call the question and end debate on this passed by hand-vote 12-3-0. The motion to table discussion of Executive Board By-laws until the September meeting, failed by hand-vote 9-11-0.

Ms. Jenkins asked for the lower bound, i.e., all Officers, including the President, VPs of CA, EA, PC, Budget and Rules Officers, and one Grad Council rep.

A friendly amendment was suggested to have the Exec Board comprised of all Officers plus two Grad Council reps.

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

Mr. Daal said the Executive Board has been talking about this for three months, so it wasn't surprising it was taking so much time that evening.

Mr. Daniels said the vote would be on all Officers plus one Grad Council rep. The motion failed by hand-vote 7-10-0.

Mr. Harley moved to have the Board comprised of all Officers and all three Grad Council reps, and the Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Committee. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote 6-9-2.

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to table discussion.

Mr. Stavrinides asked about keeping the current structure of chairs being non-voting members, but having the right to vote when an issue a result of that related to their specific area of responsibility. Mr. Daniels

said that would mean all Officers, all Grad Council reps, each chair, if the question related to their areas, and those chairs would have a vote when issues arose before the Exec Board that concerned that committee. It was so moved and seconded.

Ms. Cementwala asked who would decide whether chairs got to vote or not. If photocopies became an issue, she asked if that would relate to Environmental Sustainability. Student families could also relate to international students, and she would ask who would decide whether chairs would have a vote. Mr. Stavrinides said the Delegates would get to decide. This would give the committees a say. Most times things would not come down to one vote, but it would give Committee chairs the option of using their vote.

Ms. Anderson said that when questions involved one's issues, that was the definition of a conflict of interest. It made sense to put in the wording that chairs would be non-voting members of the Exec Board. And she could promise the Exec Board would listen to them when important issues come up that concerned their committee.

Mr. Begtrup said this was not a workable solution. At one point, the Board talked about having non-voting members of the Exec Board. That would mean they couldn't be kept out of closed session and they could have their voices heard. But the idea that they would vote on the issues they decided they cared about was silly.

Mr. Purdy said that when they had questions with the Chinese Students Association, there was profound ignorance of the Exec Board regarding the matter. That argued for having International Student Affairs students involved. This would be helpful to people who didn't have specific expertise.

Mr. Daniels asked if people had made up their minds, since people could state their positions endlessly.

On a point of order, Mr. Wolgin said he didn't think they had a quorum. Mr. Rajan said 33 people signed in, and if they had 17 people present, they had a quorum. Mr. Daniels said that if they didn't have a quorum, the meeting could be over, and no decisions on this could be made, and they would not have elected a Funding chair. Mr. Rajan said that would mean the Executive Board would have to elect one. Mr. Daniels said that wasn't the case, and said the Board would take the place of the Funding Committee.

Mr. Daniels asked certified Delegates to please raise their hands. Mr. Daniels asked to see how many people signed in. Mr. Wolgin asked to withdraw his request for a quorum.

Ms. Cementwala asked if they could just have committee chairs serve as non-voting members on the Exec Board, to be required to attend and to remain during closed session.

Mr. Daniels said there was a motion to amend Mr. Stavrinides's motion, to make all the chairs mandatory attendees of the Executive Board, but not voting members. That would include Environmental Sustainability, International Affairs, Technology, and Funding. The motion was seconded. Mr. Daniels said motion would have the Exec Board also include all Officers and the four Grad Council reps. Mr. Harley asked if the alternate was included. Mr. Daniels said the alternate would be a voting member.

Ms. Freedman said she couldn't recall the last time something came down to a vote, and said the Board usually operated by consensus.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 13-5-0.

Mr. Daniels said he would like the Alternate to be a non-voting member because they had 10 people. Ms. Cementwala said she'd accept that as a friendly amendment. THE AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED. A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daniels said the proposal was to have an Executive Board comprised of six Officers plus three Grad Council reps. The Alternate and the four committee chairs would be required to attend all Board meetings and would be able to remain in closed session, but would not have a vote.

Mr. Stavrinides asked if they would debate on the proposal. Mr. Daniels said that if people have not made up their minds, he'd be happy to debate. But there was no reason to simply express their opinions about benefits or drawbacks of a particular proposal if they've made up their minds.

Mr. Stavrinides said that with this amendment, the four committee chairs would have all the responsibilities as the other Board members, but wouldn't have the same rights.

A motion to call the question and end debate. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote.

The motion to approve the composition under consideration of the Executive Board failed by hand-vote 9-10-1.

