

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

May 8, 2008

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting concluded the Spring Semester, and was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

Jobs were available with the GA. The GA was also soliciting ideas on what Delegates would like to see for a new project.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The GA will have an end-of-the-year party in Anthony Hall in two weeks.

The GA was doing a survey, on its Web site, on how grads voted in the ASUC elections. Information could be useful in talking to the Administration.

A Graduate Town Hall Meeting will be held on Friday. It was part of a campus-wide strategic planning effort on equity and inclusion.

The Spring Fiesta will be held next Thursday.

Copies of last month's *The Berkeley Graduate* were available.

The SUPERB Referendum on the ASUC ballot was defeated by 112 votes, meaning that grad students were the decisive factor in the vote. But the GA's own Brad Froehle lost the election to be an ASUC Senate by 4.7 votes.

The School of Optometry was having an Eye-Ball on Friday, a fundraiser.

East Asian Languages and Cultures was facing drastic cuts, and more than half of the Department could be eliminated, affecting affect thousands of people, with only 1,500 students as opposed to 3,200. Grads doing a specialization in East Asia could not take classes to fulfill language requirements. Over half the lecturers would be fired. EALC students requested any information about how the cuts on campus were being done.

The deadline to get reimbursed for student group spending was May 12. The Business Office, from May 27 through August 22, will be open Monday through Friday from 10:00 to 3:00. Career staff will continue to be there full-time.

Mr. Daniels was thanked for his service to the GA, and a card and flowers were presented by Mr. Daniels.

GA ELECTIONS

The position of Technology Committee chair was open. The chair did not have to be technically savvy, but should have an interest in those issues, such as downloading music. There were no nominations, and the task would fall to the President and the Executive Board.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 2 -

REPORTS

Report from the President

The GA had a Web site to collect ideas on possible ideas to propose to potential donors.

A presentation was shown recapping the year.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

A Resolution was fast tracked with no objection, to be considered at this meeting, Directed Action to Prevent the Increase in Early Childhood Education Program Full-Fee Rates for Student Families.

RESOLUTIONS

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution on Directed Action In Support of Increased Graduate Student-Focused Mental Health Services.

The Resolution calls on the campus to allot a significant portion of funding to specifically address grads' mental health needs and has the GA President send a letter the Director of Counseling and Psychological Services.

A few incidents in the UC System caused the President and the Regents to think seriously about this issue, and they approved an increase in student fees to support increased student mental health services. Berkeley used almost all of this money to hire new staff in CPS. A higher percentage of grads at Berkeley seek out help from CPS than do undergrads. The Resolution states that the GA would like a substantial portion of this funding to go towards graduate student-focused services. CPS has a satellite office for graduate students only, located between the Law School and the Business School.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved, with some clauses separated out, the Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency.

The changes to the By-laws that were approved in the Resolution, as divided, included the following: allow the President to appoint somebody else on the Exec Board to chair GA meetings; allow the Budget Officer, in consultation, state where different revenue sources would go; give final say over the composition of each committee to the Assembly; not allow bills to be fast tracked unless they were included in the agenda packet; require a reason a committee didn't consider a bill referred to it; allow for final consideration of bills coming out of committee without the author having to re-introduce the bill and be present.

Among the paragraphs that were divided out from the Resolution, the GA took the following actions: voted down an amendment to have Delegates' committee requirement filled only by GA committees; approved having all positions elected by the Assembly serve as voting members of the Exec Board; approved making reasonable efforts to have all GA events accessible, and to include language in advertising stating that an event was ADA compliant; asked the Exec Board to come up with changes to make

Action Agenda Item committees more accountable; included the Campus Affairs Committee and the External Affairs Committee in the GA's current committees.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution on Directed Action to Prevent the Increase In Early Childhood Education Program Full-Fee Rates for Student Families.

The Resolution asks that the proposed fee increase for unsubsidized students in ECEP be immediately frozen for 2008-09; asks to exempt ECEP from University-wide budget cuts; and forms a working group to revise University childcare funding and create a new fee structure for student families by 2009-10.

Students earning no more than \$4,200 a month pay no more than 10% of their gross income for childcare. When income was over that limit, the proposed increase would have about 70% of gross monthly income go towards childcare. The increase was announced two weeks ago. A couple with two GSIships at 50% each would no longer have childcare subsidized by the State, and they'd have to pay the full faculty rate.

2008-2009 GA BUDGET

Budget basics: the total budget was a little over \$810,000. Of that, about \$250,000 went into reserves; \$150,000 would go for student funding, travel, student group funding, and grants \$145,000 was for projects; \$90,000 was for Executive offices; \$83,000 was for the Business Office; \$36,000 was for IT and the Web; and about \$5,000 was for committees.

The major changes made for next year included the following: chiefs-of-staff for the President and the Campus Affairs VP were combined into one position; an Executive Office Assistant position was created, Executive Offices, the President in particular, to report to Mr. Tuchman; and the hourly rate that all positions were paid was the equivalent an hour to \$16 an hour, an increase from about \$14.

Another change from last year's budget was that the GA, from reserves, would gift the UC Berkeley campus \$25,000. GA money comes from student fees and commercial revenue generated Lower Sproul businesses, which has historically been student government money. The ASUC Auxiliary oversees the GA financially and provides commercial revenue, and the campus wanted to take some money from the Auxiliary. The GA and the ASUC successfully fought that. But to be a good campus citizen, and to demonstrate that the GA was an independent part of campus, they would make this gift voluntarily. That would reaffirm the GA's independence. If Lower Sproul is redeveloped, commercial revenue would probably double, to \$12 million. The campus might like some of that, and this voluntary gift could prove that the GA was independent. They would also suggest that this amount go towards graduate student fellowships.

Stipends in the budget were actually the same, and the increase in the hourly rate meant people would work a few less hours every week, from 15 hours per week to 14, for chiefs-of-staff and project coordinators

By unanimous voice-vote, the Assembly approved the 2008-2009 GA budget, as proposed.

This meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

Announcements

- 4 -

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Spring Semester, was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:35 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

Mr. Daniels said this was the last meeting of the year. He hoped they were ready for the summer, or at least for school to be over with. He'd ask them to please remember to turn in their feedback forms. If people would like to give criticism, constructive or non-constructive, there were extra forms available. They could use their name on one and be anonymous with the other.

Mr. Daniels said that if people were interested in a job with the GA, they should check that box on the feedback form. The GA was also looking at what sorts of things Delegates would like to see for a new project. There was a notice at the very end, which he would ask them to please read carefully. The departments that will be reviewed next year were listed, and if people would like to participate in the review process of their department, he would ask them to please let the GA know.

Mr. Daniels said dessert will be made available after the meeting. So for those who really wanted dessert, they'd have to decide between leaving early or getting dessert. It should be a fun meeting. The only major item was a discussion of the budget, which should be interesting. So to the extent they could stay, he would ask them to please do so.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AND THE AGENDA

Mr. Daniels said the minutes from the April meeting were online. They would approve at the same time those minutes as well as the agenda for the meeting that evening. He called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 3, 2008 MEETING WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION. THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daniels said that two weeks from that day the GA will have an end-of-the-year party in Anthony Hall, and there will be alcohol at the party. Fliers about the event were available. He would encourage people, if they were done with finals or grading, or if they were leaving, to please come by. It should be a fun time. There will be lots of good food.

Mr. Daniels said that one thing they did last year that they'd like to and this year was to do a survey on how graduate students voted in the ASUC elections, if they did vote. The link was on the GA's Web site. If people had the time, he would ask Delegates to please forward the survey to their departments so they could get those responses. That information would be really useful, because when GA representatives go to the Administration, the campus really listened to them when they tell administrators that 90% of gradu-

ate students voted a particular way. It would be very useful to have as many responses to the survey as possible.

Mr. Daniels said there will be a Graduate Town Hall Meeting on Friday from 1:00 to 4:00. The RSVP list was closed, but if people were really interested in attending this meeting, he would ask them to please

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

let him or Ms. Rivas know, and they'd see what they could do. The meeting was part of a campus-wide strategic planning effort on equity and inclusion.

Ms. Mitchell said that next Thursday, a week from that day, will be the Spring Fiesta. There will be Mexican food and a DJ, from 5:00 to 8 p.m. It will be a lot of fun.

Ms. ElNaggar said that if people didn't pick up a packet of *Berkeley Graduates* last month, they were available, and she would ask them to please pick up a packet to take back to their department.

Mr. Armstrong said that as they probably noticed, the SUPERB Referendum that was on the ASUC ballot was defeated by 112 votes. That meant that grad students were the decisive factor in killing it. So "yay." Unfortunately, the GA's own Brad Froehle lost in the election to be an ASUC Senate by 4.7 votes. So if Delegates and their 3.7 friends didn't vote, they should feel really bad.

