

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 7, 2008

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting commenced the Spring Semester. It was called to order at 5:30 p.m. There was a show of hands for new Delegates. Most people were continuing Delegates. New Delegates were asked to select a committee to join.

Announcements

The GA had a new Web site.

A GA info session will be held February 21 to learn more about the GA, in preparation for GA elections in March.

There was a new satellite counseling office at 2241 College.

The UCSA Lobby Conference will be March 1-3, at Sacramento.

A childcare focus group will meet on Friday.

TEACH US will meet after the GA meeting.

The Green Initiative Fund was accepting grant applications. About \$175,000 was available to grant that year.

Student Regent applications were available and an informational session will be held on Monday.

The "Bridging the Gap Conference," for high school youth, will be held on February 22 at the MLK Student Union.

The Grad Social Club's first event of the year will be a St. Patty's Day Party, Tuesday, March 4.

BAMN was showing a videotape deposition of Ward Connerly.

The Business Office was doing a survey, with an iPod Nano as a prize.

Introductions

Introductions were held of GA participants.

Delegates were encouraged to attend committee meetings.

Elections

The GA elected Gabe Podesta as Funding Committee Chair and elected to the Scott Armstrong and Jessica LePak as GA Representative and Alternate to the Graduate Council, a subcommittee of the faculty Senate that oversaw academic matters related to graduate students.

Report from the Interim Funding Committee Chair

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the allocations recommended by the Funding Committee for Grants, Round 5; Grad Events, Round 4; and Group Resources, Round 2.

Report from the Student Regent

Ben Allen introduced himself, Student Regent, a third-year Law student at Berkeley. The Governor called for a 10% cut across the board to all State programs. That spoke broken system of public finance in the State, and a group of students, largely the UCSA and Student Regent, were discussing financing issues across the System. The State's tax base relied on certain kinds of taxes that were very sensitive to certain parts of the market, leaving them in what was now a very difficult budget situation. They'll discuss trying to get together all public education sectors to lobby State government to think more proactively about finding new revenue for the State's public education and other institutions. They were working to protect mental health and academic preparation and student-initiated outreach. He was also trying to work to raise the profile of student affairs to the Regents.

Report from ASUC Representatives

The ASUC lawyer was retiring and a search committee, with GA representation, was looking for a new lawyer. The ASUC Auxiliary put forward a plan to redevelop commercial space in the ASUC, to be considered by the Store Operations Board, on which the GA had reps.

Report from Dean of Students Jonathan Poullard

Graduate students had a high level of risk for mental health issues as a result of stress, isolation, and the singular research they do. GSIs did not have enough information and skills to address classroom management issues that arise due to mental health issues, behavioral issues, or outbreak behavior. He'd like to discuss this further with the GA.

Resolutions for Referral

A motion to consider that evening the Resolution on Standing Policy to Increase Underrepresented Minority Enrollment in the UC System and to Support the BOARS Admissions Proposal failed by hand-vote 19-9-4. the bill was referred to the External Affairs Committee.

Resolutions

The GA considered the Resolution to Advocate that a Portion of the Graduate Student Instructor Orientation Be Devoted to Environmental Sustainability. The Resolution would have the GA advocate to the Director of the GSI Teaching and Resource Center that a portion of the Graduate Student Instructor orientation be devoted to how to be a "Green GSI."

It was noted that 300 classes were not centralized, and it would be better to have this information at the GSI orientation. At 300 classes, a lot of GSIs already had their Web pages, and it would be nice to have them to begin with. The Resolution was amended and passed by voice-vote.

The GA considered a Directed Action In Support of Student Participation in Faculty Hiring Committees. The Resolution would have the GA expresses its support for a letter to be sent to all UC Berkeley departments and programs that hire faculty affirming the ideal of student involvement in faculty hiring. This was a coordinated effort with the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion and the ASUC. The bill also had broad support for faculty and administrators. The bill was amended and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

The GA considered the Budget Amendment to Adequately Fund the PC Officer Position for the Year. The bill would increase the Project Coordinator position from \$7,000 to \$10,200 and increase the position's discretionary line item from \$100 to \$200, and decrease the contingency line item by \$3,400. The position was created at the end of last year to improve relations between GA Projects, the Executive Board, Delegates, and the campus. The GA voted last year to only fund this for a half year, to see if the position was necessary. It was thought that the position was found to be surprisingly necessary. A concern was expressed that the GA was spending more on bureaucracy to provide its services. The Resolution was amended and passed by voice-vote.

The GA considered the Amendment to the Funding Procedures to Reduce the Number of Graduate Events Funding Rounds from Three to Two Per Semester. The bill would have two funding rounds per semester, instead of three. A concern was raised that the change would mean groups would have to plan in the Spring Semester events that would occur in the 1st Round of the fall. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA voted to table the bill, refer it back to the Funding Committee and the Rules Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daniels said he wanted to thank them for attending the meeting, the first Delegate Assembly of spring, 2008. He wanted to wish a happy belated New Year to everyone. They had a very full agenda that evening and he'd like to finish by 7:30 and start a good precedent for the semester. That didn't mean people shouldn't talk, and they need Delegates' participation. But to avoid having to come to a vote on whether to extend the meeting, he would ask them to try and end quickly.

Mr. Daniels asked for a show of hands of people who were new Delegates, and noted that not many hands were raised. So most people there knew what was happening. If people didn't understand an acronym, a

Announcements (cont'd)

- 4 -

name, or something that was referenced, he would ask them to please interrupt and raise a point of information, to make sure everybody was on the same page and that the discussion was fruitful.

Mr. Daniels noted that this was the fifth Delegate Assembly meeting of the academic year. He asked people to please attend committee meetings as well as GA meetings. The GA operated as a student government by grads' involvement and participation. He would also ask people to please fill out a feedback form. It was how the GA kept attendance and how they got feedback on things. If they don't fill it out they wouldn't be marked as present; and if they miss two GA meetings, they may be removed as a Delegate.

For new Delegates, Mr. Daniels said he would ask them to please select a committee to join. Introductions of everybody will be held later that evening.

There was also space on the feedback form to note any problems people have had with reimbursements. If they've had any trouble being reimbursed for any expense whatsoever on campus, the GA was looking into that issue and needed Delegates' feedback about what was actually happening with that on campus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daniels said the GA has a new Web site. He would ask people to please check it out and give the GA their thoughts. Not everything has been converted to the new site yet and they were still working out different processes.

Also, the GA will have an info session on February 21 at 6:00 at Anthony Hall. If people were interested in learning more about the GA, or getting more involved, they were encouraged to attend. There will be food. The reason for the info session was because at the GA's next meeting, in March, they'll hold elections for 08-09. All elected positions will be voted on in March.

Mr. Daniels said there was a new satellite counseling office at 2241 College, and there was a sheet with more information in the agenda packet.

Mr. Ortega said there will be a Lobby Conference March 1-3 sponsored by the UC Student Association. It was basically a weekend retreat. On Saturday and Sunday they'll go to Sacramento for workshops on California government and how to lobby representatives. And then on Monday people will go and speak to their elected representatives. People will leave on Friday afternoon and get back on Monday. Everything was paid for, including transportation, the hotel, and everything else. But people had to register, and the deadline was on Friday. He'd write the information on the board. Mr. Daniels said this was a great opportunity to lobby legislators in Sacramento, particularly because a 10% across-the-board budget cut was being considered.

Mr. Daniels said there will be a focus group related to childcare on Friday from 1:00 to 2:00, in Anthony Hall. Ms. Hubbard said people could also send comments if they couldn't attend regarding their situation

and things they have observed. There was more information in the E-grad newsletter. This was being organized by a campus administrator.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

Mr. Rheume said he talked about TEACH US at the first GA meeting of the year. He was on the committee last year but was kind of busy since he took his qualifying exam; so things got a little bit stalled. But a bunch of people met and they've come up with a good strategy. That semester they'll try to roll out online course evaluations for the College of Engineering. That was their goal. Ms. Hubbard said they had other goals as well, and they were going to have a brief after the GA meeting. This was one of the Action Agenda Items that the GA decided upon last semester. They haven't talked about it much lately. It was for people who were passionate about improving the quality of teaching in their departments. The committee was focusing on the College of Engineering because it had a good system and a good format. The committee basically had a protocol in place that they just had to sell to the College, and to then possibly expand it. Ms. Hubbard said she was in the College of Chemistry, which was sort of their next target, since she was there. If people in those or other departments were interested in improving teaching, as well as in having a mentorship relationship with an undergrad, she would ask them to please stick around for a few minutes after the GA meeting.

Mr. Stanley introduced himself and said he was the Acting Chair of The Green Initiative Fund and also the GA rep to the TGIF grant-making committee. The Green Initiative Fund was now accepting grant applications for the coming cycle. So if people had ideas, or knew people with ideas to make the campus greener, he would ask them to please consider applying. Students, faculty, and staff were eligible to apply. The Committee had about \$175,000 available to grant that year. This was funded by a student fee, \$5 per semester, per student. So this was students' money, and hopefully they'll have great ideas about how to put it to good use. People could learn more at the Web site, tgif.berkeley.edu and could send them an e-mail. In the meantime, since Delegates were representatives from particular campus departments, he would ask them to please let their departments know that this opportunity was available. Mr. Stanley said they would like to see a tidal wave of applications coming in that semester. He wanted to thank them.

