

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

October 2, 2008

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Announcements

Kara Joong, the new Graduate Women's Project Coordinator, asked for feedback on programs of interest to graduate women. The Graduate Women's Caucus will happen again.

Jonathan Poullard, Dean of Students, is working with the GA and the Student Advisory Board on Lower Sproul and on liability issues for student organizations, including the ways that grads organize. Graduate students organize differently than undergrads do.

People were working hard to revitalize the Lower Sproul area. Eshleman Hall needed to come down. Grads were one-third of the student body and will be represented in the design.

Student groups are not covered by the University's liability coverage, so Dean Poullard was working with a Systemwide task force on how to cover student events and activities on campus. Coverage that fall was being provided by the Vice Chancellors for registered student organizations. But many grad events are not put on by a registered group, so they had to figure out how to cover that.

The next issue will be off-campus events, like internships and field trips, which were not covered unless they were organized by a sponsored student group.

Rafael Colonna and Claire Woo, from the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on LGBT issues, talked about the ramifications of Proposition 8, a constitutional amendment that would eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry. Marriage and domestic partnership were not the same and wasn't portable across state lines. The GA was asked to help educate the graduate community. A rally will be held in opposition to Prop. 8, with S.F. Mayor Gavin Newsom.

The Statistics Department has a consulting service for people with any statistical questions.

The Grad Social Club will have Oktoberfest on Thursday, October 23.

Approval of the Agenda

The Law School's academic calendar changed that year and conflicted with the GA. The Law School had 1,000 students and it was argued that that Law School Delegates should be present to vote on Resolutions. A motion to move Resolution 0809A to the November meeting failed by voice-vote.

Address from Graduate Dean Andrew Szeri

The amount and stability of funding the campus to graduate programs was inadequate. This was Dean Szeri's 13th month in the Graduate Division, and he's been working on this, through the Campaign for

Berkeley, with graduate student support an integral part, and matching endowments. Berkeley's endowment was \$2.9 billion; Harvard was at \$35 billion; Yale, \$22.5 billion; Stanford, \$17.2 billion; Princeton, \$15.8 billion.

Dean Szeri wanted to increase endowment dedicated to graduate student support by magnitudes through the Graduate Fellowship Matching Program. Endowments are established in perpetuity.

Every year the Grad Division gives about \$20 million to graduate programs all across the University to give to students. A proposal would earmark some of that to use as matching funds in collaboration with some of the endowment payout. It would be matched by endowments to allow the principle to eventually grow enough to take over full funding of the award.

With a traditional fellowship, the entire payout would be spent every year, and they'd never be able continue to support students with the award.

A department trying to bring in an out-of-State student could make a combination of awards.

Donors would like this because there was flexibility and could direct support to students in any graduate program or group of programs.

Every degree-granting graduate program got block grant allocations from the Grad Division and could support endowment gifts.

The overall goal University-wide for the Campaign for Berkeley was \$3 billion, and the target for graduate student support was \$350 million. So far about \$75 million has been raised in the quiet phase of the campaign, over almost two years. With \$10 million of block grant money to support this \$350 million of new endowment, that would establish a total of 450 fellowship packages that were equivalent to their most prestigious fellowship, the Berkeley Fellowship, which includes nine-month stipends, fees, non-resident tuition, summer awards, and a top-off award. The Grad Division gives out only 70 Berkeley Fellowships a year, so the program represents a major increase.

One problem was the decentralized nature of the Campaign for Berkeley. Fundraisers were attached to schools and colleges. Interdisciplinary programs spanned schools and colleges, and 14% of doctoral students receive degrees from interdisciplinary graduate groups.

Grads were urged to participate in any calls from people making the case for grad student support who were asking for good stories from current students.

UC Student Association Announcement

Christine Byon, Field Organizer for the UC Student Association, explained the UCSA, which was student-run and student-led, and included grad and undergrad representatives from all UCs. The UCSA has a lobbyist, kept in communication with UCOP, and tracked Regental news.