A Delegate said the School of Optometry was having an Eye-Ball on Friday, a fundraiser. The GA was not able to provide funding for the event that year, and they were in danger of actually not making any money, which was unfortunate.

Janet L. introduced herself and Dade Humphrey, and said they were there to publicize the serious budget cuts that a department were facing, East Asian Languages and Cultures. Effectively, more than half of the Department would be eliminated, affecting affect thousands of people. Her friends were passing out factsheets. Classes will be cut from each language: Japanese, 40%; Chinese, 54%; and Korean, 66%. Korean was currently a minor, and the cuts would obliterate that. They'd have only 1,500 students as opposed to 3,200. This was long-term damage that the University would be facing. Next year's students outside Letters & Science would not be able to take any language classes from the Department any more. So current language students, if they wanted to go on to a second or third year of a language would not be able to do so.

Ms. Rivas said that incoming graduate students will be the last people able to sign up for classes. So if grads were doing a specialization in East Asia and needed to fulfill a language requirement, which most programs had, they wouldn't be able to do it and could not go on.

Mr. Armstrong asked where these numbers came from, and asked who has said these cuts would occur. Mr. Humphrey said the figures came from their Department. They worked out how these cuts would work and the numbers of instructors that would have to be laid off. Mr. Armstrong asked who told them they would be facing these cuts. Mr. Humphrey said it came down from the Dean. Languages were cut between 28%. Ninety percent of all the instruction in language in the East Asian Language Department came from a temporary budget, and over half the lecturers would be fired if this current situation continued. Ms. Rivas said there wouldn't be any Korean Studies, and graduate student work would be obliterated. And this was just for now. They already have hundreds of students on the waiting list, and were currently teaching 3,200, so they could easily fill classes up with just students in the Humanities. Right

now they're saying students in L&S could take classes, but preference will be given to students in the Humanities. And after that, it will just be EALC majors, if they continue to cut the way they were.

Janet said that if a student in Law or History wanted to take an East Asian language, they wouldn't be able to. Students were trying to organize petitions. There will be an electronic petition available to sign by

Announcements -- Cuts to the East Asian Language and Cultures Department (cont'd)

- 6 -

Sunday morning. They want to also try and get to the bottom of these budget cuts. The problem was that there wasn't transparency across departments as to what cuts they were facing, and whether EALC was the only one being cut, and what was going on. They've tried to ask questions of department chairs, but basically, no one was giving them a straight answer. They were trying to get a sense of how things were going. If Delegates were interested in helping them, and interested in making this University a truly interdisciplinary place, by enabling these classes to be there, she would ask them to please write their name and e-mail address and the group working on this would send them back an e-mail when the next petition occurred. She would also ask Delegates to please tell this group if they had any sense at all on the kinds of cuts their department were facing. This was important, and severe budget cuts like this could happen to any department, and could happen to Delegates' departments next year. So she would ask them to please help EALC out. If people knew anybody in the University Finance Department, or knew of some way to get some sense of how these cuts were being done, she would ask them to please let them know.

Ms. Rivas said they just opened up a new East Asian Library, and so much money was used to construct it. It was supposedly the only free-standing East Asian language library in the US. And yet, the campus couldn't pay to keep this Department, teach these languages, and allow that kind of access to students. It was a really skewed perspective on language and specialization, in not just area studies, but how this would affect anthropologists, historians, and even lawyers at Boalt, people who were always taking classes in the Department when they were interested in international law, e.g. They would no longer be able to do that.

Janet said the Web site will be up and running on Sunday morning. She would ask Delegates to please help them. They want to have a press conference on Wednesday and try and publicize this. She would ask people to please tell the students in this Department what they think by sending them an e-mail. It would truly help, and would help make Berkeley a truly interdisciplinary school.

Ms. Anderson asked if she could send Delegates an e-mail to remind them when the petition came back. Mr. Daniels said they could do that.

Ms. Hsueh said that on a lighter note, Delegates all belong to student groups, and if a group received funding that year and spent the money that was allocated to them, they should file the reimbursement within the 30 days, or by the deadline, May 12. If they don't file it after May 12, they wouldn't be able to get their money back. Secondly, the Business Office will start its summer schedule on May 27, through August 22. They'll be open Monday through Friday from 10:00 to 3:00. Career staff will continue to be there eight hours a day, but the Business Office will have limited hours since they'll have limited staff.

Mr. Daniels said he would urge Delegates to please not test the GA on the receipt deadline. They shouldn't put the GA or themselves in that situation and should just turn in their receipts. That's all the GA was asking.

Ms. Able so that Mr. Daniels has been an awesome President all year and they had some flowers and a card that everybody should have signed. If people didn't sign, she'd put it on the table outside and people could sign it before they left.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

Ms. Able said she would like to thank Mr. Daniels for making sure the GA got everything done that year. It would not have happened without him and his e-mails. So she wanted to thank him. A card and flowers were presented by Mr. Daniels by Ms. Able and Mr. Daal. (Applause) Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank them very much.

GA ELECTIONS

Mr. Daniels said the Assembly had now another opportunity to elect the Chair of the Technology Committee. He asked if there was anyone who had an epiphany and realized that technology was their thing, and wanted to help out the GA. Just to remind them, the Technology chair did not themselves have to be technically savvy, but should have an interest in that. This position could include content on the Web site, how technology was used, or issues involving technology, such as downloading music that wasn't technically legal. That was something that has happened to some of them in the room, he was sure. According to the Chief Information Officer on campus, if record companies were to actually go after a student, the student wouldn't be an undergrad who could complain to mommy or daddy, with resulting news reports about how some 17-year-old was getting beat up by a huge company. Rather, the student would be a 35-year-old computer science graduate student with 3,000 illegal videos on their site. So even though grads might not do as much illegal downloading as undergrads, record companies would probably pick on the grads. Issues like that could be what the Technology Committee chair could potentially address.

Mr. Daniels said that if no one volunteered, then the duty would fall to Mr. Daal and the Executive Board, until such time as someone nominated themselves. Or over the summer, Mr. Daal and the Exec Board could nominate an interim Tech chair, who would then have to be elected by the Delegates in September. Seeing no nominations, Mr. Daniels said they would move on.

REPORTS

Mr. Daniels noted that there was no Funding Committee report to approve that month.

Report from the President

Mr. Daal said there was one thing he would like to point out to the Assembly. They're putting together a site to collect ideas on what to propose to potential donors who might give money to the GA. They'll put

together a booklet, a “wish list,” of projects, or perhaps equipment, or events, that the GA would like to put on. That might include a lecture series, honoraria, things like that. They'll collect these ideas and give them to the donor population, through the Administration, Cal alumni, etc., and try to get funds to do these things for the Graduate Assembly. In his report, Mr. Daal said he listed a Web page where they're collecting this information. If Delegates had ideas for new projects, lecture series, etc., he would ask them to please write it down on that Web site and the GA will include it in the wish-list book.

Report from the President (cont'd)

- 8 -

Mr. Daniels said he had a presentation that recapped the year. It has been an honor to work with all of them. He's really enjoyed it, much more than Law School or Policy School, to be honest. He was sorry he didn't get to know all of them individually, because he was sure they were extremely smart, intelligent, creative, fun, and compassionate graduate students. It was too bad they didn't have enough time to get to know each other. But he certainly thought they accomplished a lot that year, so he thought they should feel good about that.

The list being shown was an incomplete list of the good things that happened that year: Admitted grad student mixer; Bay cruise; Diversity Fair; Bridging the Gap; Cal Day; discussion with Japanese women activists; Diversity Day; New Admit Pizza event; and others.

Ms. Anderson said wanted to send a shout-out to Mr. Daal, who's been doing a really excellent job with transitioning for next year and getting the budget ready. They decided to wait and let him shape what he wanted to do, and it looked like it will be a fantastic year. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels called for any questions regarding reports.

Ms. Parrish asked Mr. Daal about the Web site, and asked if he was not only interested in requests for funding, but if there could also be something about general GA itself, and how the GA helped grad students, why they wanted the money. She asked if there was a section for that, and if he was looking forward feedback in this area. Mr. Daal said yes, they would create a section for that.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Daniels said they had a Resolution to be referred to committee, Directed Action to Prevent the Increase in Early Childhood Education Program Full-Fee Rates for Student Families. He noted that unless it was fast tracked, the bill wouldn't be considered until September or October.

A motion to fast track the bill was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Daniels said they would consider it among the Resolutions.

RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolution was authored by Sarah Hubbard:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF INCREASED GRADUATE STUDENT-FOCUSED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

WHEREAS, in recent years issues concerning student mental health have seen heightened national attention, with colleges and universities reporting unprecedented numbers of students in psychological distress; and

Resolution on Directed Action In Support of Increased Graduate Student-Focused Mental Health Services (cont'd)

- 9 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF INCREASED GRADUATE STUDENT-FOCUSED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (cont'd)

WHEREAS, alarming trends in student mental health catalyzed the UC Office of the President to create a Student Mental Health Committee to assess mental health services across the UC System and to make recommendations to address deficiencies; and

WHEREAS, the Committee found that the escalation of student mental health cases has seriously taxed the capacity of all UC schools to respond to the demand for psychological, psychiatric, and related services; and

WHEREAS, graduate students as a group have been identified as a population at higher risk for mental health concerns. Our level of stress is magnified by our relative isolation from the broader components of campus life, the intense academic pressures of our advanced studies and teaching responsibilities, and the increased presence of family and financial obligations; and

WHEREAS, international students enrolled at UC are also identified as particularly vulnerable to student mental health problems. This cohort of students often experiences cultural adjustment issues, carries significant financial burdens, and struggles with increasingly complicated and uncertain visa processes, resulting in increased stress. The teaching demands at UC Berkeley are also particularly stressful for international students for whom English is not their primary language; and

WHEREAS, data from a recent UC Berkeley study of 3,100 graduate students reveals that almost 50% of respondents had experienced an emotional or stress-related problem that significantly affected their well-being and/or academic performance, while nearly 10% of respondents further reported they had considered suicide in the last twelve months; and

WHEREAS, the recommendations of the Committee's findings were accepted, and a Registration Fee increase was approved to cover the cost of a three-year, three-tier system to improve the mental health resources on UC campuses; and

WHEREAS, the second round of funding, Tier 2, outlines targeted interventions for vulnerable groups through education, support, and prevention programs, restores key services to help students manage stress, and increases staffing levels to target students most impacted by mental health issues;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly calls on UC Berkeley to allot a significant portion of the Tier 2 funding specifically to address the mental health needs of graduate students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President of the Graduate Assembly will send a letter of support to the Director of Counseling and Psychological Services, Jeff Prince, to assist in his petitioning for more graduate student-focused mental health services.

Ms. Hubbard said she wrote the Resolution and said it was discussed briefly at the last meeting of the Campus Affairs Committee. With national news about this recently, a lot of universities got very

Resolution on Directed Action In Support of Increased Graduate Student-Focused
Mental Health Services (cont'd)

- 10 -

concerned about mental health services offered to their campuses. And a few incidents in the UC System basically caused the President and the Regents to think seriously about this issue. As a result, they approved an increase in different student fees to support increased student mental health services. That past year has been called "Year 1" for those increases, or "Tier 1." Each campus in the UC System received a certain amount of funding to address major deficiencies. Berkeley chose to use almost all of that money to hire new staff in Counseling and Psychological Services. So the number of staff has gone up, and the number of people triaging calls, seeing patients, and dealing with crises, have all gone up. They were now above the national average in terms of the ratio of students to counselors. What was coming up next was Tier 2, or Year 2 funding. Basically, that year was supposed to target groups, either major groups for counseling support, groups that have demonstrated need, or continuing services.

On this campus, a higher percentage of graduate students actually seek out help from CPS than do undergrads. So the GA definitely felt that graduate students were a major focus group that CPS should serve. So what the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Mental Health, the Graduate Student Mental Health Committee, on which some people in the room serve, would like to see a good portion of that Tier 2 funding, which would be anywhere from \$500,000 to \$1.2 million, go to graduate student-focused services.

Ms. Hubbard said the Resolution basically states that she will get together with either Mr. Daniels, Mr. Daal, or others, and write a letter to Steve Lustig and other administrators, saying that the GA would like a substantial portion of this funding to go towards graduate student-focused services. As some of them knew, something that was published in *The Berkeley Graduate* and was publicized somewhat around campus, there was now a satellite office for Counseling and Psychological Services for graduate students only. It was located in a weird little house between the Law School and the Business School. Ms. Hubbard said they'd like to see a whole suite of those offices just for graduate students. There's already more than enough staff in CPS who explicitly stated they wanted to focus on graduate student needs. So if a grad student were to go to this office, they would walk in the door and staff would already assume they were a graduate student. They wouldn't have to go through all of the same questions and other things that might affect undergrads but didn't really relate to grads.

Ms. Hubbard said the Tier 2 money was basically there, and grads just had to use their voice to say they want some of that money to go directly to grads. If the Assembly approved the Resolution, that's what they'd write and send to the powers that be. She called for any questions.

Mr. Daal said that something happened with the agenda packet and the Campus Affairs Committee didn't get its analysis of the Resolution in the agenda packet. Mr. Daniels said that was his fault. He said the

Campus Affairs Committee reviewed the Resolution and found it to be very well written, and were very happy with how the Whereas Clauses motivated the Resolved Clauses. The Committee recommended that specific mention be made of how the money would be spent, just to make sure that all the needs were met that they envisioned. He asked if there was an amendment with that. Mr. Daal said there wasn't. Ms. Hubbard said that in the letter they'd write, they'd mention some specifics. Mr. Daniels asked if there was something they wanted to amend the Resolution to include, or if there was a need for that. Ms. Hubbard said it was brought up that they might state some specific dollar amount, or percentage, so they thought about saying they'd like a representative percentage. Since graduate students represent X% of the campus, then they deserved X% of this dollar amount. So it could go into specifics like that. If people felt it was critical to the Resolution, they could make that amendment; or, people could just ask to have a lot of detail included in the letter that was written.

Resolution on Directed Action In Support of Increased Graduate Student-Focused
Mental Health Services (cont'd)

- 11 -

Ms. Anderson said she trusted Ms. Hubbard to include a lot of detail in the letter that was written.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF INCREASED GRADUATE STUDENT-FOCUSED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Hubbard said she would like to thank them.

The following Resolution was authored by Scott Armstrong:

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENTS TO IMPROVE GA EFFICIENCY

WHEREAS, the GA's By-laws regulate the actions of the its members as well as its operations; and

WHEREAS, the current By-laws are still unclear in certain areas, and still can be improved to increase efficiency, transparency, and effectiveness;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the By-laws be amended (with the underlined passages added and the strikethrough passages deleted) as follows:

- 1.2.1. Political Activity. The Graduate Assembly shall not engage in political activity that might endanger the tax-exempt status of the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC).
- 2.2.4.3 Representation Requirement. Every Delegate must sit on at least one ~~of the following: a Committee, a Workgroup, or a campus committee on behalf of the Graduate Assembly.~~ An Alternate, independent of the responsibility to his or her Delegate pairing, may also sit on a ~~Committee, a Workgroup, or a campus committee on behalf of the Graduate Assembly.~~
- 2.3.10.1. President. The President shall represent the Graduate Assembly where appropriate and as the Delegate Assembly or the Executive Board shall direct, but the President shall not speak or act on behalf of the Delegate Assembly except with the concurrence of that body.

The President shall serve as chair for meetings of the Delegate Assembly and of the Executive Board, unless the President chooses to delegate this responsibility to another member of the Executive Board.

- 2.3.10.2. Vice President for Campus Affairs. The Vice President for Campus Affairs shall monitor campus policies affecting graduate students, and shall work on other issues as agreed upon by the President. The Vice President for Campus Affairs shall chair meetings of the Delegate Assembly and of the Executive Board in the absence of the President. The Vice President for Campus Affairs shall serve as the chair of the Campus Affairs Committee. The Vice President for Campus Affairs shall also be responsible for placing Delegates, Alternates, and other graduate students on ~~Committees, Workgroups, and~~ campus

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 12 -

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENTS TO IMPROVE GA EFFICIENCY (cont'd)

committees with designated seats for graduate students. Whenever possible the Vice President for Campus Affairs shall first assign graduate students to ~~Committees, Workgroups, and~~ campus committees in the following order:

~~Graduate Assembly:~~

~~* Committees~~

~~* Workgroups~~

- 2.3.10.5. Budget Officer. The Budget Officer, with the assistance of the Budget Committee, shall oversee and make recommendations regarding the fiscal health of the Graduate Assembly and its budget. The Budget Officer ~~shall work with and~~ the Finance Officer (i.e., the Business Officer Manager) ~~on preparing~~ shall prepare financial documents regarding the fiscal health of the Graduate Assembly and its budget. The Budget Officer ~~shall work with and~~ the Finance Officer shall be responsible for obtaining and requesting additional sources of financing. The Budget Officer shall serve as the chair of the Budget Committee. The Budget Officer shall, in consultation with the President and the Business Office Manager, determine which revenue sources shall fund the various expenses as determined by the GA's budget.
- 4.1. Current Committees. The current Committees shall be the Budget Committee, the Rules Committee, the Funding Committee, the Technology Committee, the Environmental Sustainability Committee, ~~and~~ the International Student Affairs Committee, the Campus Affairs Committee, and the External Affairs Committee.
- 4.5. Membership. The Delegate Assembly shall determine the membership of each Committee. Only graduate students may constitute the voting membership of a Committee ~~or a Workgroup~~. A majority of these members may vote to invite other individuals to serve as ex officio members. The voting membership of a Committee ~~or Workgroup~~ shall be more than five (5) and less than fifteen (15). All voting members shall have equal privileges.
- 4.15.1.6. Membership. The President shall serve as chair of the Executive Board, which shall consist of any position elected by the Delegate Assembly ~~the following voting members: All officers and the three Graduate Council Representatives.~~ ~~The Executive Board shall also con-~~

~~sist of the following non voting members: the chairs of the Environmental Sustainability, International Student Affairs, Funding, and Technology Committees as well as the Graduate Council alternate.~~

6.3 Disability Access. Those GA members who put on a GA event shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure that it is accessible to all reasonably expected to attend. All GA events that are open to the public shall include the following language on all advertisements: [insert ADA compliant text].

