

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 6, 2008

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m.

Announcements

The GA Fall Reception will be held next Thursday in the Lipman Room.

Ms. Flores, ASUC Senator and a representative to the GA, gave an update efforts to get out the vote. The Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program was taking applications. The Senate appointed a Finance Officer for the year. An issue has come up is the Berkeley Thai Temple. A few residents in the area were trying to close it and the Senate passed a bill in support of the Temple.

The International Student Affairs Committee will have a Fall Reception on November 17.

CALPIRG, a social justice group, was working with an East Bay coalition to push for immediate reduction of diesel emissions at the Port of Oakland.

The Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Program will sponsor a graduate diversity career networking reception, across all disciplines. There will also be a forum for diversity in graduate education, with over 1,700 students from across California. Volunteers were needed.

A public hearing will be held UC Berkeley students to give testimony about the campus environment, which has worsened since the ban on affirmative action.

The Mario Savio Memorial Lecture will take place, featuring Robert Kennedy, Jr., an environmental activist and lawyer.

People were asked to take the Business Office survey, on the GA's main page.

The Dean of Students is looking for grads to serve on the Dean of Students Advisory Council.

SPEAKERS

Beth Piatnitza, Capital Projects

Beth Piatnitza, from Capital Projects, was present with architects from Moore Ruble Yudell, which was selected in the summer to develop a master plan for a revitalized Lower Sproul Plaza. It will go to the campus for approval in January, to be followed by a feasibility analysis to develop costs and figure out financing. Financing would come from a student fee referendum, possibly in 2010, donor funding, and additional retail.

A lot of previous studies and analyses have been done in the past ten years. The earliest date for construction might be 2012-2013.

The architects were charged with helping to support a collective dialogue about Lower Sproul and to articulate a vision. They've done this across the country at other university campuses.

Four or five principles have emerged around Lower Sproul: it must be student centered; it must recognize Berkeley's unique qualities, it had to be ecologically progressive, it had to be something that could be implemented, and it had to emphasize flexibility.

Architects have met with various student groups and components and with administrators,

Most revenue would be generated by retail. The question was, what type and how much.

The architects were operating under a series of assumptions. One was that Eshleman would be demolished. They're looking at opportunities along Bancroft Avenue. The Martin Luther King building was is structurally pretty robust. Chavez works with program elements they're considering, and was quite a nice building, with adjacency to Strawberry Creek. Zellerbach was not going to be touched much in this effort.

The next consideration to be studied was the program matrix, and what the needs were. They had to consider the correct blend of retail and student-serving program pieces, a balancing act.

Report from the Funding Committee

With no objection, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations on Round 3 of Graduate Events allocations, \$22,827.09, and Round 2 of Grants allocations, \$11,258.36.

RESOLUTION REFERRALS

Mr. Daal said he would referred the following Resolutions:

The following Resolutions were referred to committee:
Graduate Assembly Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare
To Create a Lower Sproul Redevelopment Action Agenda Item
To Promote Fairness and Transparency in Funding Allocations.

RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

0810e was withdrawn, To Amend the By-laws to Allow Committee Participation for Action Agenda Items.

0810f was withdrawn, To Create an Access to Health Care (Physical and Mental) Action Agenda Item.

0810g was withdrawn, To Create a Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item.

0810a was approved by voice-vote, To Amend the GA By-laws with Regard to Funding Practices. It calls for a yearly Funding Guide on how to apply for GA funding. Also, the Funding Appeal Committee was created, which would consider funding appeals instead of the Exec Board.

0810b was amended and passed unanimously by voice-vote, By-law Amendment for the Determination of Delegate Seat Allocations. Units in the Graduate Division get one Delegate per 100 enrolled students. The Resolution calls on the President to determine the number of grads enrolled in each program once a year, and to post that information on the Web site.

0810c was amended and was approved by voice-vote, On Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics. Course evaluation information was currently being withheld from students, and the bill calls on the President to work with the Chancellor to provide summary statistics of course evaluations to authenticated users. There was discussion about whether GSI evaluations should be included as well.

0809b was withdrawn, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness In Funding Applications.

0810d failed by voice-vote, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness and Transparency In Funding Allocations. Another Resolution dealing with this subject was submitted.

The meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting



This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:31 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Rivas said the GA Fall Reception will be held next Thursday in the Lipman Room, the top floor of Barrows Hall, from 6:30 to 8:30. Information sheets about the event were available and she'd ask Delegates to please take them back to their departments. There will be food and drink, for those over 21.

Ms. Flores introduced herself and said she was an ASUC Senator. She'd give the GA a quick update on how the Senate and Executive Officers have been going. During Election Day, some Senators helped to get out the vote by phone banking, and at the end of the night, they were able to call 5,520 Berkeley students. The Office of the ASUC External Affairs Vice President helped in registering 9,425 students to vote. The phone bank was their last push in trying to get people to vote.

Ms. Flores said Academic Affairs Vice President De la Cruz asked her to make an announcement about the Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program. It's an opportunity for undergraduates to obtain individualized guidance from a graduate student. It was also a great way for grads to learn about mentorship relationships and helping undergraduates who were also interested in being where graduate

students were. Mr. De la Cruz will forward applications to Mr. Daal. The application deadline is Friday, November 21 and can be e-mailed to ugmp0809@gmail.com or dropped at 205 Eshleman.

In terms of the Senate, they appointed their Finance Officer for the coming year, Madeline Batac. She'll be in charge of figuring out the ASUC's budget when the Finance Committee allocates money, and will also evaluate their fiscal responsibility and line items. Also, one bill they passed was in support of the Berkeley Thai Temple. A few residents in the area were trying to close it, the oldest Thai Temple in the Berkeley area. A lot of students have sought it as a place of sanctuary and as a good place to meditate. The Temple has weekend breakfasts and a lot of residents were complaining about noise. The Berkeley Thai Temple has really tried to address this issue, and in the coming weeks there will be meetings about what the Senate could do. If grad students were interested in helping out with that, the ASUC External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Jirachaikitti, would be more than happy to get their input. Ms. Flores said people could also talk to her if they would like to learn more about the ASUC, they could attend any Senate meetings or committee meetings.

Mr. DeGrasse said the International Student Affairs Committee will have a Fall Reception on November 17. Fliers were available and Delegates were asked to take a few and put them up in their departments. It was intended to get people talking and sharing experiences. It will be from 5:30 to 7:00. There will be food and music.

Mr. Marchand said he had a message on behalf of CALPIRG, a social justice group. They're working with a coalition in the East Bay to push for immediate reduction of emissions that were mostly due to diesel in the Port of Oakland. As they'd see by the handout he was passing out, there were serious health risks associated with this. Basically, CALPIRG is gathering support on campus to see if there's support for this and to help the health of people in West Oakland and reduce emissions from the Port. The campaign will start a letter-writing campaign because there was a precedent in Los Angeles. Delegates could read the details about this. Proposed changes would be good for the environment and also good for truck drivers at the Port, and they'd make better wages. He'd leave the GA information and a hand-out and would encourage Delegates to do participate. The Environmental Science Department will write a letter and there were also examples available of letters they could write. They could get letters signed by grad students in their programs and could bring them back to CALPIRG, 303 Eshleman. He'd pass the information around.

Ms. Rivas said that on Monday, October 10, the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Program will sponsor a graduate diversity career networking reception, across all disciplines. It will be at 5:30 at Morrison Library. People should come in business mode with copies of résumés on hand and be prepared to interact and develop connections with different human resources representatives. Secondly, on Saturday there will be a Northern California forum for diversity in graduate education. It will be held for the first time on the Berkeley campus. There will be over 1,700 college seniors, juniors, and Masters of diversity students from across California. They need volunteers. They're in desperate need of at least ten more volunteers to make this happen. It will be 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. People were especially needed from 8 a.m. to noon. If they could get through lunch, they'd be okay. If people could take some time away from their Saturday morning, she'd sent a sign-up sheet around.

Ronald Cruz said he was with By Any Means Necessary (BAMN), the pro-affirmative action and immigrants rights group on campus. He'd pass out a flier about a public hearing next week. First, he wanted to offer congratulations for Tuesday's presidential election and the history they made on that day,

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

electing Barack Obama. They've really opened a new period, and the nation has reawakened to its best and brightest traditions and has opened up a new era of possibilities and of hope. For them, as students who were politically and socially minded, they had to continue to press collectively on the basis of building a new civil rights movement and meet their demands for change.

Mr. Cruz said that on January they'll have a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President. The President will pass a law to allow undocumented students financial aid. They can restore affirmative action in the State. There will be a public hearing next week for UC Berkeley students to give testimony about the campus environment. The campus climate has worsened since the ban on affirmative action. Minority students at the hearing will talk about being one of the few black, Latino, or Native American students in their dorms and in their classes, and why that needed to change and must change. They've broken down barriers to the White House, but they still have de facto segregation on their own campus. Undocumented immigrant students will also talk about being forced to withdraw after this semester and for the need for UC Berkeley to be a sanctuary university, to be the nation's first, and to declare they will not cooperate with ICE raids and deportation of immigrant students. That's what the petition was about, and he would ask Delegates to please sign it. They're also calling for UC Berkeley to immediately increase underrepresented minority student enrollment by eliminating the SAT, which the National Admissions Panel has recommended eliminating. This panel was headed by Harvard. The time to act was now. The hearing will be next Wednesday evening. He would ask people to come testify and to support the people who will be testifying. They'll send copies of the testimony to the University and to President-elect Obama.