Each summer the UCSA has a conference to choose their Action Agendas, the campaigns they'll work on for the whole year. The one that got the highest votes was putting more funding towards graduate and undergraduate student research. They also worked on the California DREAM Act, which was vetoed on

Wednesday by the Governor. They're also trying to register 40,000 students across the UC System. The UCSA holds monthly meetings.

Report from the ASUC

Ms. Flores is an ASUC Senator and a representative to the GA. Bills of note that the Senate passed were mentioned.

Report from the Funding Committee

Global cuts for requests from Grants was over 50% and for Resources was about 50%. But they had a lot of applications. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations for Grants, Round 1, totaling \$11,247.95.

Officers' Reports

The GA was writing a letter to Pres. Yudof to encourage prioritizing a \$10 million graduate student-funding package that would be disbursed this budget year.

Resolution Referral

Mr. Daal referred the following bills to committee: Resolution 0810A, To amend the GA By-laws with Regard to Funding Practices; Resolution 0810B, By-law Amendment for the Determination of Delegate Seat Allocations; and Resolution 0810C, Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics Resolution 0810D, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness and Transparency In Funding Allocations.

Resolution Discussion and Vote

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved Resolution 0809A, To Promote Accountability and Effectiveness for Action Agenda Items. The bill amended GA By-laws about Action Agenda Items.

With the By-laws amended, Action Agenda Resolutions were referred to committee: 0810E, To Amend the By-laws to Allow Committee Participation for Action Agenda Items; To Create a Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item; Access to Mental Health Care; and TEACH Us.

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting



This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

Announcements

- 4 -

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daal said the first announcement was from Kara Joong. Ms. Joong said she was the new Graduate Women's Project Coordinator, replacing Carmen Mitchell. She was very happy to be with them as part of the GA community. She had a lot of great ideas about programming for the year and wanted to hear from Delegates about things they want to have, such as or workshops they might want to have, programs that were of interest to graduate women. She didn't know if any of them were part of the Graduate Women's Caucus that happened last year, which they'll definitely have again. It's a chance for graduate women to come together in a political environment to talk, tell stories, discuss things they want to change on campus and also become a committee for her in terms of programs she organizes. People should feel free to stop by Anthony Hall. She'll be there most of the day every Thursday, or people could send her an e-mail at gwp.ga.berkeley.edu.

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was from Jonathan Poullard, Dean of Students. Mr. Poullard introduced himself and said he was the Dean of Students on campus, working very closely with the undergraduate students and the GA. With regard to the Graduate Assembly, most of the work was with Mr. Daal and his Cabinet around two issues. One was Lower Sproul and the Student Advisory Board that Mr. Daal sits on, as does a couple of other graduate students, including last year's GA President, Josh Daniels, who's a member of this Board. They're going to meet for the first time next Monday, October 6.

Mr. Poullard said the other big issue was about liability issues for student organizations. Graduate students organize differently than do undergraduate students, and perhaps policy and guidelines could be rewritten for the specific needs of the GA and its Delegates and how they do events on campus.

Mr. Poullard asked how many people there were new Delegates. He said his role in working with graduate students, and all students, was to be an advocate for students on the campus, and to make sure that critical issues, concerns, and needs of students were addressed on the campus by working very closely with his boss, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, their Chancellor, Bob Birgeneau, the Dean of the Graduate Division, Andrew Szeri, and others. It was about making sure that their classroom lives were much better integrated, but outside of that, they also had lives; and that's where he sort of came in. He'll be at all GA meetings and will probably give a report each time for four to five minutes, and take any questions people might have about general campus issues and concerns they saw in their departments or in their daily lives on the campus. That would help him be much more effective in his role as the Dean of Students. Unfortunately, he won't be there next month because he'll be in Egypt when the GA meets in November. But he'll be back in December and for the rest of the time. If people had any questions, he could take them at that time.