6.3.2.2. Introduction. During a Delegate Assembly meeting, ~~an author~~ any author may introduce a resolution. ~~In order to introduce a resolution, its title must be included in the Delegate~~

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 13 -

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENTS TO IMPROVE GA EFFICIENCY (cont'd)

~~Assembly meeting agenda and its text must be in the Delegate Assembly meeting's supporting materials. The author may give a one (1) minute statement supporting the resolution.~~

6.3.2.3. Committee Referral. The President shall refer each resolution to the appropriate committee(s) for analysis and shall announce to the Delegate Assembly the committee(s) to which each resolution is referred. The Delegate Assembly may, upon an appropriate motion, modify the specific committee(s) to which the President refers each resolution if there is no objection or by a majority vote. The chair of the Delegate Assembly shall remind author(s), or another person delegated by the author(s), that it is the common practice of the Graduate Assembly for authors to attend committee meetings in which resolutions are analyzed to answer any questions and provide the committee with background information on the resolution.

6.3.2.4. Committee Analysis. Each Committee shall analyze the resolutions referred to it. Any Committee analysis shall be included as an addendum to a resolution when it is reintroduced to the Delegate Assembly. If a committee fails to consider the resolution (either because of a lack of quorum or for any other reason), the committee's analysis shall state the reason for its lack of analysis.

6.3.2.5. ~~Reintroduction~~ Final Consideration. ~~During the appropriate time of the Delegate Assembly will consider passage of the resolution at the meeting Delegate Assembly meeting following the Delegate Assembly meeting in which the resolution was introduced, the author may reintroduce the resolution with the committees' analyses. Only after reintroduction can the Delegate Assembly consider passage of the resolution.~~

6.3.2.6. Exception. A three-fourths (3/4) vote of the Delegate Assembly may suspend these procedures and consider passage of a resolution during the same Assembly meeting in which the resolution is introduced, but only if notice of the resolution is given in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda and the full text of the resolution included in the Delegate Assembly meeting's supporting materials.

6.4. Committee Action Agenda Items

6.4.2. Assembly Consideration. The Delegate Assembly shall consider passage of this Standing Policy during the same meeting in which it is introduced. ~~Before final passage is allowed, the Delegate Assembly shall amend the Standing Policy to include exactly three action agenda items that shall guide the Graduate Assembly for that academic year.~~

Mr. Daniels said that one of the things they could do was go on through each paragraph and briefly mention what it did. If there were particular sections that anyone objected to, they could remove that section and vote on the uncontentious ones all at once, and then vote on the contentious ones individually. Mr. Armstrong said there actually had to be a motion to split it in pieces like that.

Mr. Daniels said they would go through the paragraphs. He would ask Delegates to please keep track of paragraph changes they'd like to discuss separately. They'll make a list of those and then have a motion

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 14 -

to divide them out from the main Resolution. He asked Mr. Armstrong to lead them off, paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. Armstrong said the first change just added what "ASUC" stood for.

Paragraph 2.2.4.3 was part of a running theme in these changes that would require every Delegate to sit on a GA committee, rather than simply just being on a campus committee. Everyone would have to actually serve on a GA committee.

Mr. Wolgin asked to pull out that paragraph from the main body of the Resolution.

Mr. Armstrong said paragraph 2.3.10.1 would allow the President to appoint somebody else on the Executive Board to chair meetings of the Delegate Assembly, if the President so chose.

2.3.10.2 made changes consistent with changes to 2.2.4.3, and since the latter was pulled, he would assume the former would be pulled as well.

2.3.10.5, first of all, re-worded the paragraph in a way that improved it. These were Rebekah Ahrendt changes. Mr. Daniels said there were those who didn't know Ms. Ahrendt. Mr. Daal said she was the grammatical officer for the GA.

Mr. Daniels said the background behind the changes in 2.3.10.5 was that while the budget approved how the GA spent its money, it didn't dictate which revenue sources would go where. That was important because some revenue sources were more restrictive than others. This By-law change would allow the Budget Officer, in consultation with the President and with Ms. Hsueh, the Business Office Manager, to state where different revenue sources would go. Mr. Armstrong said the change would allow Executive Offices to make silly bookkeeping decisions that were nonetheless important, but not that interesting.

Mr. Armstrong said that paragraph 4.1 included the Campus Affairs Committee and the External Affairs Committee on the list of committees in that paragraph. This was something that probably should have already happened.

Mr. Armstrong said that 4.5 was a significant change. It would give final say over the composition of each committee to the Delegate Assembly. One could argue that the Delegate Assembly also had that authority, because he thought the By-laws were kind of mute on that. But the amendment would make it very clear that the Delegate Assembly had the final say over this. So if there was an argument on a committee, or something like that, and someone threatened to throw somebody off the committee, with a big fight ensuing, something that could happen some day, this change would give the final say to the Delegate Assembly, and not any individual.

Mr. Armstrong said 4.5 was his change, and the reason he wanted it was because in some of the committee procedures he's seen, it's been declared that the committee chair, or somebody else, had authority over who was on the committee. They could imagine the scene at which any chair decided that he or she didn't like the committee and threw everybody else off the committee. That could happen. So the proposed version of the By-law was better.

Mr. Armstrong said that paragraph 4.15.1.6 would change the composition of the Executive Board. They currently have a kind of strange, two-tiered Executive Board. Basically, there are voting members and

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 15 -

non-voting members. This was kind of irritating, because when they vote, the non-voting members of the Executive Board felt kind of left out. They fully participate in what the Exec Board discussed, but for whatever stupid reason, they couldn't vote. This change was thought to be a good idea last year. Everyone on the Board wanted to include it, except for Ms. Anderson.

Ms. Anderson asked to have the By-law pulled, 4.15.1.6.

Mr. Daniels said he pulled 6.3.

Mr. Armstrong said that regarding 6.3.2.2, the way the By-laws currently read, a Delegate at the GA meeting could not introduce a Resolution at the meeting unless they already talked to Mr. Daniels, or whoever, in order to have the bill included in the agenda packet. Mr. Armstrong said that was kind of an unusual rule. Most of the time, people can make motions and offer resolutions on the fly at a meeting. However, this change ran through all the changes in section 6. So all the rest would reflect this change.

Mr. Armstrong said the idea behind 6.3.2.2 was that while one could introduce a resolution for referral, it couldn't be fast tracked unless it was included in the packet. The idea was that people should be able to offer a resolution whenever they wanted. But they couldn't spring a surprise and then fast track it before people had a chance to see it on the Web site and know about it. So if there was some crazy Resolution that somebody they hate, they could see it on the Web site, show up at the meeting, and yell and scream about it. But the change would still allow people to reasonably introduce resolutions. That was the idea behind the change, and that was what a lot of other organizations, in his experience, have done. So most of the changes, in that section reflect that, and other paragraphs include changes made in 6.3.2.3.

Mr. Daniels said the idea was to require authors to attend committee meetings at which their resolutions were being analyzed. Instead, they decided that the chair of the Delegate Assembly would remind authors that it was current practice of the GA for authors to attend committee meetings. So they wouldn't require it, but pressure would be applied for that to happen.

Mr. Armstrong said it was kind of a strange By-law.

Mr. Inkabi said that along the same lines as the resolutions being in the packet beforehand, he asked if there was something in the By-laws that stated that a resolution should be on the Web site X number of days prior to the GA meeting. Mr. Daniels said the By-laws state that should a bill should be posted for a week, to the extent that could happen. The By-laws request a week, but pretty much said “to the extent possible.”