Manuel Vallee introduced himself and said he was a former Delegate from the Sociology Department. Every year or so he comes to the GA to make a pitch for the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture, which will be taking place. For those interested in environmental issues, science, and law, it will be very interesting and exciting. It will feature Robert Kennedy, Jr., a big-time environmental activist and environmental lawyer. Mr. Vallee said he would request that Delegates take one or more fliers back to their departments to post in a conspicuous place. He'd pass them around and would ask people to please take several.

Ms. Hsueh asked people to please take the Business Office survey. Some of them have submitted something to be reimbursed and get money from a grant or from Graduate Events, and the GA wanted to know how they were doing. If they don't get their feedback, they wouldn't know and will assume they're doing wonderfully. There is a link to the survey on the GA's main page.

Mr. Daal said the Dean of Students was looking for six graduate students to serve on the Dean of Students Advisory Council. The Dean was looking for "outstanding graduate students." If people were interested in this, he would ask them to please indicate that on the back of their Delegate feedback form. Ms. Freedman asked what the Council does. Mr. Daal said he had no idea.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daal said the GA didn't approve the September minutes because they weren't available online. He called for a motion to approve the September and October minutes. It was so moved and seconded.

Approval of the Minutes

- 6 -

Approval of the Agenda

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatnitza, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects, on Lower Sproul

Mr. Kramer said that in the September minutes, he was referred throughout as "Mr. Work," and it was Mr. Kramer who was Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Committee. A motion to approve the amendment was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2008 MEETING, AS AMENDED, AND FROM THE OCTOBER 2, 2008 MEETING, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

SPEAKERS

Beth Piatnitza, Capital Projects

Mr. Daal said he would like to introduce Beth Piatnitza, from Capital Projects, who will introduce the architects present that evening.

Ms. Piatnitza said she would like to thank the GA for having them. She introduced herself and said she was with the campus Planning Office. She was present with Moore Ruble Yudell, architects who were selected in the summer to work on and develop a master plan for a revitalized Lower Sproul Plaza, including not just the Plaza, but also Eshleman, Chavez, and King, the whole environment there. The schedule was to develop a master plan, a concept, that would go to the campus for approval in January. Following that there will be a feasibility analysis to develop costs and figure out the financing.

Ms. Piatnitza said the financing for any redevelopment in Lower Sproul Plaza was expected to come from three sources. One source was a student fee referendum, and she believed there's a buildup towards spring 2010 as the date for that vote. The second source was possibly donor funding. The third source was to look at what additional retail revenue capacity there was and whether retail could also contribute to physical improvements.

Ms. Piatnitza said that one thing she wanted to make sure she covered with the GA was the idea of the timeline. Just so they had a sense, there's a long timeline for projects of this magnitude and complexity. The screen showed the ten years or so that have occurred up until that past summer, when a lot of previous study and analysis was done, and to utilize all that information. It includes student survey work done

last year, '07. Some of them may have been a part of that. They had about 150 students involved in focus groups on Lower Sproul. So all the findings from those studies will be incorporated.

The architects have been gathering that information, weaving it in as well as information they're getting in meetings with student advisory groups and various user groups and administrators. Then they'll do the feasibility part.

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatniza, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 7 -

The red part on the screen was the fundraising, which could go on for quite a long time. It showed the fee referendum date of 2010. After that they'd have design, documentation, and then construction. The earliest date for construction might be 2012, 2013. Hopefully some of them will still be there, or, hopefully not; or maybe there in a different capacity.

Ms. Piatniza said the main thing she was trying to get across was that there has been a lot of work done and a lot of input in the past from students. The planners want people to trust those findings, and trust their predecessors, as they also get input from current students that will move on to the future as well. Planners were just trying to keep the momentum going and not go back to the beginning and not just keep doing studies. They want to keep this thing moving forward.

Ms. Piatniza said she would turn it over to Mario Violich, Buzz Yudell, and Richard Destin, to run through the rest of the presentation.

Mr. Violich introduced himself and said he would like to thank Mr. Daal for inviting them to the GA to present an update of where they are in the master planning process. He's a graduate from UC Berkeley, 1983, and he is the principle at Moore Ruble Yudell. He introduced Richard Destin, an Associate, and Buzz Yudell.

Mr. Violich said they were kind of charged with helping to support a collective dialogue about Lower Sproul and to articulate a vision that was inclusive of many different student organizations. They've done this across the country at other university campuses and they were thrilled and excited to part of UC Berkeley's vision for Lower Sproul.

As their discussions have evolved with different constituencies, there were four or five emerging principles that they thought were foundational to the success of Lower Sproul. The first was that Lower Sproul must be student centered. There are components of Lower Sproul that will involve retail and components that will involve administration. But Moore Ruble Yudell thought that from the perspectives of planning, architecture, and programming, it was very important to keep it student centered.

The second principle they think is critical for Lower Sproul was to recognize that UC Berkeley isn't Stanford, or Dartmouth, or like any other university. So the unique qualities of Lower Sproul and of UC Berkeley need to be recognized in the planning and design development. They had to recognize its unique history, the Free Speech Movement, those kinds of things.

Mr. Violich said the third principle for Lower Sproul success that was foundational was to have an ecologically progressive master plan strategy. On Friday they're participating in a sustainability charette with over 75 students to further some of the design and sustainability principles that can be applied.

There were a couple of more principles for Lower Sproul that they think are critical. Ms. Piatniza talked about funding. Lower Sproul, for Moore Ruble, had to be implementable. So they're not in the business of trying for a blue-sky solution of what could be. They really had their sleeves rolled up to look at what was realistic in terms of what could be funded and implemented. That's something their consultant team and the broader team were currently tracking.

Then finally, because they have a limited envelope for programs at Lower Sproul, all program components had to serve multiple student organizations and multiple purposes. So they're looking at a

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatniza, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 8 -

master plan that emphasizes flexibility, and looking at an architecture and a planning approach that had flexible architecture that could accommodate a wide range of interests on Lower Sproul.

Mr. Violich said that he and Mr. Destin would give a brief update on some feedback they gotten from the various groups that Ms. Piatniza mentioned. Mr. Destin said they met with the student advisory group and from that, started to list some emerging principles. There was a diagram that was created about a year or two ago that identified the main components of a student center. Since then, two components were added, the Multicultural Center and a graduate student center. The screen showed it centered around congregation, which was the middle level. At the top of the list was to maintain a student-centered focus.

Ms. Piatniza said that around the congregation, in support, were the ASUC Auxiliary; entertainment, which would be anything, Pauley Ballroom or other concerts; service, the many things happening underground; food, either Cal Dining, the Bear's Lair, the Food Court, or some sort of expansion of that; retail services, which would be the ASUC Bookstore and possibly having more retail to make this sustainable; a graduate student center, which would have a home here; and the Multicultural Center.

Mr. Destin said they also met with a number of administrators, including Jonathan Poullard, and directors of some of the programs in the center. Generating revenue was the key topic, as well as making it sustainable, not only from a perspective of treading lightly on the earth, but also making sure that this would be a building that was flexible, i.e., it could take on a lot of different types of programming. Another topic was having different types of retail; that it would be affordable; and that it would be a building that would be around a lot longer than 40 or 50 years, something that had an inherent value in it that was long lasting. That's really what they think about for sustainability.

There was also an idea about making "big" Berkeley smaller. People come here and it's a big campus with a lot of complicated issues. They need a place they could call their home, a place where they're comfortable. It was almost like one-stop shopping, where somebody could come and get about 80% of their questions answered.

As for emerging questions and issues, there's about three or so that dealt with retail, which was still the main revenue-generating piece. The questions are what type of retail and how much they'd have. There's a sort of a limit on how much they could have. Other questions would be where it would be located and what the adjacencies were.

Mr. Violich said they're looking now at the relationship or convergence of two things: physical planning opportunities and challenges for Lower Sproul and programs. They're looking at what they could conserve and what the synergies were between the two.

Mr. Violich said they started by looking at the macro scale of the campus of Lower Sproul's location. Eshleman, could be considered the edge of the campus, because of Bancroft. It's a seam between campus and the City. Looking at an expanded radius around Lower Sproul, quite a bit of student housing and other student amenities existed south of Bancroft. So one thing they thought was resonant with Lower Sproul was that it could be viewed as a center point as opposed to a perimeter point. For that very reason, they think Lower Sproul has tremendous potential.

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatniza, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 9 -

The screen showed a 3-to-5-minute and a 7-to-10-minute walking radius from Lower Sproul, and showed key elements in a very close adjacency to Lower Sproul. These elements include spaces people know very well, such as the Free Speech Movement Café, Morrison Library, which provides a very different kind of place for students, as well as the Asian Art Library. So this was a range of opportunity and of places for students to go, graduates and undergrads, in order to study, rest, and communicate.

Mr. Violich said they're also looking at the network of green and open spaces around the campus. Lower Sproul, of course, was a very urban space. The question was whether Lower Sproul could be a softer kind of space, like other, adjacent spaces on campus. Or perhaps it should stay urban, since it accommodated a lot of programmed activities, be it dance or music.

In looking at the micro-scale of Lower Sproul, before buildings, they currently had a series of assumptions they were beginning to operate around. One was that Eshleman, for those who have been at the top during any seismic activities, can be a scary building to be in. Eshleman is likely to go down. So they're currently looking at what opportunities lie in recasting program elements along Bancroft Avenue.