Mr. Daal asked if everybody knew about Lower Sproul. Mr. Poullard said they were actually in Lower Sproul at that time. People were working hard to revitalize this whole area. The building they're in, Eshleman Hall, needed to come down. It was completely deficient and needed to be replaced, and joined with MLK. One big issue for graduate students was what would be their space there. They need a much better lounge, much better offices, better places to meet, and the grassroots needs for Lower Sproul space should not just come from undergrads, but from grads as well. Grads were one-third of the student body,

so they need to make sure that the grad student third was represented in terms of how the space was designed.

Announcements -- Dean of Students Jonathan Poullard (cont'd)

- 5 -

The building was completely antiquated. When he interviewed on campus two and a half years ago, he asked himself why this eyesore was in the middle of campus. It really said a lot to him as to how they value students' lives outside the classroom. For him, it was horrific. So he's been really working hard with grad and undergrad students, about how to re-envision this in a much more lively situation for students outside the classroom. Lower Sproul included Martin Luther King, Eshleman Hall, Cesar Chavez, and the parking garage under Eshleman. They all need to go away.

Mr. Daal asked if everybody heard of the liability issue that was surfacing at that time. He asked if Mr. Poullard could say a few things about that. Mr. Poullard said that about a year ago he learned that student groups, both graduate and undergraduate, when holding their events, were not covered by the University's liability. So if something were to go wrong at a GA event, basically the GA would be on the hook. That made no sense to him. So he worked with a task force for UC Systemwide to look at how to cover students for their events and activities on the campus. When they have speakers, programs, other kinds of events on the campus, or especially when they have alcohol at events, the campus should cover that through the University's insurance policy. The campus didn't do so. So that fall Mr. Poullard said he worked with his boss and other people to cover all of the students' events for the fall, until they write a rider, a policy, for the entire System, which will take place in the spring.

However, coverage would require all groups to be registered student organizations. Many of the ways that graduate students organize isn't done that way, unlike the situation with undergrads. Grads might just throw a party or have a one-time event. So they had to figure out how do they do this differently for grad students than for undergrads. Again, whenever they have an event on campus, it will be covered by the University's liability insurance, so any liability would not fall to the group, but to the University. Mr. Poullard said those were the big issues at that time for the fall.

A Delegate asked when the coverage started. Mr. Poullard said it has already started, and the campus was paying for it at that time. The Vice Chancellors agreed to pay for it through the Fall Semester until they actually write the Systemwide policy, which is what they'll do in January. If it's not done in January, they'll ask for more money from the Vice Chancellor. But they hope to have it done in January.

The Delegate asked if an event had to be on campus. Mr. Poullard said it did, which was a whole other issue. The next issue will be about off-campus events, like internships and field trips. They were currently not covered unless there was a sponsored student organization, in which case they would be covered because they basically operate on behalf of the University.

Ms. Berkeley said that the GA meeting was covered. Mr. Poullard said that was correct, and it didn't need liability coverage because they weren't doing anything that bridged liability. They didn't prepare their food, which was delivered, so if people got sick from it, the campus would take it up with the people they got the food from.

Ms. Hsueh asked if there was anything on the Web that told students how to look into this if they wanted to have events and were sponsored, registered, and how they could hold an event that served alcohol. Mr.

Poullard said that information was on the CLL Web site. But the bigger issue was the one-time events that graduate students have, maybe doing something once a year, or once a semester.

Rafael Colonna, a graduate student in Sociology, and Claire Woo, a graduate student in Chemistry, introduced themselves. Mr. Colonna said they were the graduate student representatives for the

Announcements (cont'd)
Approval of the Agenda

- 6 -

Chancellor's Advisory Committee on LGBT issues. They were at the GA meeting because they wanted to inform and educate the graduate student community on the ramifications of Proposition 8, a constitutional amendment that would eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry. They'd talk about how passage would affect the UC community, particularly graduate students.