Ben Allen said he wanted to introduce graduate and undergraduate representatives from UC Riverside, who were at the meeting that evening to observe the GA.

Rachel Luna said she worked with the Dean of Students, Jonathan Poullard, and she was there that evening to talk to the GA about the Student Regent position. The application process was now open. She had some informational fliers that talk about what the Student Regent position was and what it did. She also had applications that she'd leave. Applications were due on February 21. There will be an informational session on Monday from 2:00 to 3:00, in the Senate Chamber. If people wanted to learn more about it, they could talk to her or to Ben Allen, the current Student Regent. Applications were also available in 102 Sproul, the recruitment office for the Student Regent position.

Brandon Nicholson said he was the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Coordinator for the GA, but he was making an announcement on behalf of the Graduate Minority Students Project, about an upcoming conference to be held in two weeks, the "Bridging the Gap Conference." It was being planned by a combination of people, graduate students and also, for that year, high school youth from Oakland, Berkeley, and the surrounding areas. Essentially, it was a youth activism conference incorporating different elements of youth culture that were pertinent to the students in this area, including hip-hop and spoken word. There will be a lot of performances and break-out sessions on questions around vio-

lence and non-violence, and pertinent community issues. It will be all-day event on February 22 at the MLK Student Union. It was open to the public, and hopefully, he'd see them there.

Elaine Shapland said she was head of the Grad Social Club and said their first event of the year will be a St. Patty's Day Party, Tuesday, March 4. There will be live music and it will cost \$5, for all they could

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

drink. They'll probably have some type of beer-type games. People could bring a guest, who did not have to be a Berkeley grad student.

Ronald Cruz said he was a Delegate and an organizer of BAMN, the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration and Immigrant Rights and Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary. Ward Connerly was a former UC Regent, a black Republican businessman, who passed Prop. 209, which pushed the ban on affirmative action at the UC system, leading to a dramatic drop in underrepresented minority students in the UC System, especially in graduate schools. Mr. Connerly was now trying to ban affirmative action in five states. BAMN did a videotape deposition of Ward Connerly last October as part of BAMN's federal constitutional challenge to Connerly's Statewide ballot initiatives across the country, and they're going to have a viewing of that video deposition. Shanta Driver, the attorney who conducted the deposition, who was also the national Co-Chair of BAMN, will be there as well. This will be a real opportunity to see pro affirmative action arguments confronting Ward Connerly, and his responses. Ms. Driver will speak on the case and talk about how UC Berkeley students can get involved. Mr. Cruz said he also thought this would interest many of their colleagues, their undergraduate students, and faculty, so people should feel free take extra copies of the flier and post them in people's offices and put in mail boxes. He wanted to thank them.

Ms. Hsueh said the Business Office of the GA was doing a survey. People could go to the Web site to take the survey. It will continue until March 7. Only grad students can participate. There will be a prize will be an iPod Nano, with the winner to be selected by a drawing on March 10. People could fill out only one survey.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Mr. Daniels said the minutes were not on the Web site at that point because of a delay with the site. So they'd approve the December minutes next month. However, they did need to approve the agenda.

Ms. Anderson asked to make a motion, to switch the order of the elections to be held. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Daniels said that just to let everybody know, at GA meetings they follow a loose form of Robert's Rules, although they try not to let procedural issues bog them down. But if things got contentious, they do tend to rely on Robert's Rules.

The motion to switch the order of the elections passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the agenda as amended. It was so moved and seconded. The motion to approve the agenda, as amended, passed unanimously by voice-vote.

INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Daniels said that most of them already knew who everybody was, but he just wanted to remind everyone how big the GA was and what people did. Information in the agenda packet included descriptions

Introductions (cont'd)

- 7 -

of who people were, their titles, what they did, their e-mail information, and any committee information they had. Most people knew who everybody was, so they'd go through the introductions quickly.

Introductions were held, including:

Budget Officer, Meghan Anderson

Business Manager, Susan Hsueh

Business Office staff, Cat Gutierrez, Diana Chandara, Elisa Estrera, and Evelyn Taur

Campus Affairs Vice President, Miguel Daal

Campus Affairs Chief-of-Staff, Yenhoa Ching

Environmental Sustainability, Dan Buonado and Brad Froehle.

External Affairs Vice President, Triffid Abel

External Affairs Chief-of-Staff, Alberto Ortega;

Funding Advisor, Natan Tuchman;

Funding Chair, open position; Graduate Council Representatives, Phil Wolgin and Danna Freedman

Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention, Brandon Nicholson

Graduate Minority Student Project, Funie Hsu

Graduate Social Club, Kate Williams, Elaine Shapland

Graduate Student Parent Researcher, Katrinell Davis

Graduate Support Services Project, open position

Graduate Women's Project, Carmen Mitchell

International Student Affairs, Ahmed El Antably

IT Support, Angel Kittiyachavilit, Hua Chen, Peter Tran

President, Josh Daniels

President's Chief-of-Staff, Marta Filipski

Project Coordinator Liaison, Jade Sasser

Rules Officer, Nish Rajan

Technology Chair, Karl Chen

"The Berkeley Graduate," Mariam El-Naggar

Women of Color Initiative, Zeli Rivas.

Ms. Mitchell said the Graduate Women's Project will have a caucus meeting on Friday 15, a lunch; Mr. Froehle said the next Environmental Sustainability Committee meeting will be on Tuesday morning; Mr. El Antably said the International Student Affairs Committee will meet February 15 at noon at Anthony Hall; Mr. Daniels said that he and Ms. Filipski plan the meetings, so if there were any issues with food, materials, seating arrangements, they should let them know; Mr. Daniels said Ms. Rival will put on the Empowering Women of Color Conference, on March 8. It's the 23rd Annual Conference, the longest-running conference of its kind in the entire country. People come from all over the country to visit and speak.

Mr. Daniels asked if there were any ASUC representatives who would like to introduce themselves. Mr. Rhoads introduced himself and said he was an undergraduate ASUC representative to the GA. Lisa Patel introduced herself and said she was an ASUC Senator. Danielle Duong introduced herself and said she was the other ASUC Senate representative to the GA.

Mr. Daniels asked if anybody not on the Executive Board knew what “ASUC” stood for.

Elections -- Funding Committee Chair

- 8 -

Mr. Daniels said that one person who didn't introduce himself was Steve Litwak, who has been the recorder for many years. He was awesome and it was worthwhile just introducing themselves to him. He's gone through many generations of the Graduate Assembly and the ASUC Senate. They don't appreciate him enough but he did all the hard work recording them.

Mr. Daniels said that for those Delegates who weren't on a committee, they needed to be on one.

Ms. Anderson said she wanted to make a pitch for the Budget Committee, because the next two months will be the most important months for putting the budget together; and it was the budget that would pretty much determine how the whole GA would run next year. The Budget Committee currently only had only one more member than was needed to have quorum; so if two people didn't show up they wouldn't have a quorum. They need to have a budget in two months, so if people wanted to have a really big affect on operations for the GA next year, the Budget Committee's next meeting will be next Wednesday at 5:00, and a Wednesday the month after that. It was a really good Committee.

Mr. Daniels said they weren't very strict last semester about committee attendance, but if Delegates commit to a committee, he would ask them to please attend the meetings. And if they couldn't attend, he would ask them to please let the committee chair know they, so chairs knew who to expect and whether or not there would be quorum. Committees were very important for the internal operations of the GA. If Delegates couldn't commit to a committee due to a conflict, they could talk to him or Ms. Filipski and they'd find something that worked for them, since there were a lot of options. But it was important that Delegates' commitment was to more than just attendance at GA meetings.

ELECTIONS

Mr. Daniels said he'd go over the elections process. People could nominate themselves or anyone could nominate them. The GA would then hear quick statements, they'd have Q&A, and the candidates would then leave, at which time the GA would to have a discussion and a vote. If people weren't Delegates, he would ask them to please not vote. If people got paid by the GA or were not a graduate student, they were not a Delegate.

Mr. Daniels said they would first hold election for the Chair of the Funding Committee. He said the floor was open to nominations.

A Delegate nominated Gabe Podesta. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Podesta to please make a statement as to why he was interested in the position.

Mr. Podesta introduced himself and said he was a first-year grad. He's been on the Funding Committee and thought he could run Committee meetings and respond to e-mails; and apparently he wanted a job no one else wanted. Beyond that, he would be more than happy to discuss his qualifications, but he thought everything he has said indicated he was qualified for the position.

Mr. Daniels call for a questions for Mr. Podesta. Mr. Mr. Inkabi asked what he was studying. Mr. Podesta said he was in the Law School.

Elections -- Funding Committee Chair

- 9 -

A Delegate asked why he was interested in the position. Mr. Podesta said they definitely need a permanent chair for the Funding Committee. He thought they had a great interim chair at their last meeting, but they need someone permanently, who understood the funding process. The Funding Committee did some pretty good work, but every time they came meet they've had to approve amounts that had a global reduction, 50% or 60%. He thought it was really important to get that number down. So if they elect him, that would be his priority. He would work with student groups. He understood that groups couldn't just get more money from the GA and they need to work with groups so they'll start to submit realistic applications. Right now people were pushing all the numbers up. And then the Funding Committee says a group could only have half of what it asked for. If groups actually asked for what they need, instead of asking for twice what they need, then they get to cut their fat. That was why he would like the position. He thought the number by which they globally cut groups needed to come down.