The Martin Luther King building is structurally pretty robust. A seismic retrofit will happen there. Mr. Violich said they think there is some opportunity for adaptive re-use, a complicated way of saying "combining new with old." They think Chavez is a building that works with some of the program elements that they're considering, and they think it's resonant with some of their interests. It was quite a nice building and had adjacency to Strawberry Creek. Zellerbach was not really going to be touched in this effort other than the possibility of a support café that might be planned around it.

One of the interesting challenges is the microclimate of Lower Sproul. The screen showed the incredible range of places one could go in Upper Sproul. Planners were just up there that afternoon. There's a lawn under the trees, filtered light, direct light, steps. People who go to Lower Sproul basically have two choices, sun or shade. They think that irrespective of what programs happen on Lower Sproul, they'd need a broader range of microclimates and a broader spectrum of choices as to how Lower Sproul is used.

Mr. Violich said they're starting look at viewsheds and views, not just of the Campanile or of the iconic elements around Lower Sproul, but as they go up to the upper spaces, the sense, as they all know, of capturing campus and regional viewsheds. A series of studies was currently underway looking at pedestrian movement. They think that unless a program element in Lower Sproul generated a kind of 24/7 activity, then it should not go in Lower Sproul, because they really want it to be a magnet for pedestrian activity. Studies show some of the predominant movement and pedestrian patterns, which were shown on the screen. They also have movement through transportation, as a transit center, a critical link to a broader, regional set of transportation networks.

Lower Sproul was a place for improvisation and impromptu programming. It was also part of the network of bicycles and the importance of bicycles in Lower Sproul. The planners understand there are some interesting programs people on campus have looked at in terms accommodating students in terms of bicycle storage, perhaps daily rentals of bicycles. Planners think it's very important to consider these things as they move forward.

Me. Violich said that as they all knew, the room they're in was above a parking structure. The service to Lower Sproul had to remain, and the four buildings on the Plaza would continue to be serviced by that

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatniza, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 10 -

lower parking structure. That was a given. But as for the parking lot itself, the planners thought that was an open opportunity. The parking didn't need to be there. So there are some opportunities in how to reconfigure that.

Mr. Destin said they're mapping the amount of programming that was currently here, looking at these different divisions. Zellerbach is a performing arts center and there was no need to really look at that. There may be some improvements, a small addition, or a café, but they're really looking at Chavez, King, and Eshleman.

The slide being shown indicated ASUC area in warm colors. Merchandise was the largest program component, the Bookstore, and all of the stores associated with that. The Bear's Lair was food and dining, the bright yellow. Housing and Dining was shown in green. At the basement level they could see that all of these three buildings benefit from having this service access. The Bookstore had a lot of things in the basement.

Mr. Destin said the first level is the ground level on Lower Sproul, with the Bear's Lair Food Court. And there's another ground floor on Upper Sproul, with the Golden Bear Café, the first level of the Bookstore, and the Multicultural Center. And as the screen showed, Eshleman and MLK continue up to higher levels, and they get to single use and single occupancy in the buildings the higher one went. So when they go all the way up to the top they have the Tilden Room, the Daily Cal, and the reading room. There are no amenities that support that reading room. If people want to get a cup of coffee, they have to come all the way down. So the planners want to fix that program placement and not do something like that again.

The next consideration was the program matrix. After talking to student groups and administrators, what planners heard suggestions of what was needed for merchandise what was needed in a new student center. There was talk of having ASUC merchandise grow to be twice as big. It could be a combination of food, dining, and other kinds of retail. There could also be Cal Dining. And this would not be just one big dining hall, but two or three small cafés. There's a lot that had to be studied first before they knew the total program need and how much retail could be supported by just the shape of the Plaza, what was affordable, and what made sense from a site-planning issue. They don't want to build another tall, eight-story building and block out the sunlight. So there was a balance that had to be struck.

Mr. Violich said one question they collectively had to answer was the correct blend of retail and student-serving program pieces. They were struggling with that, quite frankly, because on one hand they want to preserve a student-center kind of environment, one that was clearly and unmistakably student centered.

On the other hand, as Mr. Destin said, they need revenue to make this financially sustainable. So there's a balancing act that threatened either end of the spectrum. That was the challenge they have collectively.

Just to finish up a few thoughts that they have, as they identify the spectrum of retail components, they had to consider their relationship to one another. One question was whether the adjacency of retail to student-serving programs should be discreet, where retail was separate, essentially like the other side of Bancroft, with student services perhaps in a separate building envelope, and student organizations in yet a separate building, with a sense of discreet districts of the student organization. The model that the planners are intrigued in was less one of discreet program elements, but more a fabric or plaid of smaller grade retail elements, like cafés, a bicycle shop, a technology center, things that could be woven into the

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatnitzka, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 11 -

fabric of student services. So as the upper diagram showed, they'd have more of a plaid of program elements, each supporting one another synergistically. So the planners were starting to look at patterns of how these different program elements might share adjacency. It would be the spectrum of public to private space. In the diagram, yellow is an assigned program element. A room with a door that could be closed, and was private, might be one end of the spectrum. The intermediate might be the green, a shared space, a resource center, that perhaps could accommodate a larger group. And then maybe there would be spaces that were more informal, part of the circulation network, hallways and corridors that were informal lounges that allow for smaller groups of two to three to meet without the necessity for assigned rooms.

Mr. Violich said that what they're going to end on is some emerging patterns that they see in Lower Sproul as possibilities. These had to do with the side context. They see a Strawberry Creek as an amenity, something that one had a sense of, but not a direct connection to. Perhaps Cesar Chavez could be more visually permeable, so that there could be openings through Chavez to get a better sense of Strawberry Creek and connect to one's sense of place on campus. Alternatively, as they rethink the building envelope along Bancroft, they're thinking about how many openings they want to make a connection to the City of Berkeley. These were questions they're looking at.

Similarly, as they move in an east-west axis, there's Upper Sproul and Lower Sproul. Upper Sproul has so many great things going for it. It's got the stream of most of the students; it has beautiful, landscaped spaces; it's highly used; and it's a place where people meet and where they exchange ideas. They want that at Lower Sproul. The question was whether there should be a more deliberate connection between Upper and Lower Sproul, and what that meant in terms of architecture and programming. Some landscape ideas were to perhaps look at the campus ecologically. The riparian corridor of Strawberry Creek was one of the greenest pieces of infrastructure on the campus. Perhaps they could have that green ribbon envelope Chavez, so that Lower Sproul would have a green face, if they will, with trees in front of Chavez, on the southern side, giving some buffer to that exposure.

A pattern suggests that Lower Sproul is too big, it needs to be broken down, and the question was whether there was a way to develop a sense of hierarchy in the public, open space, with smaller open spaces acting as a kind of foyer to the larger space.

Mr. Violich said the next pattern, which was one that suggested a focal element for Lower Sproul. For all its attributes, it was a place that was very difficult from a way-finding standpoint. People don't know

where to go and it doesn't have a sense of focus. Perhaps there could be a program element such as a multicultural center, for example, that was featured prominently in this plan. It's a program element like the Career Center, which shared amenities with a cultural center. Or maybe it would be a technology center, or maybe all of the above. Mr. Violich said the question of prominence, of program, is one that the planners were looking at.

And then finally, on Friday they're going to talk a lot about sustainability. One of the most sustainable approaches that one could really look at in terms of planning and architecture was adaptive re-use, i.e., how many of these buildings can be saved, and how many could have a combined use. What they're looking at was a laminate, or the idea of new construction in a ribbon-like configuration that might occupy the edges of MLK. They think that kind of approach could be quite interesting from an adaptive re-use standpoint. The planners know they have some seismic issues on the perimeter of MLK that can

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatnitsa, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 12 -

kind of have some efficiencies in terms of addressing those seismic issues. And the idea of the laminate could also begin to create some prominence for Lower Sproul and Upper Sproul. A laminate piece of construction could go vertically to mark a corridor or sweep down to relate to the human scale of the Plaza.

Mr. Violich said they're really in a conversation with a whole spectrum of groups there, including the GA, and they're in the process of weaving together a lot of different information. This was an inclusive process, but it's one that they're charged to focus on, and to make implementable. So in the coming weeks and months, they'll look forward to getting as much input from grads as possible. But that evening, if there were additional questions, they'd be more than willing to answer them at that time.

Mr. Rajan said that from the presentation, it seemed they had two main goals. They want to discuss with all the students the purpose of Lower Sproul, and it seemed one of the goals was revenue maximization for retail space and the other was student services. Planners had a lot more data to gather, but he asked if they had an idea of what the weights of those two separate goals might be and whether there was a third goal, or more. Mr. Violich said there are parallel analyses taking place as they speak. One analysis was an economic modeling they've done on retail independent of how much they thought they should put into Sproul. They had a retail study that was being done that says that based on the economic model, they think Lower Sproul can absorb this amount of retail. They don't yet know what those numbers are. So that's one component to the question. What they do know is what kind of student-centered program elements to go in Lower Sproul. So he thought they had a better handle on that than currently had on retail. The trick was in revenue generating and funding of this project, and how much they'd let the retail drive the funding process. He thought that was the elephant in the room.