Proposition 8 would basically overrule a court decision from last May. The Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law has calculated that \$65 million over the next three years would be contributed to the State's budget through the issuing of marriage licenses and sales tax revenue from the marriages. Of the school's budget, 19-25% comes from the State. This could also potentially have an adverse affect on the ability to recruit and retain faculty and future graduate students, given that some of Berkeley's major rival schools, MIT and Harvard, are in Massachusetts, which wouldn't carry these laws.

Mr. Colonna said passage would also affect his work, since he did a lot of queer research. It would be problematic to get queer faculty here when other schools offer better financial packages. In other states that banned same-sex marriage, university domestic partnership benefits, which Berkeley has, were also ruled illegal. That has actually happened that year in May, through the Michigan Supreme Court.

Finally, Mr. Colonna said there was a difference between marriage and domestic partnership. The latter did not provide access to the 1,130 federal rights and benefits available to married couples. Also, it wouldn't be portable across state lines. In addition, other restrictions would be imposed, such as the same household living requirement and differential taxation and healthcare. In addition, many institutions, including the California State Supreme Court and the American Psychology Association, have pointed out the second-class status imposed by domestic partnership, in comparison to marriage. In light of some of these facts of how passage of Prop. 8 would influence the graduate community as well as the larger community of California as a whole, he and Ms. Woo were there to talk about this.

Ms. Woo said that because of all these far reaching ramifications of Prop. 8, they want to encourage the entire GA to help in educating the graduate community on this issue. The ASUC recently passed a bill in opposition of Prop. 8. They hope the GA will also take affirmative action as soon as possible. One suggestion they had was for the GA to send out a letter as well as to use other means to disseminate this information to all graduate students and to educate them on the potential ramifications of Prop. 8 on faculty, staff, grad students, and the whole Berkeley population.

Mr. Colonna said there will be a rally opposing Prop. 8 on Friday at 12:30, on the Savio Steps in Upper Sproul. San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom will speak, among others. He would urge people to attend.

Carl introduced himself and said he was from the Statistics Department. The Department has a consulting service for people with any statistical questions. People were welcome to come by and ask questions. He would encourage them to go to the Web site and go to "consulting services," where they could find more

details. He would ask people to please come in early, and to not collect data only to figure out that their model didn't work, and to then ask the Department to save them. In such circumstances, the Department couldn't do that. It was best to come to the Department when people were designing their experiment.

Ms. Berkeley said that Elaine Shapland, from the Grad Social Club, dropped of fliers for the Oktoberfest, on Thursday, October 23, at MLK Pauley Ballroom, from 6:00 to 9 p.m. There will be beer and they may or may not have Top Dog.

Approval of the Agenda

- 7 -

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Daal said everybody should have a copy of the agenda. He called for a motion to approve.

Ms. Pannu said she understood from the last meeting that the GA delayed action on both Resolutions because the Law School said they wouldn't be present that evening. The agenda for the meeting listed discussion and vote of one of those Resolutions. She wanted to clarify what the GA actually voted on. The minutes state that they voted on one, but her recollection was different. Mr. Daal said they voted to not discuss the Resolution 0809B, the funding Resolution, not the Resolution on the Action Agenda, which was 0809A.

Ms. Pannu said that when the Law School students left, they thought the GA was going to vote and they thought the motion was to delay a vote. Mr. Daal said that's not what the GA voted on. Mr. Armstrong said that wasn't what they voted on.

Mr. Podesta said they could delay consideration if there was concern. Mr. Daal said he would move to delay discussion on the Action Agenda Item and to vote on Resolution 0809A at the November GA meeting. The motion was seconded.

On a point of information, a Delegate what the affect would be to delay vote on Action Agenda items. Mr. Armstrong said the GA had a system for Action Agenda Items. They'll select three items, which they were supposed to do last month, and vote on them to be the GA's Action Agenda Items. If they do not vote on Resolution 0809A, then they should proceed on finding Action Agenda Items for that year, as per the By-laws as they were currently written.

Mr. Froehle said he didn't think this had any relevance to the Law School and having read the text, he didn't see why the Law School would have to be there for this vote.