Mr. Armstrong said that paragraph 6.3.2.4 states that when things get referred to committee, the committee was supposed to actually look at it. And if they forget to do so, or there was a lack of quorum, or some other reason they didn't look at it, they should tell the Assembly what the reason was.

For 6.3.2.5, Mr. Armstrong said he also sort of re-wrote. When a resolution was offered, it was sent to a committee. But it came back, and if it wasn't re-introduced, it was still on the table at the Assembly meeting. It was a strange way of wording the rule. So instead of being reintroduced, he called it “Final Consideration.” He re-wrote the bit about the author having to re-introduce the resolution. The author might not be present at the second meeting, and the resolution should still come up for a vote.

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 16 -

On 6.3.2.6, Mr. Armstrong said he inserted a bit about how resolutions couldn't be fast tracked if the author didn't give prior notice. That would prevent anybody from springing a surprise and passing something when people didn't have a chance to object.

For 6.4.2, Mr. Armstrong said there was a long, drawn out debate about this that he didn't recall. Mr. Daniels said they would pull this paragraph and discuss it separately.

Mr. Daniels said he knew it was a little tedious for those who haven't memorized the By-laws yet, like everyone on the Exec Board has, but he would ask people to please bear with them. He called for any other paragraphs that people wanted to ask questions about, or divide out from the main Resolution.

Mr. Harley asked if he was to understand that the purpose of 6.3.2.2 was to be able to introduce something that they hadn't previously gotten to in the packet. Mr. Armstrong said a resolution could be introduced, but it could only be referred to a committee if it wasn't in the packet. Mr. Harley said that was then later modified by the later exception. Mr. Armstrong said that was correct. As it currently stood, a resolution had to be in the packet in order for it to be introduced. But now, that didn't have to be the case in order to fast track a resolution.

Mr. Rheaume asked to pull item 4.1.

Ms. Parrish moved to separately consider the pulled By-laws, including 2.2.4.3; 2.3.10.2; 4.1; 4.15.1.6; 6.3; and 6.4.2., and to vote on the remaining By-laws at that time. **THE MOTION TO DIVIDE OUT THE ABOVE PARAGRAPHS, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the paragraphs in the Resolution that were not listed on the board. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO IMPROVE GA EFFICIENCY, AS DIVIDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Daniels said they go down the list of paragraphs that were divided out.

On 2.2.4.3, Mr. Wolgin said he thought it was a good idea to clarify this. But this would be a pretty major change. They're basically saying that Delegates had to serve on a GA committee instead of another committee on campus. He was sure there were people who have served only on campus committees. He was afraid that if they pulled this out, it might hinder the GA's ability to fill the 300 or so campus committees that had openings for grads. It seemed that if there was a really big problem getting people to join GA committees, this change might make sense. But if the issue was just that people weren't showing up to committees they were assigned to, he thought the GA might want to keep this rule as it stood and allow that kind of flexibility.

Ms. Anderson said she agreed with the work group's language. But she also agreed that campus committees were really important, and realized the GA had a lot of trouble filling them.

Mr. Daniels asked if anybody who currently served on a campus committee or didn't serve on a campus committee and did serve on a GA committee wanted to give the GA some idea.

Ms. Hubbard said none of the mental health stuff the GA considered that evening would have happened if she had one other meeting to go to. She couldn't have done both, and couldn't have dealt with two

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 17 -

committees. So none of the mental health stuff that happened that evening would have happened had she been forced to serve on a GA committee.

Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Daniels what he thought. Mr. Daniels said he was leaving, so he was neutral. He wasn't saying whether or not he agreed with it the proposed change, but the motivation behind it was, for the most part, because the reason they don't fill campus committees openings had to do with issues outside of whether or not someone sat on a GA committee. That was his experience, and perhaps Ms. Hubbard and others had different experiences. But campus committees, e.g., met at random times that weren't known ahead of time. It was very difficult to keep track of whether anyone attended or reported back. The idea behind the proposed change was for people to be more invested in the GA and learn more about the GA before they were sent out to represent the GA on campus committees. It didn't preclude that, but that was, he thought, one justification. Whether or not that was convincing, he didn't know.

A Delegate said that first-year members of the GA would have to serve on a GA committee, if that was a concern.

Ms. Parrish asked if they were having a problem filling GA committees. Mr. Daniels said that some committees have not had quorum for much of the year.

Mr. Harley said it seemed that there was a problem, but that they were tackling it in the wrong way. Right now, presumably everyone was assigned to some committee. If people were going to those meetings, then the GA was happy; and if people weren't going, the GA wasn't happy. But that didn't have to do with whether or not people were assigned to a GA committee, but whether or not people were actually going to committee meetings. So if they wanted to have a better reporting process, or they'd want to have some sort of accountability, they could strip people of their votes if they didn't go committee meetings. That sounded like one way to solve this problem. But if they thought the way to do this was to make sure that they have relatively involved senior people in the GA being involved in the outside campus, it seemed like there actually really only perhaps two dozen people who were a little bit more committed; and they were over-committed. He thought that was what Ms. Hubbard was getting at.

Mr. Daniels said that for those who were Delegates and sat on a campus committee or GA committee, or those who haven't, if they just came in, he was really curious to know, how this change would make them feel, and if this would be a good thing or if it would deter people from getting more involved. He asked what their thoughts were, since this would affect all of them, and not necessarily just the people on the Executive Board, who were doing the talking.

A Delegate said he served on the Committee on Teaching, a campus committee, and they awarded the Distinguished Teaching Award. He thought he was more interested in that than serving on a GA committee. GA committees weren't worse than anything else, but he was interested in this particular Committee, and was glad he had the possibility to get involved in it. It turned out that they're going to start a review of all teaching evaluation processes on campus, for the first time in 20 years. He found out about that because he was on the Committee, and he talked to Mr. Daniels about getting involved. He thought it was good that something like what he experienced could happen for people. He thought people should be able to sit on a campus committee without having to stay with the GA for a year.

Ms. Anderson said that no one answered her question about how they would fill GA committees. If people thought back to the very first meeting in the Fall Semester, if they were there, it was like high

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 18 -

school gym class, where people had to run to a particular corner of the room where committees were getting together. She had the smallest Committee. Nobody wanted to be on it, and her Committee was really awesome. They met all but one time. So she didn't think they were having that much trouble having committee meetings. She knew some committees had trouble making quorum, and she didn't know the recourse was. But she thought it was a manageable problem since she had a Committee that she thought was boring, but did okay.

Mr. Wolgin said he would like to ask people to raise their hands if they were on a campus committee instead of GA committee. He noted that three people raise their hands. If the GA changed this policy, they would hinder three people; and if they didn't change this requirement, it really wouldn't matter and it could just stay in the By-laws.

A Delegate said she saw a problem with the exact opposite scenario. If they got only a few dedicated people on a committee, they'd be likely to have quorum all the time. But if there were people who weren't really interested in particular committee but had to be on it, the committee still might not get quorum.

Mr. Armstrong said the other possible interpretation of what Mr. Wolgin said was that people might not serve on GA committees because they got disinterested in the GA and stopped coming to meetings.

Mr. Daniels said they would take a vote on whether or not to include or exclude this section.

Ms. Parrish asked if they could clarify if they exclude this from the Resolution, then if the By-laws would default to their current position. Mr. Daniels said that was correct. Ms. Parrish said that if they accept this change, then the amendment to this paragraph would be included in the Resolution amending the By-laws. Mr. Daniels said that was correct.

Mr. Armstrong said the GA should vote on 2.3.10.2. Mr. Daniels said they were connected. The change to 2.3.10.2 just modified other parts of the By-laws that would reflect the change made in 2.2.4.3.

Mr. Wolgin asked if they could just vote to exclude, “yes or no.” Mr. Daniels said they could. They would vote to exclude these sections, where they'd vote “yes” if they wanted to exclude these sections and would vote “no” if they didn't want to exclude them.

THE VOTE TO EXCLUDE 2.2.4.3 AND 2.3.10.2 FROM THE RESOLUTION PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 35-0-0.

Mr. Daniels said the next clause that was divided out was 4.15.1.6, which would get rid of the two-tiered system of voting on the Executive Board and make everyone who was in an elected position serve on the Board equally.

Ms. Anderson said she wasn't super passionate about this. She wanted to remind everyone of why the two-tiered Exec Board was created. There were central people who dealt with running things day-to-day, such as the Budget Committee Chair, and the President, in a way that was very different from what other positions did, such as the Funding Committee Chair or the International Student Committee Chair. Those positions also had really important jobs and provided a lot of important input. But they were not really working with the day-to-day running of the GA, and with what the Exec Board was supposed to be

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 19 -

dealing with. In a two-tiered Exec Board, there were really central people in Anthony Hall every day, having meetings, and they knew exactly what was going on; and these were the people who actually voted. The second tier included people who were sort of really involved and who advised the central-level people doing the day-to-day operations and represented specific interests, such as the Funding Committee, the Environmental Sustainability Committee, or the International Students Committee. That was something the GA did on purpose. It's something Mr. Daniels felt was silly, and was something the GA Assembly voted on last year. They had about eight choices to compromise the Executive Board, and together, this was the one they chose. So the GA should really consider whether they want to change it back to how it used to be.