Ms. Anderson asked what his opinion was about the Funding chair being overworked. Mr. Podesta said he supported the idea of giving the Funding chair a little bit more, and thought that that was perfectly reasonable. But the GA shot that down. So to that extent, he thought it was moot.

Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Podesta to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After discussion, Mr. Daniels said that Mr. Podesta was elected Funding Committee Chair. Mr. Daniels asked to have Mr. Podesta brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate him. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said that nominations were open for the Graduate Council. Ms. Anderson said the Graduate Council is a subcommittee of the faculty Senate that oversees academic matters related to graduate students. It's made up of 12 faculty and three grad students. Grads don't really have much of a voice to set the agenda, but they do have a voice to make sure the graduate student voice was heard when faculty dealt with issues that affected grads. Being on the Grad Council was a lot of fun and GA members learn about how the University worked.

Mr. Daal said that as for expectations, people had to attend one two and-a-half hour meeting every month, the first Monday of every month, beginning at 2:00. They would also be a member of the GA's Executive Board, which included all GA Officers. It met once every two or three weeks. There were things Grad Council reps had to keep secret since Grad Council agendas were usually confidential.

Ms. Anderson said that the two and-a-half hour Grad Council meetings were incredibly pleasant, with a bunch of smart people sitting at a table. Grads may disagree with them, but these were people with the best of intentions who didn't have a lot of time. It was a great job.

Mr. Daniels said the open positions were for a Representative position and an Alternate position. The top vote getter would be rep and the second vote getter the alternate, unless they winner chose differently. He called for any questions about the position before the floor was open to nominations.

A Delegate asked why the agenda of Grad Council meetings was confidential. Ms. Anderson said the agenda was no longer secret two months after. The Graduate Council approved maternity leave for PhD students, but then the University System had to allow Berkeley to do that. Grad Council members knew it was going to happen, but weren't allowed to say anything because the University didn't want that out without the matter being completed. Mr. Daal said the Grad Council also got heavily into departments' policies because it reviewed PhD programs. So they look at what professors say about departments and

Elections -- GA Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)

- 10 -

critique everything, and the Grad Council didn't want that getting out. Ms. Anderson said a main part of the job on the Grad Council was doing reviews of departments and graduate groups. They all go through the Grad Council. The Grad Council didn't necessarily do the evaluations, but reviewed them and made all the confirmations. A lot of that was confidential.

Mr. Daniels said the floor was open for nominations.

Ms. Abel Gavi Begtrup. A Delegate nominated Scott Armstrong. Jessica LePak nominated herself.

A Delegate asked if the positions get renewed every semester. Mr. Daniels said that two people resigned at the end of last semester. These positions in one month will be up for election for next year. The regular terms was for a year.

Mr. Daniels said the floor was closed to nominations, and said they would ask the candidates for quick statements, after which the floor would be open for questions.

Mr. Begtrup said he's been a Delegate for three years, although last year he took a break in order to be Legislative Liaison and External Affairs VP. He was interested in being on the Grad Council because this was his last year there and he kind of didn't have the time to be a Vice President, but would like to have a way to be more involved. At the end of last semester there were some pretty interesting issues, like British Petroleum, and now they had issues with trying to get students more involved in faculty search committees. He would really like to see what was happening on the faculty side of things. He also kind of missed being involved on the Executive Board and would enjoy being more involved in the GA as a whole.

Mr. Armstrong said he was a sixth-year in the Math Department. This was his first year as a Delegate in the GA. He thought it would be fun to be on the Grad Council. He's also been involved in the Union for about three years, so he's talked to a lot of people in a lot of different departments and had a lot of experience talking to people about arcane things that happened in their departments and things that they wanted to improve. He has quit all his Union positions and that was why he thought this position would be fun to do. He was also in his second-to-last year.

Ms. LePak said she was from the School of Social Welfare and this was her third semester in the GA. She's never been on the Exec Board so this would be an opportunity for her. She was always an advocate because she was a social worker, and she advocated for social justice, people of color, people with dis-

abilities, all kinds of people, including everyone there. She was the Chair of the American Indian Graduate Student Association and was on the Advisory Board for the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion.

Mr. Siera said he was a sixth-year student in Molecular and Cell Biology, and if his advisor signed his dissertation, this will be his last semester there. He's been on the GA for two years as a Delegate. He's never been a formal leader and has been on the External Affairs Committee. One project he's worked on in the Committee was the seminar series to disseminate information about hot topics happening at that time at Berkeley. His interest in the Graduate Council came from being involved in the workings of his Department and on the Department's Graduate Admissions Committee and has been on some search committees, so he's seen the way that MCB students and faculty were selected and saw how the Department worked. He would like to get a broader perspective of how things worked on campus, and before he left Berkeley and the GA, he would like to feel that he contributed something in a leadership role.

Elections -- GA Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Daniels called for questions for the candidates. Mr. McDougal asked for one burning issue that they thought drove them to take up this level of participation, one passion or burning issue they had. Mr. Armstrong said he had many burning issues and was pissed off at non-resident tuition not being paid for when students worked as a GSI or GSR and that grads' health care sucked. He didn't know if those would come up at the Grad Council, but he was also pissed off about a whole host of other issues. If people would like a long list, they could have some beer and he could talk to them about it. Mr. Begtrup said he didn't know what was going on at the Grad Council, but for one thing, the BP issue wasn't over and was something he thought students were really interested in, but was something they didn't find out about until too late. And it wasn't something they had much of a voice in. He couldn't give a specific issue because he didn't know what the Grad Council was talking about, but he just wanted to bring the student voice to the table, something he'd be very appreciative of doing. Ms. LePak said just having their voice count as a student at those meetings was a big issue to her. So increasing participation and having the student voice valued was important. Mr. Siera said he found there were a lot of underrepresented groups, underrepresented minorities, in a lot of graduate programs at Berkeley. They had the paradox of having to wrestle with the effects of Prop. 209 on secondary education and undergraduate admissions, and he thought that has really affected the pipeline of who was able to come in and who was applying to their graduate programs. He thought that was an issue they could wrangle with and probably do a better job with.

A Delegate asked what they thought would separate a good candidate in this position from a great candidate. Mr. Armstrong said a good candidate from a great candidate would be someone who would do a moderate amount of work from someone who would do a lot of work. Typically, that's what he's found when he's been on committees. The people who do a lot of work were the people who got more done. Mr. Begtrup said people had to remember that the Grad Council was not one person, but multiple voices. He thought anyone there could do a good job of representing students. But some people had more experience doing it. But probably, they were all good choices. Ms. LePak said that as the only woman, a great candidate would be a woman, and a not so great candidate would be a man. Mr. Siera said that anybody who showed up at meetings would be good, and anybody who showed up and also participated would be great.

Mr. Harley said it sounded like some of the nominees were busy, and he asked if people had the time for the position. Mr. Armstrong said he just left the number-two position in the Union, which was about 400 hours per week, so he had a big hole of time. Mr. Begtrup said it was a busy semester, as every semester was. He kept putting off lots of things that he was going to do in grad school because he always thought he didn't have enough time. But people make time for the things they cared about. Actually, the whole

reason he was running for the position and didn't continue his other positions was because it would take time, but it wasn't a huge commitment that he thought Vice Presidents and chiefs-of-staff had. He had time to do this. Ms. LePak said that if people had a passion for something, then they find the time to do it. She thought that throwing one more thing into the mix of everything she did wouldn't throw her off-balance. She was a pro at juggling things. She's a single mom and she had an internship of 24-hours a week, but she always found time to do what she had to do. Mr. Siera said he had time for the position. He sort of had nothing left. He was in his last semester and was writing his dissertation. He gives chapters to his advisor and then waits, often times for weeks or months, to have the chapters returned. Mr. Siera said he didn't want to do too many more experiments because then he'd have more writing to do. It would be nice to make one last contribution while he was at Berkeley, and this would be his last shot. He had a lot of time on his hands and he thought it could make it work very well.

Mr. Daal said that as a former Grad Council member, and the person who was filling in for the vacancies at that time, he thought that what the GA needed in a great Grad Council member was someone who was

Elections -- GA Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)
Report from the Interim Funding Committee Chair

- 12 -

vocal and somebody who would not be shot down by the 12 professors on the Council, who were really well-established, so to speak. So he would ask the nominees to nod that they wouldn't be shot down and that they would vocalize for graduate students. He noted that all the nominees nodded in agreement.

Mr. Daniels asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. Mr. Daniels said people would get two votes. After for a discussion off the record and a vote, Mr. Daniels asked to have the candidates returned to the room. Mr. Daniels said the GA's Grad Council representative will be Scott Armstrong and the GA's Grad Council alternate was Jessica LePak. He would like to congratulate them. (Applause) He wanted to thank Mr. Siera and Mr. Begtrup very much. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said reports were included in the agenda packet. All he would say at that point was that they've been cleaning Anthony Hall. If any Delegates had an interest in 8x14 pieces of paper, they should let him know. They had over 1,000.