Mr. Rajan said that what he was trying to get at was from what sort of perspective the planners were approaching this problem. He thought it was retail generation and student services. But it seemed that the plans they have were much more focused on the latter, and how this could be a student space; and then they'd have a necessary evil of revenue. He asked if that came from some sort of feedback that students gave, or if that was something planners thought was the right model for the University. He asked where they drew that from. Mr. Violich said it came a little bit from the side analysis of their opportunity for the maximum program expansion being along Bancroft. Bancroft is a natural seam between the City and the campus. So planners saw that as a great retail opportunity, to be a filter to the campus. Planners

are cautious about the retail dominating the ground levels of Lower Sproul and it becoming a shopping center and not a place of learning.

Ms. Parrish said planners talked about flexibility in the design. She asked how flexible these spaces would be that they're talking about, and how deeply they'd be able to shift through different program elements, like revenue generating areas, reading and learning areas, maybe turning into green space. Mr. Destin said they could build that in as an inherent part of the structure. They could have a structural grid and follow something that was pretty regular and simple. And they could add and subtract as the years went, and move models back and forth between one grid and the next. That could change the size of the space. They could have an entire wing that was really a series of flexible spaces like this. And those spaces would be supported by more permanent core elements, like restrooms and maybe private offices or storage, things that were more designated to a certain use. So there would be a kind of programming.

Ms. Moran asked how much actual space will be lost. The actual space outside was quite large, and she asked how much that would be reduced. Mr. Violich said that's something they were just looking at that

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatnitzer, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 13 -

afternoon. They were questioning whether Lower Sproul was too big, and if it could be smaller. They think that probably there are areas they could encroach, particularly on the west face of MLK, into Lower Sproul. They also think that along the edge of Bancroft, particularly the area just behind Eshleman, was a pretty wide-open area that was not the most flattering façade of Zellerbach. It's also a service entry and seemed to be underutilized to the west of Eshleman. An additional area was the aperture between Eshleman and MLK to the east. They're looking at perhaps closing that more and perhaps even making a passageway there and getting program above it. So they think they can encroach on Lower Sproul. He didn't know what the percentage was.

Ms. Moran said she wasn't necessarily worried about going inward, but her concern was about actual open space in the center part. Ms. Piatnitzer said she was concerned about losing open space. Ms. Moran said that was correct. Mr. Yudell said they're not losing current open space, with the exception of the possibility of, say, a focal element. They had a meeting earlier where they talked about maybe a kind of pavilion that could be used for dancing, rehearsal, technology, information, a very flexible piece in the space. At the moment he thought they were trying to think of how to get more richness and diversity to the big Plaza rather than how to make it smaller. He'd add that one thing that came up a lot in a meeting they just had with some grads and undergrads, an idea planners have been looking at more recently, was to kind of optimize the indoor/outdoor aspect. They're in a great climate that was pretty benign. Elements of this would be something like glazing in certain parts of MLK or lower elements on Lower Sproul and possibly creating opportunities to have big sort of glass panes, or big glass doors. Or, people could determine whether there was shade or not, depending on the sun and the flow outside, and then flow more inside in the winter, the way great plazas do around the world. So the indoor/outdoor aspect was something they're really just starting to push and explore. He thought the feedback has shown that to be a very promising direction. So they're going to look at that more. And to also answer the question, they want this large outdoor space to really come to life and to really accommodate as many kinds of life as possible, for as many hours of the day as possible.

Mr. Daal said that this was a catalog of ideas. The architects were interested in getting an understanding of what the students want as much as the students were interested in understanding the Lower Sproul project. So he would ask people to please articulate ideas at that time.

A Delegate said he was a little confused and thought one idea was create more pedestrian traffic and create more of an open feel between the University and the City. He asked how a row of retail or another division like Eshleman, between the University and the City, encroaching close to MLK, would actually increase pedestrian traffic and invite a more open feel between the University and the City. Mr. Violich said the degree of openness between Lower Sproul and the City was one that could be determined by people collectively. As they look at this, in the plan it looks like they're putting a wall between Lower Sproul and the City, planners think such a building could have multiple openings at the first and second levels so that they could have something much like they have in Eshleman, a series of passageways where they have framed views between Lower Sproul and the City. So they think the actual openness question could be achieved with a first and second level that was both solid and open as they move up and down Bancroft.

A Delegate concern was that restricting pathways would mean less pedestrian traffic, whereas if visibility was not impaired, more people could actually see what was happening in the Plaza. So all the great stuff that happened there, like all the dance practice at night and performances on Lower Sproul, are blocked

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatnitza, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 14 -

by Eshleman. So unless people come from Upper Sproul, that was the only time people would actually see it. He was concerned that having a bank or row of buildings blocking Lower Sproul would again, have the some sort of effect. He wasn't sure if that was helpful towards the objective of creating Lower Sproul or continuing activities on Lower Sproul. Mr. Violich said he could take the negative standpoint of being adjacent to a city, where they have the noise of Bancroft, the sounds, and the sense of being exposed. So he thought there was a counter issue there, of being buffered. He thought it was a balance between those two issues.

Mr. Yudell said that was hitting a very key point, and like a number of other points, the question was whether in planning they could find a kind of sweet spot. If they look at the gate by Zellerbach, they might imagine a building that had various kinds of flexible space on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th floors, and some very transparent retail on the lower floor, with a series of two-story high big gateways. They could play that back and forth, and at some point try and find a balance of containment, so people feel comfortable, but they don't have the street sounds. And there would be framed views that were welcoming. He thought that in any kind of wonderful campus or urban setting, they're always trying to find that balance, which was really important.

Ms. Ortega asked if by doorways, he meant tunnels that would create an arch that went through the buildings. Mr. Violich said it could be that. It could be one building, say an expanded Eshleman coming closer to MLK. It could be the connection on the upper levels that were glassy, like a bridge connection, so people could be seen walking back and forth, and it would give a sense of transparency.

Mr. Yudell said that Mr. Violich mentioned that the more they looked at it, a promising place to pick up area was south of the kind of side wall of Zellerbach. There's a kind of service road and a very beautiful small church there. But there was currently nothing between the west side of Eshleman and that service road, all that was there was the side wall of a big building, Zellerbach. So that area seemed like it would benefit from a pretty solid building. This area might just be a place where they could improve the grade change, since they're dropping down half a level, and at the same time, they could bring MLK more out to the street.

If they start looking at this, the area they really want porosity is aligned with the corridor. They look at how open that is, and as they start to look at it in more detail, they could pick up a lot of area there and screen the side wall of Zellerbach. Doing that, maybe they'd need less area on the other side where they might want greater porosity. That will be an interesting study over time.

A Delegate said he liked the idea of expanding the ribbon of green spaces. Secondly, in the winter, the one limiting factor for people doing things outside was the rain. He asked if there were any plans for covered outdoor spaces. Thirdly, on the other side of campus there's been a lot of construction in past years. He felt people in his program who are graduating have only seen things as being under construction. He asked if there was any thought going into the project about trying to minimize the amount of time it took to build it. Mr. Violich said phasing was a reality of this project. Not everything will be done at once. To the extent to which phasing could reduce the impact of construction, that will probably be the case with Lower Sproul. They might adaptively retrofit Chavez as the first phase and then touch Eshleman or the other buildings. Or, they might not touch MLK and Chavez and focus solely on a new building along Bancroft. He thought the phasing will, to some degree, help minimize the issue of living with a construction site. As for the question about covered, rain-protected areas, Mr. Violich

Guest Speakers -- Beth Piatniza, Capital Projects, and Moore Ruble Yudell Architects,
on Lower Sproul Redevelopment (cont'd)

- 15 -

Report from the Funding Committee

said that he thought, like a lot of cities that have beautiful public spaces, that element of choice, depending on the microclimate, was key and underscored the problem of Lower Sproul. They don't have choices. They have sun or shade; and then they're stuck. They either run inside or pop open an umbrella. The architects think that actually having opportunities for covered, rain-protected spaces, and that was definitely something that should happen along the perimeter. Mr. Daal said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Piatniza said there will be a workshop on Friday for which they've been soliciting participants. They pretty much now had a full list of students coming. So she was worried about having more people than she could accommodate. She'd suppose if people want to try and pull a couple of more representatives over, that would be possible. Mr. Daal said that was Delegates' invitation. If they were interested in going to the sustainability design workshop, which will focus on how to make these buildings as green and sustainable as possible, they were invited. Ms. Piatniza said it will be from 8:00 to 2:00, and they would prefer people to stay for the whole time. It's a participatory workshop that will be held in the Multicultural Center, Heller Lounge. A motion to move on with the agenda was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank the speakers for attending. (Applause)

REPORTS

Mr. Daal said reports were printed in the agenda packet. He called for any questions Delegates might have regarding Officers' reports.

Report from the Funding Committee

Mr. Podesta said the Funding Committee considered Grad Events Round 3, which takes them through the semester. They did okay, and had a 27.5% global cut. That's higher than they'd like, but not nearly as high as they've seen it.

Mr. Podesta said they also had Grants Round 2, and had a global cut of 12%, which was also pretty good. But again, they'd like to see it a little bit lower. He called for any questions.