Mr. Rajan said this was less about politics and more about functionality. Some chairs on the Executive Board don't get paid, and some do get a stipend. The concern was raised last year that while people who didn't vote might not want to attend every Exec Board meeting, perhaps they should be forced to do so. They were certainly welcome to attend, as was anybody. But if the GA was to define the Exec Board as all elected officials, then getting quorum, which was defined as half plus one, could be difficult if they had a year where chairs of ES, or ISA, were less interested than they were this year; and that might handicap the Exec Board. So in some sense there was a non-political reason for having the Board in its current form, and much more of a practical reason to not have these chairs overloaded past their capacity. That was also a consideration last year.

Ms. Anderson said that for clarification, people were encouraged, but not required to attend Exec Board meetings. So the second-tier people give input but didn't have to be at meetings.

A Delegate said Mr. Daniels sends him e-mails all the time, telling he had to come to Exec Board meetings. Dave said he should either not have to go, and not have a vote, which he was okay with, and he wouldn't go, or, he should get a vote at these meetings. But right now he sat there and discussed things,

and should get to vote. It was fine if they kept it the way it was, but there was no way he would attend Exec Board meetings.

Mr. Harley said the idea of having people show up at meetings and not voting was not foreign to the GA. They invite people to Assembly meetings, such as deans and all sorts of other people, and listen to what they had to say. But that didn't mean they got to vote. So it wasn't as if this Board meetings were the only place in the world where that happened.

A Delegate asked how many on the Exec Board could vote and how many couldn't. Mr. Daniels said the people who could vote were the President, two Vice Presidents, the Project Coordinator, Rules Officer, Budget Officer, the three Grad Council reps. The people who attend, like Mr. Harley, but couldn't vote, were the Graduate Council Alternate, the Funding Committee Chair, the Environmental Sustainability Chair, the International Student Affairs Chair, and the Technology Chair. Chiefs-of-staff attend Exec Board meetings frequently, but weren't technically part of the Exec Board. So there were 14 members total, 9 of whom could vote, and 5 who couldn't.

Mr. Froehle said he felt similarly to Mr. Harley about this. It was frustrating to go to meetings and have a voice, but then not have a final say. He understood Mr. Rajan's concern, that perhaps if somebody else in his position wasn't really invested and didn't come to meetings, that could cause havoc. Mr. Froehle said that in his experience that year, that hasn't been the case; and he hoped it wouldn't be the case in the future.

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 20 -

A Delegate asked how Exec Board meetings would suffer if people didn't show up. She asked if it was necessary for them to attend for the GA to function appropriately, and if so, then perhaps they should get a vote. Mr. Daniels said that was a difficult question to answer. Exec Board meetings are held once a month, which was probably the minimum they'd have in a given month. He didn't want to give his personal opinion.

Ms. Anderson said they haven't had the International Student Affairs Chair at the Exec Board for a while, and it's been functioning okay. On the other hand, Mr. Froehle was always there. As to whether they could function without him, he's had a lot of good input and has done a lot of good stuff. On the other hand, they didn't have a Funding chair and were crippled by that. If there was a funding appeal, it could be that no one would know about that, and they'd need a Funding Committee chair to explain.

Ms. Hsueh said there was a change in voting on the Executive Board last year, and the year before, some of these Exec Board members were able to vote. Last year was just a one-year exception, so people had to look back in history and see who could vote before and who was not able to vote last year.

Mr. Daniels said that if people haven't made up their minds, he would encourage them to ask a question or make a comment that might help them to do so. But if people have made up their minds and everyone was clear on how to vote, they should get to a vote.

Mr. Daniels said that hearing no other comments, they'd come to a vote. A yes vote would exclude, or delete, language proposed for 4.15.1.6 and would keep the By-laws as they currently read. Mr. Armstrong said it should really be a yes vote to adopt the change, and no vote to not adopt the change.

Mr. Daniels said a yes vote would be to exclude the proposed language, and a no vote would be to approve the change. If they wanted everyone on the Exec Board to vote, then they should vote no, and if they wanted a two-tiered Exec Board, they should vote yes. He called for any questions, and seeing none, said they would come to a vote.

The motion to exclude the language, and vote down the change, failed by hand-vote 7-29-1.

Mr. Daniels said the motion to delete 4.15.1.6 failed, and that language was included in the Resolution.

Mr. Daniels said the next item proposed to be deleted was 6.3. Mr. Daniels asked for motion to amend 6.3, adding “language advertising that all events are ADA compliant and open to all graduate students,” to read as follows:

6.3 Disability Access. Those GA members who put on a GA event shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure that it is accessible to all reasonably expected to attend. All GA events that are open to the public shall include language advertising that all events are Americans with Disabilities Act compliant and open to the public.

The motion to amend 6.3 was made and seconded.

A Delegate asked if this was just for GA events, and if the Funding Committee funded a student group, if the group would have to include this in a flier. Mr. Daniels said the amendment didn't address that.

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 21 -

A Delegate said she wasn't sure if the wording was entirely clear. They had a discussion about this in the Rules Committee. She was also concerned as to whether this was just for GA events that were funded. Mr. Daniels said this language was just for GA events. Ms. Parrish said that when a group signed with Campus Life and Leadership to be eligible for GA funding, a representative of the group had to take a course requirement them to know the language for compliance, and that the group agreed, through the signatory of the group, and the group knew it had to comply. She thought that was how this was handled. Ms. Hsueh said that in addition, all GA events were open to the public. When the GA held events and publicized them, anyone could walk in and attend. Ms. Anderson asked if all GA events were open to the public. Mr. Daniels said they were.

Mr. Daniels called for any objection to the amendment. **THE MOTION TO AMEND 6.3 PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Daniels said that hearing no other comments, they would come to a vote on 6.3. They'd have a yes vote to exclude, and a no vote to include.

The motion to exclude the change to 6.3 failed by unanimously voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels said the language in 6.3 would be included in the Resolution.

Mr. Daniels said the next item that was divided out of the Resolution was 6.4.2. It had to do with Action Agenda items.

Mr. Daniels asked someone to explain what would happen if this language was accepted. Mr. Daniels said the change was unclear to him that was written out in 6.4.2.

Mr. Rajan said he recalled there were two other points about this. They might probably want to change "committee," where it says Committee Agenda Items, and change that to "Action Agenda Items." But the proposed language really didn't change what was currently there. If Mr. Armstrong properly transcribed everything they discussed in the Rules Committee, the proposed language makes no real change.

Mr. Daniels asked if he still wanted to erase that last sentence. Mr. Armstrong said he thought this was redundant, and he thought that was why they were making the change.

Mr. Rajan asked what the concern was about that line. Mr. Daniels said the question was whether they should even consider this if it wasn't going to change anything. Mr. Rajan said he believed the Rules Committee analysis said it wasn't really going to change anything.

Mr. Daniels said that unless someone made a motion to consider it, they simply wouldn't. At this point, the change, as laid out, wouldn't really change anything and the GA didn't necessarily need to take its time on this. So unless someone moved to consider it, he would just move on. Seeing no objection, he said they'd move on, and said that 6.4.2 was excluded from the Resolution.

Mr. Daniels said the next clause that was separated was 4.1.

Mr. Daniels said Mr. Rheaume had a friendly amendment. Mr. Rheaume said this went back to the discussion about the reason for participation. The friendly amendment he wanted to propose was that

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency (cont'd)

- 22 -

they include Action Agenda Item committees among GA committees. The reason for that was because in September, the GA voted on three topics that they wanted the Executive Board to support. That was great, but after that, it was usually one or two people who ended up doing all the work. And he was speaking from experience as head of the TEACH Us Committee. It was difficult to get participation for the rest of the year, so if there were some individuals who would like to participate in one of these Action Agenda committees, and give that participation and service to the GA, he thought they should have the ability to do so.

Mr. Daniels said Mr. Rheaume was amending it to include Action Agenda Item Committees, to read:

- 4.1. Current Committees. The current Committees shall be the Budget Committee, the Rules Committee, the Funding Committee, the Technology Committee, the Environmental Sustainability Committee, ~~and the International Student Affairs Committee,~~ the Campus Affairs Committee, ~~and the External Affairs Committee,~~ and Action Agenda Item committees.