Ms. Pannu said she was the only Law Delegate in town that week. The Law School's academic calendar changed that year, and it conflicts with the GA. There was an issue of democratic consideration. She understood the Resolution didn't necessarily have any inherent impact on Law School students, as opposed to all grad students. But she felt the Law School was part of the community, making up 1,000 students on campus. If it was a smaller department, she would like to delay the vote for that as well. In her opinion it was important to have democratic participation for everyone. Law School students' semester was suspended that week; they don't classes.

Mr. Froehle said the whole point of government was that it kept functioning even when one or two people couldn't be there. He thought the GA should leave the Resolution on the agenda.

Ms. Pannu said they had this debate last month, and she thought there was some confusion over delaying this. She understood the point about government continuing to function. She was sure Law Delegates will want to address this in a permanent way later on. They weren't in class that week, and for them, it was the equivalent of Winter Break.

A Delegate asked how many Law School Delegates there were. Mr. Daal said they were ten. The Delegate asked what percentage of the GA that was. Mr. Armstrong said there are 77 Delegates.

Approval of the Agenda (cont'd)
Address from Graduate Dean Szeri

- 8 -

Mr. Ortega said the longer they put this off, the longer it will take the GA to have access.

Ms. Pannu asked if there was anything in the By-law amendment that if it passed next month would trump decisions that someone made now. Mr. Froehle said there were, with the difference in coordinators and the plan. It wasn't necessarily the topics of what they'd decide.

Ms. Pannu said they had to decide on an Action Agenda, a plan, and a coordinator. If the GA passed this next month that wouldn't destroy everything and would make it impossible for the GA to function. Mr. Daal said he believed they could find a solution if they look for one.

Mr. Marchand said he would prefer to discuss the whole issue. If it wasn't a controversial issue, and wasn't even a close vote, in the end they will have delayed it for nothing. He was just trying to point out that this was a lot less controversial than maybe the funding question that was postponed for that reason. This was something everybody was very much in favor of and people could have met before that week to give their opinions about the motion. He didn't think there was that much reason to delay a vote.

Mr. Daal said this was a change in procedure, so it would require a two-thirds vote. The motion to move Resolution 0809A, discussion and vote, to the November GA meeting, failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Daal said he would entertain a motion to approve the agenda. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Froehle and was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

ADDRESS FROM GRADUATE DEAN ANDREW SZERI

Mr. Szeri said he wanted to thank them for the opportunity to come and talk to them that evening. He was there really to discuss one issue that he thought was really, really important. He would frame the discussion around graduate fellowships and the Campaign for Berkeley.

In the last seven years, as a member of the Graduate Council, Chair of the Graduate Council, Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, and Dean of the Graduate Division, he's been involved in a review of just about every academic program on campus. And those reviews include graduate student input as well as faculty input. They develop recommendations that go back to the department about how the department should improve its function. His conclusion from this long experience was that the single most important problem facing both the faculty and graduate programs around campus, and also the students in graduate programs, was an inadequate of funding.

Mr. Szeri said that both the amounts and the stability of that funding the campus had were inadequate. So he has resolved to attack this problem head on. In what was now his 13th month in the Graduate Division, they've been working for the last year to put together this program. The public phase of the Campaign for Berkeley was launched last week which was, unfortunately, also a somewhat turbulent week in the financial markets. But nevertheless, that was the public face of the campaign for the next five years, and graduate student support was an integral part of the whole package of support the campus was going after.

Address from Graduate Dean Szeri (cont'd)

- 9 -

The overall support project for this University was \$3 billion. He realized that Delegates have heard a lot of figures, and \$3 billion perhaps didn't sound that big any more. But it was the largest single campaign goal for a university without a medical school in the history of the United States. So it was a big number. To date, about \$1.4 billion has been raised. He was very proud to say that there was a specific, dedicated target for graduate fellowships.