Report from the Interim Funding Committee Chair

Mr. Daniels said the Funding Committee recommendations were in the packet, for Grad Events Round 5, Group Resources Round 2, and Grants, Round 3. He didn't know the percentage of cuts offhand, but they could see by the amounts request and the amounts rewarded that none of them had cuts of 50% or more, which was good. Cuts the Funding Committee made from initial requests were in the range of 16-18%. He noted that Ms. Abel chaired the Funding Committee meeting.

Mr. Daniels said that if there were no questions, he would entertain a motion to approve the three allocations recommended by the Funding Committee. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS TO APPROVE GRANTS, ROUND 5; GRAD EVENTS, ROUND 4; AND GROUP RESOURCES, ROUND 2, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Report from the Student Regent

Ben Allen introduced himself and said he was currently serving as the Student Regent. He was a third-year Law student at Berkeley and was actually on the Grad Council his first year, so he was very excited to see the tradition continuing. He said Mr. Daniels wanted him to come in and say hello and give a little update on some of the things he's been working on. He had an office in Eshleman Hall and people were welcome to stop by and talk about issues. As they may know, there's one student member on the UC Board of Regents. Applications for the position were out and they really hoping to get a good pool of candidates for next year. The application to apply was open to all students throughout the System. People who serve in student government such as the GA were particularly encouraged to apply because they had some experience and actually have been thinking a little bit about the issues that face students around the System. As was mentioned, there will be an informational session on Monday with himself and the Student Regent Designate, D'Artagnan Scorza, a graduate student at UCLA, will be there as well. They'll

Report from the Student Regent (cont'd)

- 13 -

talk about the application process and encourage people to think about applying. Mr. Allen said he would ask them to please think about attending that session.

Mr. Allen said he's been working on a ton of different things, including sustainability issues and efforts, community college transfer issues, and a host of other things. But he wanted to focus in a little bit on the situation with the State budget. As was mentioned, a pretty serious cut was being proposed. As they may know, the Governor has called for a 10% cut across the board to all State programs. It was a very depressing number, and it spoke to the sort of fundamentally broken system of public finance they had in the State. A group of students have gotten together to discuss financing issues from across the System, largely through the UCSA and the Office of the Student Regent. They'll be talking a lot about this. Their approach has been to do their best to have a multi-track approach. One approach was to look at the big picture. This was a longer-term issue, looking at the situation with public financing in the State and the untenable system they had. All one had to do was to spend a little bit of time learning about Prop. 13 and the aftermath, and reading Peter Schrag and others who have written about the climate in the State and the downward spiral of funding for public institutions, and they'd learn that the State had a really serious crisis on its hands. And it wasn't going to go away just that year. It just so happened that the market tanked a little bit, and the State's tax base relied so much on certain kinds of taxes that were very sensitive to certain parts of the market. As a result, they were now in very difficult budget situation.

Mr. Allen said that one thing they'll discuss was trying to get together all the public education sectors, to make a lot more noise about impressing State government to really start thinking more proactively and progressively about finding new revenue for the State's public institutions, including K through 12, community colleges, the Cal State System, and the UC. If they think about the sort of impact that the May 1 protests were able to make about immigrant issues, he would ask them to think about the combined political, social, and economic capital of all those public education sectors. He thought they could really make an impact if they all organize. So that was something that was very much on the radar screen at that time. They had to start telling State government it was time to stop cutting State government's future and start investing again. Mr. Allen said their grandparents' generation really invested in public institutions, and their parents' generation kind of pulled the rug out. That needed to be turned around. So that was one thing that was being worked on at the macro level in terms of UC.

Mr. Allen said they were really working hard to make sure that several key programs were protected. One area they wanted to protect was mental health, something they were very concerned about around the UC System. Mental health was often mentioned as something that be including in budget cuts, which would totally be the wrong decision. They were also looking at graduate student support as another major priority, a situation they were very concerned about. They were also looking at academic preparation and student-initiated outreach, and trying to do all these things while trying to minimize the impact on their fee basis. They were very much open to suggestions and needed help with lobbying. He would therefore really encourage people attend the Lobby Conference in March, and also the Regents meeting in March, in Sacramento. In the longer term, they're trying to get together to study UC's finances, and look at ways to achieve cost savings, and at providing a student perspective in UC's budgeting process, which has been lacking.

Mr. Allen said the other thing he's been trying to work on, something that some people will be interested in, was trying to raise the profile of student affairs at the Regents' table. Right now there really wasn't a place for student affairs. It was mixed in among lots of different committees. Mental health, e.g., was stuck between the Health Services Committee and the Education Policy Committee. Fees go to the

Report from the Student Regent (cont'd)
Report from ASUC Representatives

- 14 -

Finance Committee, e.g., which was really looking at issues from more of a budgetary perspective, and looking at what the most budget-friendly solution was, rather than the most student-friendly solution. Education Policy, which was a central place for student affairs, was actually focused on policy and Academic Senate issues. So one thing that was on the table was perhaps creating a Statewide committee for student life and alumni affairs, to help explain the situation to the Regents. The schools, for example, that were most effected by alumni fundraising really put some serious interest and focus on issues of student experience and create students who enjoy their experience with the school and go on to other things. Mr. Allen said that if people were interested, his contact by e-mail was ballen@berkeley.edu. He had a lot of students working with him on different issues, but those were the themes of the day. Mr. Daniels said they would have Mr. Allen return.

Report from ASUC Representatives

Danielle Duong introduced herself and said she was an ASUC Senator and was there to tell the GA about an ASUC search committee that was looking for a new ASUC lawyer. She asked if the GA appointed anyone to that committee. Mr. Daniels said the GA representative would be Triffid Abel. Ms. Duong said they're going to begin the process. Mark Himmelstein has been the ASUC's lawyer for about 30 years and was retiring. So they need a new, good lawyer to represent students. So if people were interested in giving feedback, Ms. Abel was their representative.

Dave Rhoads introduced himself and said he was also an ASUC Senator, an undergraduate. He wanted to tell them about something on the commercial side of the ASUC that was going on. The ASUC Auxiliary, on the 4th floor, handled all the commercial operations of the ASUC. The businesses on Lower Sproul pay rent to the ASUC Auxiliary. Some of that money went to the students, including to the GA, with most going to undergraduates. The big deal was that the ASUC Auxiliary and the ASUC have put forward a plan to redevelop commercial space in the ASUC. This was important to graduate students because eventually, people want to have Lower Sproul, especially Eshleman and some of the other

buildings, completely torn down and redeveloped. They need to be seismically renovated and updated for students' use. So that was something that was coming up. It was important to the GA because there will hopefully be space for graduate students included in the redesign, perhaps a lounge area. The GA was actively involved in the long-term planning of Lower Sproul. The plan was to have some new businesses come in. They'd like to get the support of the Graduate Assembly at the Store Operations Board, and keep the GA informed about what was going on. If people would like to hear about the commercial plan, they Mr. Rhoads said they could talk to him or send him an e-mail. They could also contact other Senators. This issue was coming up, so if people had any questions, they could let him know.

Mr. Daniels said the GA's representatives on the Store Operations Board who deal with this commercial development were Nish Rajan and Alberto Ortega. If Delegates had questions, they could also answer.

Report from Dean of Students Jonathan Poullard

Dean Poullard introduced himself and said he met many of them last semester. He would apologize for being late, and was actually late because of mental health issues, which Mr. Allen talked about. He

Report from the Dean of Students Jonathan Poullard (cont'd)

- 15 -

wanted to talk to the GA very briefly about what was going on from the Dean's office and more specifically, talk about mental health issues. Delegates may be aware that the campus had funding for mental health on campus, but it was clearly not enough. He was late because he had two 5150s, which was involuntarily putting somebody in protective custody for their own good because of a psychotic break, with people acting out and being dangerous to themselves or to other people. That happened that day and it happened on Wednesday night. So he missed two events last night. And earlier last week he had three in one day. One was an undergraduate student and the other two were graduate students. As they may or may not be aware, graduate student have a lot higher level of risk for mental health issues. He thought that resulted from the level of stress and isolation that grads often experienced in going through graduate school and the research they had to do, which was very, very singular, and wasn't a very group activity. They're very much by themselves. He recalled how it was.

Mr. Poullard said one of the biggest issues from last semester with regard to mental health was that GSIs did not have enough information to address classroom management issues that arose when someone in the class acted out in ways that disrupted the classroom due to mental health issues, behavioral issues, or outbreak behavior. He knew grads had to go through GSI online training, but Mr. Poullard said it was clear to him that they may have knowledge about this, but they lacked skills. That is, they know what they were supposed to do, but didn't know how to do it. That resulted in not only levels of frustration and anxiety, but also in a situation going from bad to very bad. Mr. Poullard said he wanted the GA to help him think about this, and he'd like some time on the agenda at some point to come back and talk more in depth with the GA about what this looked like and how adequate they felt with the training they've received. He had a sense that it was not very good at all.