A Delegate said there were a couple of groups that had events off-campus, and he believed there was a clause that allowed the GA to fund events within a two-mile radius of campus. He asked if Mr. Podesta could comment on that. Mr. Podesta said he should have mentioned that. They convened a new Funding Committee that year and discussed that issue; and the Funding Committee only wants to fund things that can happen on campus. Off-campus events can still get funded, but it would be for similar things that have happened in the past, such as ice skating, bowling, something that absolutely couldn't happen on campus. For these things, there were no facilities for them on campus. There were some things in Grad Events Round 3 that the Committee asked to be moved on campus because in the Committee's estimation, the events could happen on campus.

Report from the Funding Committee (cont'd)
Resolution Referrals

- 16 -

Mr. Daal said he would entertain a motion to approve the funding allocations. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S

RECOMMENDATIONS ON GRADUATE EVENTS ALLOCATIONS ROUND 3, \$22,827.09, AND GRANTS ALLOCATIONS, ROUND 2, \$11,258.36, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTION REFERRALS

Mr. Daal said he would referred the following Resolutions:

0811a, Graduate Assembly Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare, to the Campus Affairs Committee and the Rule Committee.

0811b, To Create a Lower Sproul Redevelopment Action Agenda Item, to the Campus Affairs Committee and the Rules Committee

0811c, To Promote Fairness and Transparency in Funding Allocations, to the Campus Affairs Committee, Rules Committee, and the Funding Committee.

A Delegate asked what Resolution referral was. Mr. Daal said that when a resolution is put forward, it first comes to the floor to be referred to a committee. Committees review the resolutions, analyze them, and report their analyses at the next meeting. The analysis is included in the agenda packet. At that meeting the GA will discuss and vote on the resolutions.

RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

The following Resolution, 0810e, was authored by Jonathan Rheume:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS TO ALLOW COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION FOR ACTION AGENDA ITEMS

Rename section 6.5.5 to 6.5.6

Rename section 6.5.4 to 6.5.5

Add a new section 6.5.4

6.5.4 Committees: Each Action Agenda Item has its own standing committee consisting of Delegates. These Delegates fulfill their obligation for membership in a Graduate Assembly Committee with regular participation in an Action Agenda Item Committee. The Action Agenda Item Committees are limited to five Delegates in order to not adversely impact membership in current Graduate Assembly committees.

Resolution 0810e, To Amend the By-laws to Allow Committee Participation for Action
Agenda Items

- 17 -

Ms. Hubbard said that Mr. Rheume was in Boston and couldn't be there. The purpose in amending the By-laws was to allow for committee participation in Action Agenda Items. Every year the GA selects three Action Agenda Items, usually because perhaps three people per Action Agenda Item actually feel passionate about it. One person usually ends up being entirely responsible for seeing that Action Agenda Item through, without a whole lot of support from the rest of the GA. Action Agenda Items vary from year-to-year, and people in past years have been more or less involved. The goal was to create official committees, but really, to guarantee actual participation from other members of the GA. So when people propose Action Agenda Items, people will actually work on them and make some sort of measurable progress. That was the reasoning behind the amendment.

Ms. Hubbard said the change was a little controversial in that people are busy and were already on at least one committee. But she'd ask what the point was to even have an Action Agenda Item if they didn't get people together to actually work on the issue and accomplish something.

Mr. Daal called for discussion.

A Delegate said that it was stated that this would allow for participation, but the way it was being articulated seemed to say it was being mandated. Ms. Hubbard said it wasn't forcing participation. The wording was open to amendment. Part of the problem was issues with the By-laws and issues with quorums and the minimum number of people at a committee meeting that had to be present in order for the meeting to be official. So they had to figure out if Action Agenda Items were going to have their own committees, then to fit them in with the rest of the GA's By-laws governing committees and how committees are run. That's where the complication came in. And in order to really not affect the rest of the committee participation on GA committees, which are important, more than likely the Action Agenda Items committees could not be a GA member's sole committee participation.

Mr. Valladares asked if they could hear from somebody from the Rules Committee about this. Mr. Rabkin said that the objection the Rules Committee had was that the change seemed to be either redundant or contradictory. There was no difficulty already. If somebody wanted to set up a work group for an Action Agenda Item, they could currently do so. But a “committee” had a precise meaning in the GA and meant a whole lot of stuff they didn't actually want for this because those things would contradict the context of the Resolution. For example, the Resolution limits an Action Agenda Item committee to five Delegates, but that wouldn't be a quorum. They'd need to do a lot of picking away at the GA's Charter in order to make the committees created by the Resolution weren't contradictory. It's not clear that they always want to require a committee, and it wasn't clear that the Resolution did anything if it didn't require a committee. If they want a work group, that could be easily created. But that wasn't mandatory. Making it mandatory seemed strange. They might think an Action Agenda Items could fall under an existing committee, which would be sufficient. But as worded, the Resolution would have new committees formed. And they couldn't meet because they didn't have quorum.

Ms. Hubbard said that even if an action item fell within the domain of a committee, work was still not getting done. So it really came down to what the point was if they had Action Agenda Items but things always fell on the shoulders of one person.

Mr. Marchand said he thought the objections raised were valid. Another question was that people fulfilling these assignments would come from other committees. The GA was already basically missing

Resolution 0810e, To Amend the By-laws to Allow Committee Participation for Action
Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 18 -

people from Standing Committees. He would like to see this not as a requirement, but voluntary. He agreed with the concept of the Resolution and thought that if someone brought forward an Action Agenda Item, before it was voted on they should ask if people in the Assembly were serious about working on this with them, because they wouldn't want to do it alone. To take it seriously, they should work on an item as an Assembly. But it didn't mean they needed to create a bureaucracy.

Mr. Rabkin he didn't dispute that it was good to have people work on Action Agenda Items, but putting people on a committee was not likely to make them participate. The bill didn't actually say anything at all about whether this would impact other committee service. It's not clear to him that adding an institution would make people more likely to work. Conversely, if they're willing to work for the infrastructure, it was superfluous. If nobody was willing to work on something, it shouldn't be an Action Agenda Item.

Mr. Rabkin said the Campus Affairs Committee was unclear whether the committee chair would be person who produced the Action Agenda Item. They were thinking there needed to be a formal way for the person introducing to become the chair. They were afraid of a scenario where somebody who was passionate about something and produced an Action Agenda Item would end up not being chair. They thought the person who introduced it should be chair, and it seemed unguided.

Ms. Parrish said she was part of the Rules Committee. A question the Rules Committee had was if the wording didn't involve a “committee,” but involved a work group, if that would resolve the issue. Mr. Armstrong said the feeling of the Rules Committee was that in such a case it would become unnecessary and redundant.

Ms. Berkeley said that to formally be a part of a committee would cause people to be slightly more involved. She didn't think the fact that people not getting stuff done, even when not on a committee, or

work group, didn't translate into something being unworthy of being done. She thought the idea was to take some sort of formalized action so that people would work on stuff. She thought the GA was nit picking over what actually got people going on Action Agenda Items.

Ms. Pannu said she thought the intent behind the Resolution was really good. She was concerned that they would inadvertently kill Action Agenda Items by not being able to get a critical mass on a committee to work on them. What might resolve this, which wasn't in the Resolution, was to give committee credit for working on an Action Agenda Item. That would fill role of getting Delegates to participate, while still kind of fulfilling the committee requirements, without creating a bureaucracy or additional layer. Her great fear was that they wouldn't get enough people on committees. To be honest, she kind of felt this was a place where she would hope the Executive Board would be able to lend support because ideally, the Board would be part of doing things and supporting an Action Agenda Item. It was something Delegates didn't have time to do. Maybe that would resolve the issue in terms of getting a critical mass from the Delegate body to work on Action Agenda Items, but not necessarily creating a standard that they couldn't fulfill that would kill an Item. She would recommend voting this Resolution down and coming up with something that would get done what people were looking for in terms of committee participation without necessarily creating a formal committee structure.

Mr. Podesta asked if the Resolution said that a Delegate would fulfill their obligations for membership on a GA committee by working on an Action Agenda Items. That was what the bill was intended to do. Ms. Pannu said it also made being on a committee mandatory. Mr. Podesta said they could just strike "has"

Resolution 0810e, To Amend the By-laws to Allow Committee Participation for Action
Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 19 -

and say "may have," for committee membership. That would address Ms. Pannu's concern about this taking too many people away from committees. With his suggestion, there would be no minimum and there would be a maximum of five. If it's worded as "may have," it could be a minimum of zero. It wouldn't really prevent people from being on committees.

Mr. Rabkin said they couldn't have a committee with zero people. If it didn't have at least six people, it couldn't meet. Mr. Podesta said that working groups could meet. Mr. Rabkin said they weren't permanent. Mr. Podesta said that maybe they could have an Action Agenda working group, give people on it committee credit, and have maybe a maximum of five people; and they wouldn't call it a committee. It seems that would solve many of the technical problems this Resolution had.

Mr. Ortega said a point was made earlier that the way the Resolution was currently written contradicted some of the By-laws. He would amending the bill to follow the By-laws, or amending the By-laws as part of the Resolution so that language in the By-laws was consistent.

Mr. Ortega moved to re-write the Resolution so that the bill and the Constitution were in agreement. Mr. Armstrong asked if he was saying that the GA should refer this back to committee. He said the motion had to have a specific action. He asked who would rewrite it. Mr. Ortega said he would guess the author would re-write it.

Mr. Daal said the motion was to re-write the Resolution, 0810e and to resubmit it to the Assembly such that the Resolution would not contradict the By-laws. Mr. Armstrong said that was no different than just voting it down.