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Armstrong said he was against this amendment. The point of the change was to sort of fix an oversight, not to create a bunch of new committees. If that amendment was to be made, he'd want the whole thing to go back to the Rules Committee for analysis, because the Rules Committee didn't consider a whole bunch of new committees being created. It was just trying to fix an oversight. He would rather

not, at that time, make that kind of change. He didn't even know what he thought about it, and he'd want time to think about what kind of unexpected consequences might arise.

Ms. Anderson said this was actually an issue the Executive Board has been talking about, creating some sort of different system next year for the Action Agenda Items. That would probably include committees. She was in favor of that happening, but didn't think that evening was the time to change the language. She would rather figure out what the whole system was going to be. She thought they should first figure out how to deal with the Action Agenda Items to make them more effective, and change the By-laws to reflect a larger plan, rather than just throwing in these committees at that time. She actually was in favor of this change, but she didn't think they should do it at that time.

Mr. Rheume asked if the Executive Board could apprise the Delegates about what changes were in the air. Mr. Daal said they were actually considering proposing something similar to what was being proposed by Mr. Rheume, perhaps electing Action Agenda Item chairs who would have meetings and who would be held to some deliverables for Action Agenda Items. By no means have they converged on any of this, but they would need to converge and write language into the By-laws. He thought a lot of people were going in Mr. Rheume direction.

Mr. Daniels said that in the interest of keeping the meeting moving, he would ask if Mr. Rheume wanted to keep his amendment or withdraw it. Mr. Rheume said that if the Exec Board promised to address this next year, he would withdraw the amendment. Mr. Daal said he promised to address this next year. Mr. Rheume said he would withdraw the amendment. With no objection, the amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. Daniels said that to appease Mr. Armstrong, next year's Rules Committee Chair, if they voted yes, they'd approve the changes made, and if they voted no, they wouldn't make the changes. **THE MOTION TO MAKE THE CHANGE RECOMMENDED IN 4.1 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Resolution on Directed Action to Prevent the Increase In Early Childhood Education Program
Full-Fee Rates for Student Families

- 23 -

Mr. Daniels said that concluded the Resolution on By-law Amendment to Improve GA Efficiency.

Mr. Daniels said they would next consider the Resolution they fast tracked.

The following Resolution was authored by Joanna Doran:

**RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO PREVENT THE INCREASE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD
EDUCATION PROGRAM FULL-FEE RATES FOR STUDENT FAMILIES**

WHEREAS, providing affordable childcare for student families is recognized as a crucial factor for the academic success and well-being of current student parents, and also essential for recruitment and retention of top tier graduate students; and

WHEREAS, student parents (especially graduate students) face economic hardships due to their inability to both work full-time and fulfill their academic duties on behalf of the University; and

WHEREAS many student families in the UC Berkeley Early Childhood Education Program (ECEP) benefit from full or partial childcare subsidies administered by the California Department of Education (CDE), approximately 20% of student families do not qualify for this subsidy -- for example, a family of two graduate students with one dependent child, both parents having 50% GSI appointments and receiving a parent grant, does not qualify for subsidy; and

WHEREAS, unsubsidized student families are charged a student full-fee rate that is 37% below the full-fee rate paid by faculty and staff and ranges between \$775-1,000/month per child (depending on age). This is already a significant amount higher than subsidized fees and does not vary with the level of income (see Figure 1(a)); and

WHEREAS, early in 2008, ECEP was instructed to prepare for a 7-14% cut in registration fees that are allocated by the University; and

WHEREAS, on April 10, ECEP announced the elimination of the discounted (unsubsidized) student rate beginning fall 2008, requiring students to pay fees equal to those paid by faculty and staff, namely \$1,233-1,654/month per child (depending on age). In effect, this is a 60% increase in childcare fees for unsubsidized student families. The fee hike also dramatically increases the already substantial gap between subsidized and unsubsidized childcare costs, creating a two-tiered system of daycare that is affordable only to the most economically disadvantaged or the most privileged students (see Figures 1(b) and 1(c)); and

WHEREAS, the late notice to students made efforts to find alternative, budget-manageable solutions for child care impossible, as daycare waiting lists are closed well before April. This forces students either to reduce their income in order to qualify for a CDE subsidy (become under-employed), or to increase their income in order to afford the new rates (become over-

Resolution on Directed Action to Prevent the Increase In Early Childhood Education Program - 24-
Full-Fee Rates for Student Families (cont'd)

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO PREVENT THE INCREASE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM FULL-FEE RATES FOR STUDENT FAMILIES (cont'd)

employed), or even to take a leave of absence from the University. The only suggestion for accommodating the fee hike is to apply for need-based scholarships (only marginally higher than the State subsidy requirement) that will be distributed by lottery; and

WHEREAS together with the elimination of part-time daycare options, the anticipated 5% increase in student family housing (an approximate 30% increase over a 5-year period), and the lack of dependent health coverage, Berkeley becomes a campus far less attractive to prospective students and cost-prohibitive for student families;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the proposed fee increase for unsubsidized students in ECEP be immediately frozen for the academic year 2008-09.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that ECEP be exempted from the proposed University-wide budget cut.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that a representative working group will be formed to revise University childcare funding and create a new fee structure for student families implemented by 2009-10.

A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO PREVENT THE INCREASE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM FULL-FEE RATES FOR STUDENT FAMILIES PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Arnold said he would like to thank the GA for passing the Resolution. It would be very good, even after they approve it, to go through the details. In particular, the graphs in the packet told the story. They could see what happens once the eligibility line in the State of California was crossed. They were at the mercy of the Early Childhood Education Program of the University. The graph showed two cases of families enrolled in the Early Childhood Education Night. The first case was a family of three, with two parents and one child. The second case was even more severe, two parents and two children enrolled in the system. As they could see, as long as they were subsidized by the State and earned no more than \$4,200 a month, they'd pay no more than 10% of their gross income for childcare. As soon as that line was crossed, about 70% of their gross monthly income would go into childcare.

There wasn't much that could be done about this at the moment because the increase was announced two weeks ago. All waiting lists were closed and there was no way to get funds from anywhere else. So students had no alternative other than dropping their income or getting extra jobs to be able to afford this. Another option was to quit programs, which some students were seriously considering. This was not saying they were only putting trust in the GA to pressure the Chancellor, and they were working on many different initiatives, including working with the Early Childhood Education Program, to try to find a different solution to ECEP's budget problems. ECEP was facing an actual problem due to the cut the Chancellor was proposing in Registration Fees that the ECEP received. But then, again, the GA was very important, and was the main channel for bringing the students' case directly before the Chancellor to work this out. Mr. Arnold said he wanted to thank people for approving the Resolution.

Resolution on Directed Action to Prevent the Increase In Early Childhood Education Program - 25 -
Full-Fee Rates for Student Families (cont'd)

Ms. Duran said this change would eliminate the student right, so a couple with two GSIs at 50% each would no longer be subsidized by the State. That meant that that wouldn't pay the student rate, which would be eliminated, but would have to pay the full faculty rate, ignoring the fact that students could not work full-time like faculty and staff. So she would like to thank the GA very much for supporting this.

Mr. Daniels said that if people wanted more information, they should send him an e-mail and he could send it out.

2008-2009 GA BUDGET

Mr. Daniels said that as for some budget basics, the total budget was a little bit over \$810,000. About \$250,000 of that went into their reserves, approximately, and about \$150,000 would go in the proposed budget before them, for student funding, travel, student group funding, grants, things like that. A little bit

less, about \$145,000 was for projects. About \$90,000 was for Executive offices; about \$83,000 was for the Business Office; \$36,000 was for IT and the Web; and about \$5,000 was for committees.

Mr. Daniels said he'd give a summary of not all the changes, but the major changes that were made from this year's budget in the proposed budget for next year. They chiefs-of-staff for the President and the Campus Affairs VP into one position. They also created an Executive Office Assistant who would work with the Executive Offices, but was a Business Office hire who would report to Mr. Tuchman. Many of this position's responsibilities would be related to Executive Offices, and to the President in particular.

Mr. Daniels said that all positions that were somehow paid the equivalent of an hourly rate were increased from about \$14 an hour to \$16 an hour. The GA doesn't pay by the hour, but the stipends that they give out were equivalent to that amount for most of the positions. When they look at why someone was getting paid a certain amount, if they figured the rate at \$16 an hour, and multiplied that by however many hours a week was worked, and then the total number of hours worked in a given year, that's what would determine stipend amounts.