When he talked to the two GSIs last semester who had this problem, they didn't have a clue. One of them was a first-year student and it was her first class as a GSI, and the other was a third-year. And both of them felt completely ill equipped to deal with the magnitude that they were being asked to address in their sections and classes. As the Dean of Students, Mr. Poullard said he was very concerned about students' well being and he was glad that Mr. Allen brought up the topic of mental health because as funding from the State is decreased, the things that will go first will be the things that often were needed at the base;

and when they went away, that eroded how things got supported. This wasn't to depress them, but he wanted to bring these issues to their attention, as Delegates, to get a sense what was going on with UC, either individually themselves or what their peers were experiencing. So when they have this discussion next time, he would like to get more perspective on how to do a much better job, either through his office, the Dean's office, or through University Health Services. The goal was to actually give grads the tools they need to be successful in their work. Mr. Poullard said he was in 326 Sproul, and only two grads have come to visit him, and Mr. Daniels was one of them. People should feel free to stop by, and whatever he could do to assist people, he would be more than happy to do so. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank Mr. Poullard.

Mr. Daniels said that in the interests of getting out of there by 7:30, he would pass on having questions for any report that was given.

Resolutions for Referral

Mr. Daniels said the first Resolution to refer to committee was the Resolution on Standing Policy to Increase Underrepresented Minority Enrollment in the UC System and to Support the BOARS

Resolutions for Referral (cont'd)

- 16 -

Admissions Proposal. Ronald Cruz introduced himself and said he was the sponsor of the bill. He would like to move to fast-track the Resolution. BOARS, the faculty Systemwide committee on admissions, was meeting in February and the GA should have a position on this before the Committee met. Mr. Daniels said this Resolution was going to be referred to the External Affairs Committee. But with a three-fourths vote of yes/no votes, the GA could fast-track the bill and consider it that evening. There were four other Resolutions to consider that evening, and this would be discussed after those others were discussed.

The motion to fast-track the Resolution was seconded.

Mr. Begtrup said this was very complicated and he didn't feel it was something that people were well versed on or well prepared to vote on. The GA had a system of waiting one month for a reason, so that committees could look over bills and see whether they were well written and appropriate. As someone who sat on the External Affairs Committee, this was something the Committee would absolutely like to see and be able to weigh in on to give their recommendation. He didn't think it was right to rush this without giving time to consider it fully.

Ms. Anderson said she would normally ask why the bill wasn't introduced a month earlier. But this was the first meeting of the semester, and the GA should take into consideration that if the Resolution was voted on that evening, it would have had to be introduced in December.

Mr. Cruz said he thought the GA should move on the Resolution that evening. And if it turned out the GA felt there should be more deliberation over it, he was fairly well versed on the proposal and read the reports, and could answer a lot of questions. But the bill could be tabled if necessary.

The motion to fast-track the bill failed by hand-vote 19-9-4. Mr. Daniels said the bill would be referred to the External Affairs Committee and would be considered at the next meeting. If the bill was to be amended, that could be done at the next GA meeting.

Resolutions

The following Resolution was authored by Trevor Potter:

RESOLUTION TO ADVOCATE THAT A PORTION OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTOR ORIENTATION BE DEVOTED TO ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has resolved to be committed to environmental sustainability; and

WHEREAS, Graduate Student Instructors have great potential to reduce the use of paper and other resources; and

WHEREAS, Graduate Student Instructors can demonstrate the Graduate Assembly's resolution to other instructors and students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Graduate Assembly advocate to the Director of the GSI Teaching and Resource Center that a portion of the Graduate Student Instructor orientation

Resolution for a Portion of GSI Orientation to be Devoted to Environmental Sustainability (cont'd) - 17 -

RESOLUTION TO ADVOCATE THAT A PORTION OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTOR ORIENTATION BE DEVOTED TO ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY (cont'd)

be devoted to how to be a "Green GSI." This portion will inform GSIs of their ability to affect environmental sustainability on campus and explain ways to reduce the amount of paper they and their students use. Advice will include using e-mail and Internet posting for handouts and homework where possible, and otherwise using double-sided or OSC (one side clean) paper.

Mr. Potter said the Resolution was simply to have the GA's support in telling the people who run GSI orientations for first-time GSIs that a portion of time be devoted on how GSIs could make their work environmentally sustainable, mainly by reducing paper, reducing the amount of waste that was produced. Basically, GSIs would be urged to use Internet services. The Blackboard program was online and GSIs would be encouraged to post rather than use paper. They're just asking for the GA's support in telling the people who run GSI orientations that they'd like to fit this into the orientation.

Mr. Inkabi asked who would inform the Grad Division on how to be a green GSI. Mr. Potter said they could have somebody from the Environmental Sustainability Committee do a presentation or PowerPoint, e.g. Mr. Inkabi asked if the Resolution, then, wasn't asking the people who run the workshop to talk about how to be a green GSI, but was proposing that somebody from the outside come in and tell them. Mr. Potter said they were originally just proposing this subject to be add, for the first time. People who run the orientation were saying they didn't have time to put anything else in. So the Resolution would initially ask for that time. And then people would be happy to come in to do that.

Ms. Berkeley asked if there was another way to do the same thing, since she just attended the new GSI orientation and it was pretty long. She asked if there was some resource that could be made available, maybe as part of a 300 class. The whole orientation was on the long side, and if people used another

resource, they might pay more attention. Mr. Potter asked if it was so long that things just went over people's heads anyway. It probably would be better to do it through the 300 classes, but he didn't know if there was a way to get this idea through all the different 300 classes that were given. It seemed that there could be one time when they could have a five-to ten-minute presentation on environmental sustainability during the orientation.

A Delegate asked if he felt the Resolution would allow the planners to figure out the best way to do a presentation, and that this wouldn't bind them. So if the planners decided they could only spend three minutes in this, he asked if they could do that. Mr. Potter said they could.

Mr. McDougal said there was a follow-up meeting that people had to go to around Union issues. There was a controversy about whether or not Union discussions should be a part of the orientation. It seemed like there was a general theme of input into how their own orientation as GSIs went. He asked how they could more systematically or consciously change their orientation and not just make suggestions. Mr. Potter said they were offering the Resolution and hoped people would support it. Obviously, even if they had a small amount of time, this would take away from other things, but people believed this was important, and that's why they were presenting the Resolution.

Mr. Begtrup asked if they've talked to the Director of the GSI Teaching and Resource Center. Mr. Potter said it was the Director who said they didn't have time to add anything. So the GA's support was being

Resolution for a Portion of GSI Orientation to be Devoted to Environmental Sustainability (cont'd) - 18 -

requested so students could say the GA supported this. That would be the first thing to do, to let the Director know they were serious about it.

Mr. Froehle said that in previous years, the Committee prepared a quick five-minute slide show and asked her to show it during the orientation, and she adamantly refused, saying there was no time.

Mr. Armstrong said the reason for that was because they've been telling the Union for years that there wasn't enough time, and if they let somebody else in, they'd have to go back on that and they'd lose in arbitration. So that's probably why they weren't doing that.

Ms. Andersen said she wanted to speak to Ms. Berkeley's comment about the 300 classes. Ms. Anderson said she taught a Math 300 class and there was no central organization. They basically say "Here are your students, make them teachers." To include something in all 300 classes would require a structure to them that wasn't there. She thought it was a much better idea to have this information at the orientation. At 300 classes, a lot of GSIs already have Web pages, and it would be nice to have this to begin with. The GA was just saying this was important.

Mr. Froehle said the way the bill read was for inform people doing the GSI orientation that this was what the GA felt was important and to please do their best to try and put this someplace. He thought the GA should pass this because it was better than doing nothing on the issue.

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to make this a directed action as opposed to a Resolution, to be "Directed Action To Advocate that a Portion of the Graduate Student Instructor Orientation Be Devoted to Environmental Sustainability." According to their By-laws, there was nothing called a "resolution" any more. And also, the Resolved Clause could be amended to read, "Resolved, that the Chairs of the Environmental Sustainability Committee shall advocate on behalf of the Graduate Assem-

bly, to the Director of the GSI Teaching and Resource Center....” Mr. Potter said he would accept that as a friendly amendment. THE AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED.

With no objection, the question was called and debate closed. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, DIRECTED ACTION RESOLUTION TO ADVOCATE THAT A PORTION OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTOR ORIENTATION BE DEVOTED TO ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY.

The following Resolution was authored by Miguel Daal:

DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN FACULTY HIRING COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, the graduate students of the University of California at Berkeley, express the desire to become more involved in the faculty hiring process because their involvement will advance the mission of the University as well as set a progressive example for other universities to follow; and

WHEREAS, as the primary participants in classroom instruction on our campus, students can assure that a candidate's teaching ability will not be overlooked in the faculty hiring process; and

Directed Action In Support of Student Participation In Faculty Hiring Committees (cont'd) - 19 -

DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN FACULTY HIRING COMMITTEES (cont'd)

WHEREAS, candidates that are hired with student support will be more integrated into the Berkeley community because increased interaction with the student body will make the candidate more attractive to grad students for research opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the student perspective would provide a safeguard against the homogeneity of ideas, interests, and the composition of the University's faculty, ensuring that California's diverse intellectual reservoir can be summoned to tackle our State's most pressing challenges; and

WHEREAS, students involved in faculty hiring gain valuable professional skills from the experience that will help them contribute to their success as professionals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly (GA), on behalf of all graduate students, expresses its support for the attached letter addressed to all UC Berkeley departments and programs which hire faculty and affirms the ideal of student involvement in the faculty hiring the letter represents.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that President of the GA is empowered to sign the attached letter (or a similar version), on behalf of all students, requesting greater student involvement in the faculty hiring process.