The motion to re-write the Resolution died for lack of a second.

A motion to call the question on the Resolution was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Berkeley asked if there was a way to come up with the recommendations of the Assembly for what would need to be fixed. Mr. Daal said they couldn't do that at that point. The question was called and they had to come to a vote at that time.

Mr. Daal said approval of the Resolution 0810e, as a By-law amendment, would require a two-thirds majority to approve.

The motion to approve Resolution 0810e failed by voice-vote, Resolution to Amend the By-laws to Allow Committee Participation for Action Agenda Items.

Ms. Parrish asked to withdraw Resolution, 0810f, To Create an Access to Health Care (Physical and Mental) Action Agenda Item, in favor of the other Resolution she submitted that evening, 0811a, which was already referred to committee. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO WITHDRAW 0810f PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Resolution 0810g, To Create a Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item
0810a, To Amend the GA By-laws with Regard to Funding Practices

- 20 -

On Resolution 0810g, To Create a Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item, Mr. Work said there's been enough talk of Lower Sproul. He just wanted to raise awareness that the Action Agenda Item was about Lower Sproul. They heard a lot about the architects' vision that evening and it was really important to give them feedback. This committee would formalize that communication. There's already an ad hoc committee that was currently working to do that. The Action Agenda Item has been revised and has been resubmitted, 0811b. So he would recommend that they rescind 0810g, To Create a Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO WITHDRAW RESOLUTION 0810g PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

The following Resolution, 0810a, was authored by Miguel Daal and Gabe Podesta:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BY-LAWS WITH REGARD TO FUNDING PRACTICES

WHEREAS, clarity and predictability with regard to the GA's funding practices is a critical aspect of the GA's service to graduate students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA By-laws be amended to include the following text, immediately following Section 6.6:

6.7 Graduate Student Group Funding

6.7.1 The Funding Guide

Before each academic year, the Funding Chair shall work with the Business Office to create the Funding Guide, which will outline the procedures that Graduate Student Groups should follow to apply for GA funding. The Funding Guide should be presented to the Executive Board for approval on or before August 15 of each year.

6.7.2 Funding Appeals

Decisions of the Funding Committee to deny or limit funding to a particular Graduate Student Group may be appealed to the Funding Appeal Committee, which shall consist of the Funding Chair, the Rules Chair, and the President. Appeals must be e-mailed to the Rules Chair no more than seven (7) calendar days after notification of the Funding Committee's decision. Appeals must contain the specific decision being appealed and the reasons for the appeal. Appellants shall be given the opportunity to present their case in person to the Funding Appeals Committee before a decision on an appeal is made, provided the appeal is timely.

6.7.3 Final Approval

The Funding Committee's report on funding allocations is subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly.

Mr. Podesta said that 6.7.1, "Funding Guide," and 6.7.3, "Final Approval," is the way the GA currently operated, although that hasn't been formalized. 6.7.2 "Funding Appeals," would change the appeals process a little. Appeals now go to the entire Executive Board. In the opinion of some members of the Exec Board, appeals kind of bog down meetings a bit. So instead of having appeals before the entire Exec Board, there would be a Funding Appeal Committee consisting of the Funding Chair, the Rules Chair, and the President that would meet separately. The process would stay the same and it would just be fewer people hearing the appeal.

A Delegate said the Campus Affairs Committee had an issue with appeals going to three people who'd meet behind closed doors. They could potentially blackball a group or individual, and the Committee was afraid of having three of the most powerful people already involved, and thought some kind of oversight would be necessary. He noted that this happened a week after the national financial bailout.

Mr. Podesta said he thought that was a gross exaggeration of powers.

Mr. Rabkin said he was very enthusiastic about this, but wanted to make one small change, to have the Funding Guide referred to the GA for approval at the same time they do allocations. Mr. Podesta said that was discussed, and the concern with that wasn't that they wanted to keep funding in the dark, but to have the funding guide go out before the first Delegate meeting. So it was in this in-between period. During breaks, the Exec Board actually operates as the agent of the Delegates. That's why they wanted to do it this way. But they definitely considered that. They just couldn't figure a way to do it other than to have two funding guides, before the September meeting and the one that came out after.

Mr. Rabkin asked if there was any way to get this to the GA, so more people had input. Mr. Podesta said that the input they get is from student groups and members of the Funding Committee. This wasn't three powerful people meeting behind closed doors. They get a fair amount of input now. But of course, they're always receptive to getting new ideas, particularly groups and from people who submit applications, people who perhaps don't come to GA meetings.

A Delegate said she thought there was an issue with some of this being administrative. Separating the funding guide into two separate parts would bog down a lot of things. Some criticism they get in feedback about funding practices dealt with Business Office procedures, bookkeeping procedures. And that wasn't really something the Funding Committee could address. So that would have to be separate from the Delegates discussing and approving something. And they end up with separate sections or separate guides, only part of which would go to the Delegates. She heard the suggestion, and they would like to see this go to the Delegates and get more feedback. There are ways they could probably get feedback over the summer and before the semester ended.

Mr. Rabkin withdrew his proposed amendment.

Ms. Berkeley said the Funding Guide could be posted on the Web site and they could allow for feedback over the summer.

A Delegate said there are Delegates on the Committee already giving feedback and opinions that were representative of Delegates' opinions.

Mr. Rabkin says the Resolution has the Funding Guide written by the Funding Committee Chair and by the Business Office. So there a single student was involved. Ms. Moran said that was correct, but they

Resolution 0810a, To Amend the GA By-laws with Regard to Funding Practices (cont'd) - 22-
0810b, On a By-law Amendment for the Determination of Delegate Seat Allocations

do meet and report to the Delegates. Mr. Podesta said they also consider any feedback they get, no matter where it came from.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Daal said that as a By-law amendment, it would require a two-thirds majority to pass.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0810a PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BY-LAWS WITH REGARD TO FUNDING PRACTICES.

The following Resolution, 0810b, was authored by Miguel Daal, Scott Armstrong, and Gabe Podesta:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT FOR THE DETERMINATION OF DELEGATE SEAT ALLOCATIONS

WHEREAS, section 2 1.1 of the GA Charter states "Each department, school, or college within the Graduate Division shall be entitled in the Graduate Assembly to one (1) Delegate for each one hundred (100) graduate students or fraction thereof enrolled within, except that within those schools, colleges, or departments which are functionally subdivided into two or more

semi-autonomous academic units or divisions, each unit or division shall be entitled to Delegates in accordance with the above rule. Determination of subdivisions shall be made by the Organization and Rules Committee"; and

WHEREAS, the GA does not currently obtain from the Graduate Division the number of graduate students in each department, school, or college; and

WHEREAS, this information is necessary for determining the number of Delegate seats in the GA, as per section 2.1.1;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA By-laws be amended to include the following text, immediately following Section 6.5:

6.6 Census

Once a semester, the President shall determine the number of graduate students enrolled in each Graduate Degree-Granting Program, and make this tabulation available on the GA's Web page. This census shall determine the number of delegate seats allocated to each Graduate Degree-Getting Program, in accordance with the GA Charter, for the following semester.

Mr. Podesta said this was something they thought they should be doing, but don't. They would like to formalize this and make sure they do have a census.

Mr. Armstrong said the Charter says they're supposed to do this, but doesn't say how. The Resolution sort of formalizes how they should obey the Charter.

Resolution 0810b, On a By-law Amendment for the Determination of Delegate Seat Allocations (cont'd)

- 23 -

Ms. Parrish asked why they wanted to do this once a semester, as opposed to once a year, because according to her department, people are appointed to the GA for a full, year term. Mr. Armstrong said he thought the idea was that semester to semester, some programs could change the number of students they have enrolled. The number of Delegates was based on the number of registered students who are registered semesterly, not annually. Ms. Parrish asked what the procedure was, and if it would be up to departments, then, to decide who got booted from the GA if there's a decrease. Mr. Armstrong said that if a department had a full slate of Delegates and alternates and then went down in population, and lost a seat, then they'd lose a Delegate seat. The Delegate asked who determine what Delegate would be lost. Mr. Armstrong said the department. Presumably the Delegates would work it out.

Mr. Work said he didn't think they'd need the additional work to check on the numbers every semester and thought it was fair to do it once a year. So he would propose amending the wording to reflect that.

Mr. Froehle said that if this was going to be a By-law amendment, he asked if they could do amendments to the amendment. Mr. Armstrong said they could. Mr. Armstrong said the Rules Committee met and discussed this. The Committee's opinion last year, and for as long as he's been around, was that they couldn't amend from the floor. So the Resolution would have to be re-referred. But the Rules Committee took a look at this and decided that there was no reason that should be the interpretation, and thought it was an unreasonably strict interpretation and would mean things would take an extra month if they wanted to change one word. Mr. Armstrong said he put that in his report from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Work moved to amend 6.6 and delete references to “semester,” and replace that with “year.” That would court in two places.

The motion to amend was seconded.

Ms. Parrish said she thought it should be changed to “academic year.” Mr. Work said he would accept that as a friendly amendment, with the clause to read as follows:

“6.6 Once an academic year, the President shall determine the number of graduate students... in accordance with the GA Charter, for the following academic year.”

Ms. Berkeley asked if it was necessary to specify what time of the year the census should occur, or if that could be determined. Mr. Daal said that personally, he didn't think they should specify that.