A Delegate said they had a friendly amendment, to go back to the wording where it wasn't required that committee chairs attend all Board meetings, but just once a month. That would mean they'd have the ear of the Exec Board but wouldn't have to go to every meeting. They would also be included in closed session meetings of the Board. The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT AND THE PROPOSAL PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 18-2-0, TO HAVE THE EXECUTIVE BOARD COMPRISED OF SIX OFFICERS AND THE THREE GRAD COUNCIL REPS. THE GRAD COUNCIL ALTERNATE AND THE CHAIRS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, TECHNOLOGY, AND FUNDING COMMITTEES WOULD BE REQUIRED TO ATTEND A BOARD MEETING PER MONTH, ABLE TO REMAIN IN CLOSED SESSION, BUT WOULD NOT HAVE A VOTE. (Applause)

ELECTION OF FUNDING CHAIR

Vince Law was nominated for Funding Committee Chair. Mr. Daniels said that Mr. Law was a former ASUC Senator and would be starting a degree in the fall in Mechanical Engineering. THE MOTION TO APPROVE VINCE LAW AS FUNDING COMMITTEE CHAIR PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Daniels said he would like to congratulate him (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said that concluded their agenda. He wanted to thank them very much and said he hoped they have a great summer.

This meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m. (Applause)

These minutes respectfully submitted by Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary

Present at the May 3, 2007 GA Meeting

Abigail Sedlacek, Folklore
Aileen Cruz, East Asian Languages and Cultures
Alberto Ortega, Public Health
Carolyn Hawkshaw, German
Catherine Barry, Demography
Charlene Ng, Integrative Biology
Christopher Yopp, Public Health
Corie Lynn Cobb, Mechanical Engineering
Dan Work, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Danna Freedman, Chemistry
David Purdy, Statistics
Debra Lam, Public Policy
Diane Wong, Astronomy
Gabe Harley, Materials Science
Henry Stem, Law
Jonathan Rheume, Mechanical Engineering
Jonathon Repinecz, French
Justin Virgili, Chemical Engineering
Karl Chen, Computer Science
Kate Jenkins, Materials Science
Kathryn Schild, Slavic Languages and Literatures
Keno Urquiza, Mechanical Engineering
Kristen Durham, ERG
Loddie Hagar, Chemical Engineering
Marta Filipski, Public Health
Michael Rosen-Prinz, Law
Miguel Daal, Physics
Philip Wolgin, History
Rachel Vandagriff, Music
Rebekah Ahrendt, Music
Sarah Tom, Demography
Shonan Vora, IEOR
Triffid Abel, Geography
Srinandini Parthasarathy, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Funie Hsu, Education
Owen Ozier, Economics

Resolution Regarding the Denial of Basic Civil Rights, Including the Right to Education, for Religious Minorities In Egypt [as amended on the floor]

Whereas, according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, access to education is a fundamental human right; and

Whereas, the Government of Egypt is a signatory to this and other human rights instruments; and

Whereas, it has come to our attention that the Government of Egypt continues to systematically deny access to basic civil rights, including higher education to religious minorities in Egypt on account of their faith; and

Whereas, we, as graduate students in an institution of higher education, feel moved to speak out against the denial of such access to fellow graduate students in Egypt;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that we express our deep concern and voice our opposition to this blatant discrimination and extend our hopes that attention be focused on urging the Government of Egypt to comply with the obligations of international human rights instruments to which it is a party.

Be It Further Resolved, that the President of the Graduate Assembly use the following letter and submit a similar opinion letter to local papers in the name of the Graduate Assembly.

Resolution Calling for Opposition to the Dwinelle Café [as amended on the floor]

Whereas, we believe that the highest priority of a public university is to support the intellectual and professional development of its students; and

Whereas, the plan to install the Dwinelle Cafe, a Cal Dining service, in the midst of the many classrooms and offices of the 6th floor of Dwinelle Hall, adjacent to 370 Dwinelle, the most frequently used large conference and seminar space in the building, runs directly contrary to that priority; and

Whereas, the increased noise level and traffic will render 370 Dwinelle an inappropriate venue for academic events during the business hours of the Cafe; and decreased access to wet kitchen facilities and locking storage will make the space far less suitable for hosting multi-day events, even outside of Cafe business hours; and

Whereas, the loss of full access to the only free (for departments housed in Dwinelle) or nearly free (at \$50 per half-day or \$100 per day for non-Dwinelle departments) large conference space on campus will be a heavy blow to student-organized, student-run, and student-attended events that until now have been held in 370 Dwinelle on a near-daily basis; and

Whereas, we are concerned that Dwinelle lacks sufficient building management and janitorial staff to cope with the current demands of building operations, and that the Dwinelle Cafe project does not include provisions to help alleviate the increased demands the Cafe will certainly cause; and

Resolution Calling for Opposition to the Dwinelle Café (cont'd) [as amended on the floor]

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly opposes the decision to implement the Dwinelle Cafe plan.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly Delegate from the Linguistics Department will communicate this opposition in writing to the Deans of Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and the Graduate Division by May 15, 2007.