Begin letter

We, the students of the University of California at Berkeley, express our desire to become more involved in the faculty hiring process. We believe that our involvement will advance the mission of the University as well as set a progressive example for other universities to follow. Our reasoning is as follows:

- As the primary participants in classroom instruction on our campus, students can assure that a candidate's teaching ability will not be overlooked in the faculty hiring process. Students remember that whereas the faculty live with the hire for the rest of their careers, the student body must live with the hire for the rest of the hire's career. Therefore, students have an interest in ensuring that the University invites exceptional educators to join its faculty.
- From their arrival, candidates that are hired with student support will be more integrated into the Berkeley community. For example, increased interaction with the student body will make the candidate more attractive to grad students for research opportunities. This collaboration will help the candidate thrive at Berkeley and it will help the department retain the hire.
- The student perspective would provide a safeguard against the homogeneity of ideas, interests, and the composition of the University's faculty, ensuring that California's diverse intellectual reservoir can be summoned to tackle our State's most pressing challenges. In particular, the students may be in better touch with the upcoming hot areas of research and student interest, ensuring a better match over time between professors and their prospective graduate student pool.

Directed Action In Support of Student Participation In Faculty Hiring Committees (cont'd)

- 20 -

DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN FACULTY HIRING COMMITTEES (cont'd)

- By including students in the faculty hiring process, candidates recommended for hire would benefit from the unified support of the entire department. Student support could potentially help the nomination stand up to scrutiny as it moves through the administration for ultimate approval.
- Students involved in faculty hiring gain valuable professional skills from the experience. These skills will help them obtain faculty positions and will generally contribute to their success as professionals. Of course, departments should take precaution to avoid conflicts of interest when approving students to be involved in search committees in much the same way that departments do so with the faculty members on hiring committees.

In the interest of selecting non-biased and representative students to be involved in faculty searches, we propose that departmental student associations nominate interested students to this duty. For example, students might be screened and interviewed by their peers in such associations prior to being submitted to the department for approval. In the absence of a departmental student association, the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) or the Graduate Assembly (GA) could provide this service.

We recognize the need for training to prepare students for involvement in faculty searches. As such, the ASUC and the GA propose to conduct orientation sessions for all interested students involved in faculty hiring. These sessions may be taught with help from the Office of the Provost and/or the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion.

The undersigned look forward to increased student participation in the faculty hiring process, and to its benefits for our Berkeley community.

End letter

Mr. Daal said the Resolution would send a letter to departments and other entities at the school that had the ability to hire faculty. This was a coordinated effort with the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion, the GA, the ASUC, who last month passed an almost identical bill, and Stiles Hall, an independent outreach organization on Bancroft, as well as various student departmental organizations. The bill had broad support for faculty and administrators. Faculty were asked to come up with words of support for this and he would distribute those. The bill would also assist students and the Administration to become involved in the faculty selection process by articulating the value added that students bring to the table when included. Finally, this would be distributed to various departments and faculty hiring organizations across the University, something the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion has agreed to do for the GA. Mr. Daal said he hoped the GA found it passable.

Mr. Daniels asked if he was taking the sentence in the Campus Affairs Committee's analysis as a friendly amendment. Mr. Daal said he would. Mr. Daniels said the amendment would add the following sentence to bullet point 3: "Students also bring diverse backgrounds to the faculty hiring process that can help identify and recruit faculty candidates that reflect the multicultural diversity of the State of California and the nation." THE AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED BY THE AUTHOR.

Directed Action In Support of Student Participation In Faculty Hiring Committees (cont'd)

- 21 -

Mr. Daal noted that in consideration of this bill in the Campus Affairs Committee, which he chaired, he excluded himself from discussion.

Ms. Hubbard said that basically, they hope that students will become more involved in the faculty hiring process. In a lot of departments, when a hire was made, the most complicated thing was scheduling a meeting where all faculty had to be present. And the vote had to be unanimous in some cases, which was how it was in her department. Students were invited to all the job talks, where the candidate gave a talk about their research, but everything else, their proposals, the discussion on hiring, all of that, was closed off, along with the faculties' vote. The bill contained recommendations, and she would ask what incentive departments had to do this and asked how they could hold departments more accountable to something like this. Mr. Daal said the University created a new position, the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion, who would like to see departments involve students more in the hiring process. The Vice Chancellor needed help from the students, a statement saying students would like to be involved. That was the first order answer to the question.

Mr. Inkabi said it was a little unclear exactly how they're asking for students to be involved in the hiring process. Mr. Daal said they shied away from prescribing any type of answer for departments because that would make it easy to shoot down, since departments have diverse faculty hiring processes. So they didn't want to include anything that wouldn't work for a particular school, wanted to be broad. Mr. Inkabi said he understood that, but a department could say that because students were invited to a job talk, they were involved in the hiring process. Mr. Daal said some departments actually meet all the stated ideals, and he should note that one intention of the document he distributed from the faculty describing their support was to have a kind of menu of possible ways that students could be involved in the hiring process.

Ms. Hubbard said that students, however, had to be invited. There might be a list of great things that departments could do, but students couldn't just show up to listen to someone's research proposal. Mr. Daal said they couldn't just show up, but if people were concerned that students weren't being included, the intention was for students to go to the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion and ask about this.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN FACULTY HIRING COMMITTEES, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was authored by Meghan Anderson:

BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ADEQUATELY FUND THE PC OFFICER POSITION FOR THE YEAR

WHEREAS, the position of Project Coordinator Liaison was intentionally established by the Delegates of the Graduate Assembly in the spring of 2007 as a half year position to allow for a thorough review of its usefulness before the allocation of further funds; and

WHEREAS, the provisional term of the PC Liaison is about to expire; and

Budget Amendment to Adequately Fund the PC Officer Position For The Year (cont'd)

- 22 -

BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ADEQUATELY FUND THE PC OFFICER POSITION FOR THE YEAR (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the PC Liaison has had a significant and positive impact of the functioning of the GA;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the 2007-2008 budget be amended to allow the position to continue by increasing from \$7,000 to \$10,000 the PC Officer (or PC Liaison) salary line item, increasing from \$100 to \$500 the PC Liaison discretionary line item, and making a corresponding decrease of \$3,400 in the contingency line item.

Ms. Anderson said that at the end of last year the GA established a Project Coordinator Liaison position, which Jade Sasser was currently filing. The idea was to try and improve relations between different arms of the GA. There were a lot of projects and project coordinators that kind of operated all by themselves, with funding dependent on the GA. And there was a lot of tension. So it was felt that maybe by creating a position that would connect these projects that the GA supported, it would give people an idea of what others were doing and perhaps improve relationships. This was Mr. Daniels' idea. He initially proposed making it vice president position, paid like other such positions. But the Budget Committee last year felt that was too much money for something they weren't sure would really work. So they established a smaller position, for half a year, with the intention of reviewing the position at the first meeting of the Spring Semester to see if it helped, and to then allocate more funding if they felt it did help.

Ms. Anderson said she would like to make a friendly amendment, with no net effect to the budget, to make the amount \$10,200, and to then take \$200 out of the Discretionary Fund and increase the PC Liaison discretionary line item from \$100 to \$300 instead of from \$100 to \$500. That was because Ms. Hsueh gave some estimates, and to continue to pay Mr. Sasser at the current level the GA would actually need \$10,198.

"Resolved, that the 2007-2008 budget be amended... to allow the position to continue by increasing from \$7,000 to \$10,200 the PC Officer (or PC Liaison) salary line item, increasing from \$100 to \$300 the PC Liaison discretionary line item, and making a corresponding decrease of \$3,400 in the contingency line item."

Ms. Anderson said there would be no net effect to the budget. **THE AMENDMENT WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Begtrup asked if anybody could speak to the impact of the PC Liaison and if it was worthwhile, or useful. Ms. Sasser said that from her perspective, one central reason why the position was created was to establish links between the Executive Board, the project coordinators, and the Delegate Assembly. Before that year there was basically no link or communication. Delegates really had no idea what project coordinators were doing. PCs would come in at the beginning of each semester and introduce themselves, talk about events for the semester, and then would usually not be seen again. The Executive Board also didn't really have a grasp of what PCs were doing from month-to-month, and there was now a regular line of communication. And it went both ways, and PCs were now much more clued in as to what was going on with the Executive Board and what was happening with the Delegate Assembly. The position was designed to bring PCs into other areas of the GA rather than operating completely separately and independently.

Budget Amendment to Adequately Fund the PC Officer Position For The Year (cont'd)

- 23 -

Mr. Inkabi asked if it's been successful. Ms. Sasser said that from her perspective, it has been.

Mr. Begtrup asked if he could move to have Ms. Sasser step outside for a few minutes.

Ms. Anderson said originally Delegates wanted to approve this position for fewer hours per week, and the person in the position before Ms. Sasser insisted the position wouldn't be worthwhile if the person didn't work as many hours as Ms. Sasser was working. Ms. Sasser thought the number of hours should be reduced and was actually working fewer hours than what the previous person had asked for, 18 hours. Ms. Sasser worked 15 hours a week.