Mr. Daniels said the last item they'll get to in the budget was \$25,000 that was put aside from GA reserves to give to UC Berkeley, the school. The reason for that was that the GA successfully fought the Administration from taking money from the ASUC Auxiliary. The Auxiliary oversees the GA financially, and Ms. Hsueh and Mr. Tuchman Auxiliary employees. The central campus wanted to take some of the GA's money. GA money comes from student fees and commercial revenue generated by the businesses in the Lower Sproul area. That has historically been student government money. The campus wanted to take money from the Auxiliary, and the GA and the ASUC successfully fought that. However, in the interests of being good campus citizens, and in the interests of demonstrating that the GA was an independent part of campus, independent but also part of campus, the GA thought it would, to the extent it was able, mitigate the cuts across campus, and, in essence, gift a chunk of money from GA reserves to the central campus Administration.

Mr. Daniels said that one rationale for this, besides being good campus participants, was that they wanted to put facts on the ground that they are independent of the Administration. If they were to give the campus money, that would show that the GA was independent. If the campus were to take money from the GA, that would show that the GA wasn't.

2008-2009 GA Budget (cont'd)

- 26 -

Mr. Armstrong said that if the campus cashed the GA's check, that was a good sign. Mr. Daniels said that if the campus took money from the GA, that would show that the GA was independent of the campus, not dependent on it. So this allocation would play two roles. The GA would be a good campus citizen, and secondly, it would reaffirm the GA's independence. If Lower Sproul was redeveloped, the odds of increasing the commercial revenue generated by the commercial Lower Sproul area would probably double, from \$6 million to \$12 million. The campus would look at that and think it was a lot of money, and would like some of it, because of budget cuts that will no doubt occur in six years. If the GA could prove, either through negotiations or even in a court of law, that the GA was independent, that would save them a lot of money. The gift being proposed in the upcoming budget could potentially be key evidence in that sort of negotiation or lawsuit. It was a lot of money and it could be put towards other things, so he wasn't suggesting it lightly. But that was the rationale behind including it.

Mr. Daal said the GA was also going to suggest that the campus put the GA's gift, the \$25,000, towards graduate student fellowships.

Ms. Parrish said that was a friendly suggestion, but the GA wasn't restricting it. Mr. Daal said the GA couldn't restrict it, and they were only suggesting that it be used for fellowships.

Mr. Daniels said he thought they'd start with questions about the budget, then focus on any contentious issues, and then move forward.

Mr. Armstrong asked if he could talk a little about the budget, as it was his committee. He didn't want to say this was a major change, but it was something that would affect the day-to-day running of the GA. Basically, the GA's expenses were growing and their revenues were staying the same. One change in this budget was a decision to pay people \$16 an hour. He believed that was the lowest GSR rate, and the GA was currently paying people less than that. So that's what they've done in this budget for almost all of the positions. They actually kept the stipends the same, which meant that people would work a few less hours every week. So the chiefs-of-staff will work fewer hours and project coordinators, e.g., will work 14 hours, he believed, instead of 15. And that may even trickle down to Business Office undergraduate staff, because funding for Business Office undergrad staff was not increased. Ms. Hsueh was trying to find ways to increase their hourly pay. So there will be fewer hours to go around. There will be some exceptions to that. While everyone was taking the same amount of money for a little bit less work, the President and the two VPs were getting a little bit more money, so they could get the same rate without getting their hours cut. Mr. Daniels said the hours were cut for those offices. They were 17 and a half a week that year.

Mr. Daal said that if people found themselves thinking that they would like to become more involved in the GA but that it just didn't pay enough, they might want to write that the Web site. They could ask on the Web to endow a position so that when they're GA Budget Chair, they could get a higher stipend.

Mr. Armstrong said that Mr. Daniels was saying that the GA pays more than \$16 an hour, but in fact, that wasn't true. A lot of committee chairs were solely volunteer. And then there were other committee chairs, such as of the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee, who got a small thank you that worked out to getting paid about an hour a week.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions.

2008-2009 GA Budget (cont'd)

- 27 -

A motion to approve the GA budget was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2008-2009 GA BUDGET, AS PROPOSED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said that concluded the meeting. He would ask them to please stick around for desert and please go by the Bear's Lair and have a drink with them. Again, it has been an honor to serve them as President. And of course, they should turn in their feedback forms.

Mr. Daniels said he would like to pass the gavel on to Mr. Daal. (Applause) Mr. Daal said the meeting was adjourned.

This meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency [as amended on the floor]

Whereas, the GA's By-laws regulate the actions of the its members as well as its operations; and

Whereas, the current By-laws are still unclear in certain areas, and still can be improved to increase efficiency, transparency, and effectiveness;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the By-laws be amended (with the underlined passages added and the strikethrough passages deleted) as follows:

- 1.2.1. Political Activity. The Graduate Assembly shall not engage in political activity that might endanger the tax-exempt status of the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC).
- 2.3.10.1. President. The President shall represent the Graduate Assembly where appropriate and as the Delegate Assembly or the Executive Board shall direct, but the President shall not speak or act on behalf of the Delegate Assembly except with the concurrence of that body. The President shall serve as chair for meetings of the Delegate Assembly and of the Executive Board, unless the President chooses to delegate this responsibility to another member of the Executive Board.
- 2.3.10.5. Budget Officer. The Budget Officer, with the assistance of the Budget Committee, shall oversee and make recommendations regarding the fiscal health of the Graduate Assembly and its budget. The Budget Officer ~~shall work with~~ and the Finance Officer (i.e., the Business Officer Manager) ~~on preparing~~ shall prepare financial documents regarding the fiscal health of the Graduate Assembly and its budget. The Budget Officer ~~shall work with~~ and the Finance Officer shall be responsible for obtaining and requesting additional sources of financing. The Budget Officer shall serve as the chair of the Budget Committee. The Budget Officer shall, in consultation with the President and the Business Office Manager, determine which revenue sources shall fund the various expenses as determined by the GA's budget.
- 4.1. Current Committees. The current Committees shall be the Budget Committee, the Rules Committee, the Funding Committee, the Technology Committee, the Environmental Sustainability Committee, ~~and~~ the International Student Affairs Committee, the Campus Affairs Committee, and the External Affairs Committee.
- 4.5. Membership. The Delegate Assembly shall determine the membership of each Committee. Only graduate students may constitute the voting membership of a Committee ~~or a Workgroup~~. A majority of these members may vote to invite other individuals to serve as ex officio members. The voting membership of a Committee ~~or Workgroup~~ shall be more than five (5) and less than fifteen (15). All voting members shall have equal privileges.
- 4.15.1.6. Membership. The President shall serve as chair of the Executive Board, which shall consist of any position elected by the Delegate Assembly ~~the following voting members: All officers and the three Graduate Council Representatives.~~ The Executive Board ~~shall also consist of the following non-voting members: the chairs of~~

Resolution on By-law Amendments to Improve GA Efficiency [as amended on the floor] (cont'd)

~~the Environmental Sustainability, International Student Affairs, Funding, and Technology Committees as well as the Graduate Council alternate.~~

6.3 Disability Access. Those GA members who put on a GA event shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure that it is accessible to all reasonably expected to attend. All GA events that are open to the public shall include language advertising that all events are Americans with Disabilities Act compliant and open to the public.

6.3.2.2. Introduction. During a Delegate Assembly meeting, ~~an author~~ any author may introduce a resolution. ~~In order to introduce a resolution, its title must be included in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda and its text must be in the Delegate Assembly meeting's supporting materials. The author may give a one (1) minute statement supporting the resolution.~~

6.3.2.3. Committee Referral. The President shall refer each resolution to the appropriate committee(s) for analysis and shall announce to the Delegate Assembly the committee(s) to which each resolution is referred. The Delegate Assembly may, upon an appropriate motion, modify the specific committee(s) to which the President refers each resolution if there is no objection or by a majority vote. The chair of the Delegate Assembly shall remind author(s), or another person delegated by the author(s), that it is the common practice of the Graduate Assembly for authors to attend committee meetings in which resolutions are analyzed to answer any questions and provide the committee with background information on the resolution.

6.3.2.4. Committee Analysis. Each Committee shall analyze the resolutions referred to it. Any Committee analysis shall be included as an addendum to a resolution when it is reintroduced to the Delegate Assembly. If a committee fails to consider the resolution (either because of a lack of quorum or for any other reason), the committee's analysis shall state the reason for its lack of analysis.

6.3.2.5. ~~Reintroduction~~ Final Consideration. ~~During the appropriate time of the Delegate Assembly will consider passage of the resolution at the meeting Delegate Assembly meeting following the Delegate Assembly meeting in which the resolution was introduced, the author may reintroduce the resolution with the committees' analyses. Only after reintroduction can the Delegate Assembly consider passage of the resolution.~~

6.3.2.6. Exception. A three-fourths (3/4) vote of the Delegate Assembly may suspend these procedures and consider passage of a resolution during the same Assembly meeting in which the resolution is introduced, but only if notice of the resolution is given in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda and the full text of the resolution included in the Delegate Assembly meeting's supporting materials.