To further to frame the discussion, the competition was fierce. The slide showed a list of the endowments of their principle private competitor schools, Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and Princeton. Harvard's endowment was \$35 billion; Yale's was \$22.5 billion; Stanford, \$17.2 billion; Princeton was \$15.8 billion; and Berkeley was at \$2.9 billion. There were many individual schools in between, but these schools were Berkeley's principle competitor schools.

Mr. Szeri said the next slide showed endowment. He would explain a little about what constituted endowment.

Mr. Rheume asked if he had any idea of how Berkeley compared with other public schools, like Michigan or Virginia. Mr. Szeri said he did, but not off the top of his head. The Grad Division had all of that data.

Mr. Szeri said he would explain a little about the meaning of endowment. They could think of it as a bank account, where the person spent the interest that came from that bank account every year in order to support things at the University. The part that was dedicated to graduate student support was a small fraction of the total. But nevertheless, it was important, and he wanted to increase it by magnitudes.

Mr. Szeri said the Graduate Division has developed the Graduate Fellowship Matching Program as the primary tool available to programs around the campus to try to secure endowment support for their own graduate students. The objectives are, first and foremost, to encourage gifts to endowment. The price of the various different giving opportunities they have ranged from \$50,000 to \$500,000. These could be established in installments. So somebody might pledge a \$50,000 gift and pay it over five years.

Mr. Szeri said their other primary objective was to enable departments to make competitive funding awards to students so that their students were better supported and so department could support the very best students for their graduate programs, making the University a stronger place.

Mr. Szeri said that as he mentioned, "endowment" is an account, with only some fraction of the interest spent every year. "Current use funds" are funds that are expended as one likes, maybe all of them this year, maybe over the next two years. The main point about an endowment, and the reason the Grad Division was stressing so hard the creation of endowment, was because these accounts are established in per-

petuity. That means that every year they'd spin off another fellowship award, or another non-resident tuition award, that could be given. And year after year, they'd have a stable source of funding that wouldn't go away, wouldn't fluctuate, and would be available for continued awards to deserving students.

Mr. Szeri said the next slide showed how the matching program worked. He'd illustrate this with an example of a gift of \$500,000 that established a fellowship that paid a single student, nine months of stipend, plus in-State fees. He was sure they'd much rather be listening to the Vice Presidential debate in St. Louis, but he'd work through the example because it was important to explain how the matching program worked.

Address from Graduate Dean Szeri (cont'd)

- 10 -

The slide showed a table, arranged in years 1 through 5, and the column shows the value of the endowment, the "bank account" from which they'd spend part of the interest. In the first year the initial gift is made of \$500,000, to which establish the account. Perhaps it's given over a period of years. A typical payout for an endowment was, say, 4.5%, a good, conservative estimate. That would give a payout of \$22,500. That amount, as grads knew well, was not enough to pay in-State fees and a reasonable stipend for students for nine months. So the Grad Division would take part of that \$22,500, mainly \$15,000, and would apply it to the award that would go to the student. That would be matched by other funds, in the same amount, dollar for dollar. So those funds, together, would make a \$30,000 award going to the student. And then they have a little amount re-invested, interest that was left over, \$7,500, which would be plowed back into the principle, to accelerate its rate of flow.

Mr. Szeri said this was different from a traditional endowment, where the entire payout is spent every year. While that would provide some growth of the principle, on average, it would happen at a slower rate.

Mr. Szeri said they would do this re-investment from part of the payout for year after year, until such time as the accelerated rate of growth of the endowment allowed it to grow to size where it could take over the full award by itself, and no further matching was required.

As for the source of matching funds, Mr. Szeri said the primary source the Grad Division imagined was the block grant allocation that came from the Graduate Division. Every year the Grad Division gives about \$20 million to graduate programs all across the University, and the programs give that to students. The Grad Division was suggesting to earmark some of that \$20 million to use as matching funds in collaboration with part of the endowment payout applied to fellowships so as to make full awards for students. This wouldn't take money away from the block grant allocation. Instead, it would expend the money in a way the Grad Division would normally spend it, which was to support students. But they're calling it a "match" as a part of a structured program so as to allow the rate of growth of the principle to be increased and allow the principle to eventually grow enough so that it would take over the full funding of the award. That was the idea.