Mr. Rajan asked Ms. Sasser if she saw the position as something that would continue in the future, or if she felt that links between PCs and the Exec Board could be automatic, without a formal liaison position. Ms. Sasser said that previous experience would suggest that this linkage would not be formed or maintained on its own, and wasn't there prior to the position being created. It was anticipated that this would be elected for next year.

Mr. McDougal said that as a new member, he would like to know more about the PCs and asked if those positions were recently created or if it was an ongoing structure that might be different next year. He asked for a little more background. Mr. Daniels said page 2 of the agenda packet had the structure of the GA. Some projects have been around for a very long time. The Graduate Minority Students Project was

operating in the '80s. Others were formed more recently. The Graduate Women's Project used to do the Empowering Women of Color Conference, but it was determined that too much work was involved, so a new position was created for that Conference. The GA used to have someone just for the summer to do the new Grad Student Orientation, but that was included in the Graduate Support Services Project Coordinator position. So they haven't remained static over the past, although this was group of positions that has been fairly consistent. Project coordinators were hired for two years, with a one-year evaluation. The expectation was that people would fill the position for two years. Most people were not rehired for the same position and were either offered another PC position or went off to do bigger and better things.

A Delegate asked if the position initiated communications. Ms. Sasser said it was communication as well as advocacy. And that link wasn't just between project coordinators and the Executive Board and Delegates, but also with the Administration, since she participated in meetings with University administrators where they talked about these projects as well.

Mr. Poullard said that what wasn't being talked about was the historical context for people who were new in the room. That's why PCs were created in the first place. They're talking about issues of marginalization and issues of access, but it was odd that the Executive Board was not talking about Ms. Sasser's effectiveness. To put her on the spot to answer for her own position felt very odd to him. He thought the Executive Board should have a voice about how they've seen this role play out during the past semester and why the position should or shouldn't continue.

Mr. Daal said he believed that when the GA voted on this position as a By-law revision last year, they decided to give it only half the funding that was originally proposed, to give people time to see if the position was really necessary. He thought the position has been found to be surprisingly necessary, in his view, and it's been extremely helpful with communication between the Exec Board and the PCs. That was communication that was absent before.

Budget Amendment to Adequately Fund the PC Officer Position For The Year (cont'd)

- 24 -

Mr. Inkabi said he wasn't on the Executive Board, but looking at organization chart, if there was no link, he asked how the Exec Board could manage the GA and how it was supposed to function with seven entities just floating off. Mr. Daniels said the project coordinators were under the supervision of the Business Manager, who was an ex officio member of the Board. Mr. Inkabi said there was, however, no liaison position. Mr. Daniels said Ms. Hsueh supervised the project coordinators and was on the Board and fulfilled that communication link and advocacy. Ms. Hsueh said the Business Manager was a career staffmember who attended Delegate meetings, meetings of the Exec Board, and worked with the PCs and the Business Office. As a career staffmember, she didn't know what students would like always project coordinators and the PC liaison, whole were grad students and knew the needs of grad students. So it was decided to have a student as the liaison between PCs, Exec Board, and between PCs and other entities.

Ms. Anderson said she was speaking as a member of the Exec Board who saw what was going, not in her position as Budget Committee Chair. She's seen a huge improvement in the relations between the PCs and the Exec Board since the Liaison position was created. But she's only at Exec Board meetings for two hours every other week. She didn't know if that improvement was because of Ms. Sasser or because Mr. Daniels wanted better relations with the PCs. Or if was a combination of things. It looked to her that Ms. Sasser was doing a really good job, but because she only saw Ms. Sasser four hours a week, Ms. Anderson said she had no idea whether the position needed 18 hours a week, or 15 or 10. She personally thought it was an important position, but she didn't know enough about it.

Mr. Rajan said he thought Ms. Sasser has been doing a phenomenal job. The Budget Committee last year was mostly concerned about whether the GA needed another position. The same feelings carried over to the Funding Advisor. The GA was spending a lot more on bureaucracy to be able to do the services it does. They already spend about one-third of their budget on it. He didn't mean to put Ms. Sasser on the spot, and it was mostly to see whether Ms. Sasser thought the position was effective and necessary.

Ms. Sasser said she requested a reduction in hours at the number the previous person in the position had requested. Mr. Daniels said the position had been at 17.5 hours a week and was now at 15. Ms. Sasser said she would think the minimum would be 10 hours a week.

Ms. Anderson said that as the Budget Chair and the person who put forth this amendment, she thought they shouldn't amend it, pay Ms. Sasser what she was getting at that time, and perhaps talk to her about next year's budget and what would be efficient. So she wanted the Resolution to reflect the situation. Maybe they should have this discussion for next year's budget.

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 ADEQUATELY FUND THE PC OFFICER POSITION FOR THE YEAR, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was authored by Vince Law:

AMENDMENT TO THE FUNDING PROCEDURES TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF GRADUATE EVENTS FUNDING ROUNDS FROM THREE TO TWO PER SEMESTER

WHEREAS, there are six (6) rounds of Graduate Events (GE) funding per year (Fall 2007 funding is comprised of Rounds 1, 2, & 3 and Spring 2008 funding is comprised of Rounds 4, 5, & 6) and applications are due before 12:00 p.m. on deadline dates; and

Amendment to Reduce Graduate Events Funding Rounds from Three to Two a Semester (cont'd) - 25 -

AMENDMENT TO THE FUNDING PROCEDURES TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF GRADUATE EVENTS FUNDING ROUNDS FROM THREE TO TWO PER SEMESTER (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the GA does not have enough funding to support 100% of funding requests; and

WHEREAS, two rounds per semester would encourage/reward graduate student groups who plan events in advance; and

WHEREAS, two rounds per semester will allow the Funding Committee to have a more accurate funding projection (meaning evenly distribute funding amongst all student groups with not as many global cuts); and

WHEREAS, two rounds per semester will slightly reduce the workload of the Funding Committee and the Business Office, with less number of rounds for review; and

WHEREAS, with two rounds per semester there is more flexibility changing dates because the round event timeline length is increased; and

WHEREAS, fewer rounds makes it easier to navigate the funding deadlines dates;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Funding Guidelines be amended starting in 2008-09 to include only two GE funding rounds per semester.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the 2008-09 GE funding rounds shall be as follows:

FALL 2008 EVENTS

<u>Round</u>	<u>Deadline Dates</u>	<u>Event Timelines</u>	<u>Notified</u>	<u>Receipts Due</u>
1	April. 11, '08`	Aug. 16 - Oct. 3	5/2/08	Oct. 6
2	Sept. 19, '08	Oct. 4 - Dec. 5	10/3/08	Dec. 8

SPRING 2009 EVENTS

<u>Round</u>	<u>Deadline Dates</u>	<u>Event Timelines</u>	<u>Notified</u>	<u>Receipts Due</u>
3	Nov. 14, '08	Jan. 12 - Mar. 7	12/5/08	Oct. 6
4	Feb. 20, '09	Mar. 8 - May 8	03/7/09	May 11

Mr. Podesta said the Funding Committee talked about this at a past meeting, but the commentary with the bill stated that the Committee did no analysis. Mr. Daniels said that referred to the most recent Funding Committee meeting. When the Funding Committee discussed the bill, it had not yet been submitted to the GA. There had to be a public announcement that the bill was going to be discussed so anybody who wanted to attend that meeting could do so.

Mr. Podesta said the Funding Committee discussed this and liked going from six rounds to four. The significant change was that the 1st Round for fall events would be due in the spring. The Funding Committee would consider and approve those in advance. Currently, the application for the 1st Round was due right after people arrived on campus; so a lot of organizations don't apply. He submits applications for a couple of groups and had no idea what the process was when he first got to campus. He thought this

Amendment to Reduce Graduate Events Funding Rounds from Three to Two a Semester (cont'd) - 26 -

change would be very helpful. Considering applications in the spring would also allow the Funding Committee to decide about the coming year and how they wanted to approach it. Currently, there actually was no Funding Committee to consider requests for the 1st Round, which were considered by the Exec Board. The Funding Committee starts to operate for Round 2. He thought the only disadvantage to this proposal, which was not insignificant, was that if one arrived on campus in the fall and wanted to start an organization, their very first opportunity to have the GA pay for an event was October 4. But for continuing organizations, he thought the proposal was actually better because existing leadership in the spring could plan out the first couple of months of the fall. He thought that would be very helpful given the quick turnover organizations have. When people get to campus, it's difficult to organize things, and this proposal would actually create a system where the previous year's leadership could make plans. The Funding Committee considered this proposal, but apparently not in the appropriate manner, and liked it.

Ms. Pulaski said her concern was that a lot of groups she was a part of had trouble planning events so far in advance, such as getting responses from speakers. Mr. Podesta said that if there was something about an event that a group couldn't quite hammer out, dates and speakers could be changed. People could apply for something that was very general, work on it when they got back from the summer, and then change names and dates. People didn't have to specify a speaker, a topic, or the actual date for an event, as long as they contacted the Funding Committee Chair with the new details. All speakers were pending

Mr. Daniels said they were at the end of the meeting and asked if there was a motion to extend time. A motion to extend the meeting time by two minute was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Harley said there was a limit to the times the dates could be changed. Mr. Podesta said he didn't think that was correct.