Mr. Rabkin asked how common it was for departments to change their assigned numbers during the year. Mr. Armstrong said that was out of order as the GA was talking about the amendment to the amendment, and Mr. Rabkin's comments pertained to the amendment.

Mr. Daal called for any objection to the amendment to the amendment.

A Delegate said it seemed like it would be a lot of work to do every semester, rather than every year. Mr. Armstrong said that pertained to whether a census should be every semester or every academic year.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT, MAKING IT “ACADEMIC YEAR” IN 6.6, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Resolution 0810b, On a By-law Amendment for the Determination of Delegate Seat Allocations (cont'd)

- 24 -

Resolution 0810c, On Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics

Mr. Daal said they were now voting on the amendment to the Resolution, as it was amended. Mr. Armstrong said the amendment to the By-law amendment would strike the word “a semester” in line 27 and replace it with “an academic year,” and strike the word “semester” in line 31 and replace it with the words, “academic year.”

A Delegate said that the purpose of this amendment to the By-laws, then, was that it was more work to do every semester rather than every year. He asked if people actually doing the work agreed with that. Mr. Podesta said he thought it was concern that a department could lose a Delegate from one semester to the next. It really wasn't any work, and they People get the data from the Grad Division.

A Delegate said there were two different arguments: that a Delegate seat could be lost halfway through the year and secondly, that it would be extra work. If it was no extra work, then it seemed fair. But a Delegate seat could be lost halfway into the year.

Mr. Work said that if someone had the interest at the beginning of the semester to come to meetings and sit through the bureaucracy, and wanted to remain as a Delegate, they ought to be able to do so.

Ms. Berkeley said that introducing a new person in the Spring Semester would be ridiculous and would probably involve the most work. New Delegates would have to be re-introduced to the GA. A Delegate said he thought they'd probably only have to cut people.

Ms. Parrish said that if a department went from 399 to 402, they would be entitled to send a new Delegate. And if they didn't, that would be the department's prerogative. But if they did, that new Delegate would come into Robert's Rules for the first time in February and would have no idea of what was happening in the GA.

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

Mr. Daal said they would vote on the motion to amend the Resolution, striking the words "a semester" and "semester" and replacing them with "academic year." THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

The question was called and debate closed on the Resolution, as amended. The motion to end debate passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0810b, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT FOR THE DETERMINATION OF DELEGATE SEAT ALLOCATIONS.

The following Resolution, 0810c, was authored by Jonathan Rheume, Sarah Hubbard, and Paul Albertus:

Resolution 0810c, On Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased
Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics

- 25 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ENCOURAGE BETTER TEACHING BY INCREASED
ACCESS TO COURSE EVALUATION SUMMARY STATISTICS

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley is the top ranked public American research university;^{1,2} and

WHEREAS, the Mission Statement of the University of California lists its fundamental responsibilities as teaching, research and public service, with teaching appearing first and foremost;³ and

WHEREAS, *US News and World Report* does not include teaching as a criteria in its rankings of top public national universities;⁴ and

WHEREAS, the overwhelming majority of undergraduates and the professional students who do not perform any research are poorly served by policies that focus on research at the expense of teaching; and

WHEREAS, course evaluations are a rich source of information and the only reliable summary of the quality of teaching; and

WHEREAS, course evaluations are used for faculty tenure and promotion cases; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley students provide a free service to the University by filling out course evaluations; and

WHEREAS, student access to course evaluations will ease the advising load of faculty members; and

WHEREAS, access to course evaluations will assist students to make more informed decisions about their class selections; and

WHEREAS, access to course evaluations will obviate the need for third-party sources of information that provide incomplete and sometimes emotionally charged feedback;⁵ and

WHEREAS, the policy of tenure and the lifelong job security afforded by it removes some motivational tools that are present in other professions; and

WHEREAS, a policy of transparency in the form of access to summary statistics of course evaluations is intended to be a motivational tool for faculty members to improve teaching; and

¹ John V. Lombardi, Elizabeth D. Capaldi, Craig W. Abbey "The Top American Research Universities 2006 Annual Report", The Center for Measuring University Performance at Arizona State University, 2006. Accessed from <http://mup.asu.edu/research2006.pdf>.

² "Best Colleges 2009", US News and World Report. Accessed from <http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/college/national-top-public>

Resolution 0810c, On Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased
Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd)

- 26 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ENCOURAGE BETTER TEACHING BY INCREASED
ACCESS TO COURSE EVALUATION SUMMARY STATISTICS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, several of UC Berkeley's peer universities offer students access to the student-generated course evaluation data, including the University of Michigan, the University of Virginia, Stanford, MIT, Harvard, Yale, and Carnegie Mellon; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at UC Berkeley does already share summary statistics from course evaluations online, and these statistics are available to all students to help them select their courses;⁶ and

WHEREAS, the University of California is a State-run institution that is subject to the California Public Records Act, which proclaims access to State records as a "fundamental and necessary right of every person in this State;"⁷ and

WHEREAS, the current practice at UC Berkeley of withholding course evaluation information from the citizens of California -- and particularly from the student body -- is out of compliance with State law. Universities are not exempt from the California Public Records Act;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President work with the UC Berkeley Chancellor to implement authenticated Internet access to summary statistics (but not individual written comments) from course evaluations spanning at least the past five years for members of the UC Berkeley community.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly review progress on the accessibility of course evaluations in March of the Spring 2009 Semester to determine if further actions are necessary.

³ University of California's Mission. Accessed from <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/aboutuc/mission.html>

⁴ Robert Morse, Sam Flanigan, "How We Calculate the Rankings", US News and World Report. Accessed from <http://www.usnews.com/articles/education/best-colleges/2008/08/21/how-we-calculate-the-rankings>

⁵ www.ratemyprofessor.com, www.pickaprof.com

⁶ Eta Kappa Nu, Student Services. Accessed from <http://hkn.berkeley.edu/student/CourseSurvey>.

⁷ California Public Records Act Government Code Sections 6250-6270. Accessed from <http://www.harp.org/og/cpra.htm#6254>.

Ms. Hubbard said that Mr. Rheume helped to write this, as well as she and Mr. Albertus. The Resolution was intended to add further weight to getting the University to publicly make available faculty course evaluations. There are a number of components to this. This is a public university and course

Resolution 0810c, On Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased
Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd)

- 27 -

evaluations are, by law, supposed to be publicly available. But they aren't. The premise behind the Resolution is that faculty instruction and the quality of teaching is an incredibly important part of the University's mission. It was also important in students' decisions to come there and in deciding what faculty students wanted to be taught by, and who they wanted to have as their mentors. Looking at the analysis from the Campus Affairs Committee, she thought they could modify the wording so that it was explicitly for faculty course evaluation statistics, not GSI evaluations. She's marked where that language could be changed, if someone would like to make a motion. That was a legitimate change that could be easily approved. But in general, this is something the University has fought a little bit over. Faculty are less than happy about having their teaching evaluations made public. But with student weight behind this, she thought it was something that could be fixed.

Mr. Rabkin said he thought the Campus Affairs Committee was also concerned about class size and which individuals made comments. And there was also the idea of the information being given to authenticated students.

Ms. Freedman asked if faculty wasn't already evaluated. Mr. Rabkin said the public would have access to what people said about specific faculty. He didn't really have a problem with that, but it did come up in the Committee. There was also a question of authenticated Internet access. It was unclear to them whether access to the information would have to be to graduate students. There was a question of whether this would result in total public access. Those were some of the concerns.

Mr. Marchand said that was a Resolution and not a By-law amendment. There will probably be a lot of something questions with professors and students. But this was a principle of adding some transparency to course evaluations. The GA should support it and should let people work out the details. The Resolution itself was general.

A Delegate asked if the California Public Records Act said what kinds of records were to be public, because there's a whole spectrum of records, ranging down to the Social Security Number of individual employees. He asked where this fell in the hierarchy. He'd guess that the law didn't mention professor evaluations. Ms. Hubbard said that within that, there are ongoing lawsuits against the University to make this information public. People were claiming that it was public and that it fell under this law. And the students in support of this agree with that. The University does not agree with that, as it stood.

Ms. Berkeley said she believed the issue at stake was the fact that the information was supplied by the students, who are the public. So they should have access to that information, which they've supplied. And that's what the University was taking issue with.

A Delegate said he thought this was a great Resolution. They had something similar to this at the University of Chicago. TAs were evaluated the same as professors. In general, whoever taught a course, whether faculty or GSIs, had evaluations, and people could see how they taught. The Delegate said he fully supported the Resolution.

Ms. Freedman said that Ms. Hubbard asked if someone would suggest an amendment, which she's already written out. Ms. Freedman said she would propose the amendment Ms. Hubbard suggested.

Ms. Hubbard said there was a question. The Campus Affairs Committee was concerned about the language of calling for access to faculty course evaluation statistics and not GSI evaluations. The

Resolution 0810c, On Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased
Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd)

- 28 -

motivation behind this Directed Action was mainly for faculty course evaluations. She thought GSI evaluations could also be a component. She was willing to either change the bill to explicitly relate to faculty course evaluations, if the GA thought that change should be made; or it could remain as written and be more encompassing of all course evaluations.

A Delegate said that Campus Affairs was very supportive of this Resolution. But there were some people who were concerned about the GSI issue.

Ms. Hubbard said she wouldn't, therefore, make an amendment.

A Delegate said she wouldn't support the Resolution if it meant that evaluations of her first year as a GSI would be out there for the world to see.

Ms. Freedman said there was some concern with that. She would be happy if her teaching evaluations were online, except for the idiot who said she was sarcastic and not funny. But the problem was that she was no longer going to be teaching, ever. She asked if that was fair to all of the GSIs who were no longer going to be teaching again. So she thought that was a legitimate concern.

Ms. Hubbard said that consistency was important. If they claim that this action stemmed from students providing information, and that therefore they are the public, and should be able to access the information they provide, then she thought the GA had to remain consistent. So she was in favor of not changing the language of the bill. If the University decides that both faculty and GSI evaluations would be publicly available, she thought that would be fair. The argument being made was the same that most faculty make, i.e., that they don't want all their evaluations public. But people can't pick and choose. They had to be consistent under the law.

Ms. Berkeley said she thought the key point was course evaluations, not instructors. That's what really mattered to students. Whether it was GSIs or professors, people want to know the evaluations when they take a class. While it may not be significant having specific GSI evaluations, it would still be wise to include some form of GSI evaluations within the overall course evaluation. They might not have to narrow it down to instructors' names, but perhaps could indicate what types of scores GSIs were given for a course. She was just arguing for this to be maintained as a general course evaluation and they should determine what information should be provided in order to evaluate the course.

A Delegate said he served on the campus-wide Committee on Teaching and said the University itself was starting to look at the way teaching was evaluated on campus. One aspect of that larger project was looking at how students could get access to course information. One major issue against that happening so far was just the logistics of getting thousands or tens of thousands of evaluations per semester online and easily accessible. So whether they'd extend information about GSIs who might teach two or three times, and then never really be relevant for students to look at, the issue was one of resources to do this. There was definitely a resource issue.

A Delegate said that if they tie information to specific GSIs, even if its password authenticated, they all knew that things get echoed around the Internet quite easily, especially for those who are considering future employment. But especially for those with academic employment in mind, they could easily have a situation where the quality of a class is degraded by a couple of bad apples. And just ranking a class on

Resolution 0810c, On Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased
Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd)

- 29 -

Resolution 0809b, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness In Funding Applications
Resolution 0810d, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness In Funding Applications

a score of 1 to 5 would not reflect scenarios like that. Putting information like this about GSIs on the Internet was not a wise move.

Mr. Valladares said he understood people's concerns, particularly those of GSIs. However, even if they pass this, it's not that they'd actually be putting it into effect. Rather, they'd just passing a Resolution so they could begin to work with the University to get this implemented. If they're doing this in the spirit of actual accountability, clarity, and transparency, then he thought it needed to encompass GSIs as well. They're thinking about not including GSIs, and in doing that, they're thinking about themselves. But if they represent the students, they'd include everyone who took courses. Thirdly, as it stood, in reading the Resolved Clause, that the GA President would work with the Chancellor to work with summary statistics,

but not individual written comments. It doesn't specify what was meant by "summary statistics." He didn't know if the type of information collected was relevant. But at least to some degree that should ease the fears for some.

Mr. Daal said speaking time had expired. Mr. Rabkin moved to extend time by ten minutes. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 0810c PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ENCOURAGE BETTER TEACHING BY INCREASED ACCESS TO COURSE EVALUATION SUMMARY STATISTICS.

On Resolution 0809b, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness In Funding Applications, Mr. Daal said he would leave the chair, since he was an author of the bill.

With Mr. Armstrong chairing the meeting, he said that he was also an author of the bill but wouldn't speak on the Resolution. Instead, Mr. Daal would speak on the motion and Mr. Armstrong said he would chair the meeting, unless anybody objected.

Mr. Daal said he thought there were better ideas on the table and he would like to withdraw the Resolution. The motion was seconded.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE WITHDRAWAL OF RESOLUTION 0809b PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, TO AMEND THE GA BY-LAWS TO PROMOTE FAIRNESS IN FUNDING APPLICATIONS.

With Mr. Daal chairing the meeting, the following Resolution, 0810d, was authored by Nish Rajan and Alberto M. Ortega:

Resolution 0810d, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness In Funding Applications (cont'd)- 30 -

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BY-LAWS TO PROMOTE FAIRNESS AND TRANSPARENCY IN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

WHEREAS, fairness and transparency in the allocation of GA funding to Graduate Student Groups is critical; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of a student government to make its best effort to be fair and equitable to all of its constituents; and

WHEREAS, the GA By-laws are currently silent on principles for allocating funding to graduate student groups; and

WHEREAS, lack of guiding principles may result in unfavorable loopholes which may lead to the inequitable distribution of funds;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA By-laws be amended to include the following text, immediately following Section 6.5.

6.6 Graduate Student Group Funding

6.6.1 Funding Rounds

There shall be at least three funding rounds each academic year, with deadlines provided in the Funding Guidelines. No Graduate Student Group shall be restricted from applying for funding during any funding round, except as sanctioned by the Delegate Assembly or Executive Board.

6.6.2 Funding Shares

The number of funding shares each Graduate Degree-granting Program shall receive is one (1) more than the number of occupied Delegate seats representing the Graduate Degree-granting Program. Funding shares shall be recomputed before each funding round.

6.6.3 Department-Based Apportionment of Funding

The Funding Committee shall endeavor to allocate funding to Graduate Groups in such a way that the total funding awarded to Graduate Student Groups affiliated or associated, officially or unofficially, to a particular Graduate Degree-Granting Program, shall be proportional to the Funding Shares held by the Graduate Degree-Granting Program at the time of the Funding Round. The affiliation(s) of each Graduate Student Group, if any, shall be determined by the Funding Committee. The Funding Guide, as per the principles of this Resolution, shall detail the apportionment guidelines for the department-based apportionment of funding. An exception to 6.6.3 may be made if such exception results in a more fair and equitable funding apportionment as per 6.6.5.

6.6.4 Non-Department-Based Apportionment of Funding

Resolution 0810d, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness In Funding Applications (cont'd)- 31 -

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BY-LAWS TO PROMOTE FAIRNESS AND TRANSPARENCY IN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS (cont'd)

The Funding Committee shall also award funding to Graduate Student Groups that are not related to a particular Graduate Degree-Granting Program in a way that is fair and equitable, as per Section 6.6.5. The Funding Guide, as per the principles of this Resolution, shall detail the apportionment guidelines for the non-department-based apportionment of funding.

6.6.5 Principle of Fairness

When issues arise that are not provided for here, in the Funding Guide, or elsewhere, the Funding Committee shall strive to distribute funds in an equitable and proportional way to Graduate Student Groups, and shall at all times act in accordance with common sense and an earnest desire to serve the interests of the GA.

Mr. Rajan said the Resolution was introduced because he believed there exists discrepancy in the Funding Guide. While he realized this Resolution would not take them all the way to a solution, it took them incrementally closer. He thought he did a good job except that he's heard back from all the committees that voted on it and he thought he got significant pushback on both his premise and his solution and he was happy to accept that pushback on his solution. He realized it was incomplete. He thought there was enough framework in the Resolution to work on it, but maybe not. He was cognizant of the Funding Committee's point of view in that it was a logistical nightmare, perhaps. And perhaps there were better ways to do this. The Campus Affairs Committee was correct in that there's no definition of "fair" within the Resolution. Again, he thought it was incrementally better. He thought the Rules Committee spoke to this by introducing a Resolution that was, again, incrementally better. However, he thought that Resolution was a little weak, in his personal opinion.

He would like to have this voted on because he would like the Delegates to take an opinion on this issue at this meeting so it doesn't get tabled indefinitely.

Ms. Pannu moved to call the question and to fast track the Resolution they just referred, 0811c. She thought it would get the action Mr. Rajan was talking about and it seemed like there was pretty unanimous agreement with 0810d from the committees.

Mr. Daal said the first motion was to call the question on 0810d. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed by hand-vote 20-9-11.

The motion to approve Resolution 0810d failed by voice-vote, Resolution to Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness and Transparency In Funding Allocations.

A Delegate moved to extend time by five minutes. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote 21-18, requiring a two-thirds vote. This meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

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

Amended Bill

- i -

The following Resolution, 0810b, as amended, was authored by Miguel Daal, Scott Armstrong, and Gabe Podesta:

Resolution on a By-Law Amendment for the Determination of Delegate Seat Allocations (Amended Version)

Whereas, section 2 1.1 of the GA Charter states "Each department, school, or college within the Graduate Division shall be entitled in the Graduate Assembly to one (1) Delegate for each one hundred (100) graduate students or fraction thereof enrolled within, except that within those schools, colleges, or departments which are functionally subdivided into two or more semi-autonomous

academic units or divisions, each unit or division shall be entitled to Delegates in accordance with the above rule. Determination of subdivisions shall be made by the Organization and Rules Committee"; and

Whereas, the GA does not currently obtain from the Graduate Division the number of graduate students in each department, school, or college; and

Whereas, this information is necessary for determining the number of Delegate seats in the GA, as per section 2.1.1;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the GA By-laws be amended to include the following text, immediately following Section 6.5:

6.6 Census

Once an academic year, the President shall determine the number of graduate students enrolled in each Graduate Degree-Granting Program, and make this tabulation available on the GA's Web page. This census shall determine the number of delegate seats allocated to each Graduate Degree-Getting Program, in accordance with the GA Charter, for the following academic year.