Mr. Rheaume said the good part of the Resolution was that it streamlined bureaucracy and reduced the number of rounds, and the GA had to support that. The bad part was that it was just not realistic to expect a group to plan in April a coffee hour or social event it will hold in September. He thought the GA should table the Resolution, fix it, and then re-introduce at the next Delegates meeting.

Mr. Podesta said the GA tabled this once before. Mr. Daniels said it wasn't tabled previously. Ms. Anderson said the GA failed to fast-track it. Mr. Podesta said that if the concern was having groups plan in April, and wanting to fix that, he didn't see what the fix would be. Making it August would not be helpful for organizations.

Mr. Rheaume said maybe they could have an open round in the fall for the first couple of weeks. He didn't think asking groups to plan five months in advance was realistic.

Mr. Begtrup said the change would disenfranchise new groups and didn't help anybody plan. He could submit an application for 2009 and just sit on it. He asked what the current deadline was for the first Round. Mr. Tuchman said it was August 3. Mr. Begtrup moved to make the first deadline August 3, the current deadline. Mr. Daniels said it should be August 1 or 8. Mr. Tuchman said that date could be flexible.

Mr. Daniels said they were out of time for the meeting. A motion to extend time by three minutes was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Amendment to Reduce Graduate Events Funding Rounds from Three to Two a Semester (cont'd) - 27 -

Mr. Begtrup moved to amend, have August 8 as the first deadline, replacing April 8. He said the notification would also have to move. Mr. Tuchman said that could be fixed, but the important thing was the number of rounds. Mr. Begtrup said the amendment would address one problem. It would be easier if there were less rounds. The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Armstrong moved to refer this back to the Rules Committee. This was a big change, and the Committee has not met on this. The GA could discuss it at the next meeting.

Mr. Begtrup said he would withdraw his amendment.

The motion to table discussion was seconded.

Mr. Inkabi asked what jurisdiction Rules Committee had over how the funding operated. Mr. Daniels said the Funding Committee's rules/procedures could only be approved or changed by the Delegates. Referring this to committee was to get more analysis and opinion. Committees don't enforce the policy, and Delegates had the final say over committee procedures. The motion would have the Rules Committee review this and give an analysis.

Ms. Berkeley said a lot of people apparently had ideas about improving the overall funding procedure, and asked whose responsibility that was. Mr. Daniels great if the bill was referred to committee, it would be discussed at the next meetings of the Funding and Rules Committees. Meetings were open and this would be a good opportunity for people to hash out various options.

Mr. Tuchman said these would be recommendations to the Business Office, which had the ultimate decision as to the deadline date. Mr. Daniels said that if there was a fiscal necessity, then the Business Office had the final say. If it was simply an issue of policy and could go either way, fiscally speaking, and would be okay in terms of an audit, then the Delegates had the choice.

THE MOTION TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION AND REFER IT BACK TO THE FUNDING COMMITTEE AND THE RULES COMMITTEE, FOR THE GA TO CONSIDER AGAIN IN MARCH, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Daniels said the GA Info Session will be Thursday, February 21, 6:00 to 7:00, at Anthony Hall. The next Delegates meeting will be March 6, 5:30, when they'll hold elections. People were also encouraged to attend the UCSA Lobby Conference. The Childcare Focus Group will meet February 8 from 1:00 to 2:00. And TEACHUS will meet after the meeting. Mr. Daal said there were a lot of openings for committees. Ms. Anderson said the Budget Committee needed members for the next two months, two one-hour meetings. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank people to sticking around.

This meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary

Amended Resolutions

- i -

Directed Action to Advocate that a Portion of the Graduate Student Instructor Orientation Be Devoted to Environmental Sustainability [as amended]

Whereas, the graduate assembly has resolved to be committed to environmental sustainability; and

Whereas, Graduate Student Instructors have great potential to reduce the use of paper and other resources; and

Whereas, Graduate Student Instructors can demonstrate the Graduate Assembly's resolution to other instructors and students;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Chairs of the Environmental Sustainability Committee shall advocate on behalf of the Graduate Assembly, to the Director of the GSI Teaching and Resource Center that a portion of the Graduate Student Instructor orientation be devoted to how to be a "Green GSI." This portion will inform GSIs of their ability to affect environmental sustainability on campus and explain ways to reduce the amount of paper they and their students use. Advice

will include using e-mail and Internet posting for handouts and homework where possible, and otherwise using double-sided or OSC (one side clean) paper.

Directed Action in Support of Student Participation in Faculty Hiring Committees [as amended]

Whereas, the graduate students of the University of California at Berkeley, express the desire to become more involved in the faculty hiring process because their involvement will advance the mission of the University as well as set a progressive example for other universities to follow; and

Whereas, as the primary participants in classroom instruction on our campus, students can assure that a candidate's teaching ability will not be overlooked in the faculty hiring process; and

Whereas, candidates that are hired with student support will be more integrated into the Berkeley community because increased interaction with the student body will make the candidate more attractive to grad students for research opportunities; and

Whereas, the student perspective would provide a safeguard against the homogeneity of ideas, interests, and the composition of the University's faculty, ensuring that California's diverse intellectual reservoir can be summoned to tackle our State's most pressing challenges; and

Whereas, students involved in faculty hiring gain valuable professional skills from the experience that will help them contribute to their success as professionals;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly (GA), on behalf of all graduate students, expresses its support for the attached letter addressed to all UC Berkeley departments and programs which hire faculty and affirms the ideal of student involvement in the faculty hiring the letter represents.

Amended Resolutions (cont'd)

- ii -

Directed Action in Support of Student Participation in Faculty Hiring Committees [as amended] (cont'd)

Be It Further Resolved, that President of the GA is empowered to sign the attached letter (or a similar version), on behalf of all students, requesting greater student involvement in the faculty hiring process.

Begin letter

We, the students of the University of California at Berkeley, express our desire to become more involved in the faculty hiring process. We believe that our involvement will advance the mission of the University as well as set a progressive example for other universities to follow. Our reasoning is as follows:

- As the primary participants in classroom instruction on our campus, students can assure that a candidate's teaching ability will not be overlooked in the faculty hiring process. Students remember that

whereas the faculty live with the hire for the rest of their careers, the student body must live with the hire for the rest of the hire's career. Therefore, students have an interest in ensuring that the University invites exceptional educators to join its faculty.

- From their arrival, candidates that are hired with student support will be more integrated into the Berkeley community. For example, increased interaction with the student body will make the candidate more attractive to grad students for research opportunities. This collaboration will help the candidate thrive at Berkeley and it will help the department retain the hire.
- The student perspective would provide a safeguard against the homogeneity of ideas, interests, and the composition of the University's faculty, ensuring that California's diverse intellectual reservoir can be summoned to tackle our State's most pressing challenges. In particular, the students may be in better touch with the upcoming hot areas of research and student interest, ensuring a better match over time between professors and their prospective graduate student pool. Students also bring diverse backgrounds to the faculty hiring process that can help identify and recruit faculty candidates that reflect the multicultural diversity of the State of California and the nation.
- By including students in the faculty hiring process, candidates recommended for hire would benefit from the unified support of the entire department. Student support could potentially help the nomination stand up to scrutiny as it moves through the administration for ultimate approval.
- Students involved in faculty hiring gain valuable professional skills from the experience. These skills will help them obtain faculty positions and will generally contribute to their success as professionals. Of course, departments should take precaution to avoid conflicts of interest when approving students to be involved in search committees in much the same way that departments do so with the faculty members on hiring committees.

In the interest of selecting non-biased and representative students to be involved in faculty searches, we propose that departmental student associations nominate interested students to this duty. For example, students might be screened and interviewed by their peers in such associations prior to being submitted to the department for approval. In the absence of a departmental student association, the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) or the Graduate Assembly (GA) could provide this service.

Amended Resolutions (cont'd)

- iii -

Directed Action in Support of Student Participation in Faculty Hiring Committees [as amended] (cont'd)

Letter (cont'd)

recognize the need for training to prepare students for involvement in faculty searches. As such, the ASUC and the GA propose to conduct orientation sessions for all interested students involved in faculty hiring. These sessions may be taught with help from the Office of the Provost and/or the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion.

The undersigned look forward to increased student participation in the faculty hiring process, and to its benefits for our Berkeley community.

End letter

Budget Amendment to Adequately Fund the PC Officer Position for the Year [as amended]

Whereas, the position of Project Coordinator Liaison was intentionally established by the Delegates of the Graduate Assembly in the spring of 2007 as a half year position to allow for a thorough review of its usefulness before the allocation of further funds; and

Whereas, the provisional term of the PC Liaison is about to expire; and

Whereas, the PC Liaison has had a significant and positive impact of the functioning of the GA;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the 2007-2008 budget be amended to allow the position to continue by increasing from \$7,000 to \$10,200 the PC Officer (or PC Liaison) salary line item, increasing from \$100 to \$300 the PC Liaison discretionary line item, and making a corresponding decrease of \$3,400 in the contingency line item.