Mr. Szeri said there were also other sources of matching funds that could be identified. For example, if the History Department established a Hewlett Chair, \$1 million would come from the Hewlett Foundation and another \$1 million would come from a private donor. Together, that would produce about \$100,000 a year in payout. And of that payout, \$25,000 would go to support graduate students in the History Department. So those funds could be used as matching funds to attract yet more endowment, and therefore work harder in the long run to stabilize the funding for graduate students.

Mr. Szeri said there were all kinds of other endowments for graduate student support already in existence, both held centrally by the Graduate Division and also by departments and graduate programs across the University. Those various sources of support could also be considered by matching funds. A long-standing endowment might have been set up years ago. If someone stepped forward and created a matching fellowship that used the payout from the longstanding fund to create a new endowment for graduate student support, they would then call the amount that went to the student “a hyphenated award,” such as the “Daal-Szeri” award in Cosmology.

Mr. Szeri said the next slide showed an illustration of the endowment payout versus fellowship costs. If initially, the fellowship was \$30,000 for in-State fees and nine months of stipend, the Grad Division

Address from Graduate Dean Szeri (cont'd)

- 11 -

would build into its planning a healthy rate of growth for that fellowship in the future since they know fees will be going up. There was no doubt about that. Also, stipends will need to increase in order to develop competitive awards. So they build that into the Grad Division’s planning, the cost of the fellowship and the payout to occur.

With a traditional fellowship, the entire payout would be spent every year, and they'd never be able to catch up and would never be able to continue to support students with that award. As they could see from the slide, payout never caught up to fellowship costs, and in fact, they diverged slowly over time. Mr. Szeri said this was what the Grad Division has historically been doing, and that was a situation he wanted to get out of.

Mr. Szeri said the Vice Chancellor for University Relations called that a “gift that keeps on taking,” because over time it had to be supplemented by larger and larger amounts from other campus resources because it was inefficient or inadequate to fund the whole award. So the Grad Division has structured this so that the matched endowment, with conservative assumptions on the growth rate, would eventually overtake the cost and fully fund the fellowship.

As for how long the matching period was, Mr. Szeri said that would depend on the performance of the market. He was a trustee, and they could rest assured that UC Berkeley Foundation funds were not just invested in NASDAQ, but were quite well diversified. What the slide showed was a calculation with very conservative assumptions.

Mr. Szeri said the next slide showed giving opportunities. As he mentioned, there was a range of giving opportunities ranging in price from \$50,000 to \$500,000 in endowment. He wouldn't go through all the details except to say there was a nine-month fellowship that he mentioned before and there was also a fellowship that paid a non-resident tuition award to an out-of-State or international student. Another fellowship paid a summer award, another paid a top-off, or excellence award to a student. And of course, if a program had all four of these fellowships, or some number of them, they could be combined in offers to students. So if a department was trying hard to bring in an out-of-State student, the department might make a combination of these awards. They might even make an award that was multiple years. Each of these required different levels of matching funds.

Mr. Szeri said he wanted to spend a few minutes talking about the benefits of this program as they have tried carefully to conceive it. For donors, the best benefit was that the funds were matching. Donors love matches. And in this program, the amount is matched dollar for dollar, with the payout used to support the student awards for the duration of the matching period. And then they have the full award given by

the fund itself. But donors will also like this because there's an immediate impact with their gift. They immediately start seeing the fact that every year a new student is supported by their fund. Also, there's a lasting impact with their gift, which would forever pay out to support students, and at ever increasing levels financially. So donors can rest assured that their gift would result in a lasting legacy.

A third point he wanted to mention was that donors would like this because there was flexibility. They can direct support to students in any graduate program or group of programs, such as MCB, the biological sciences, or L&S programs, or to the entire campus as a whole. They can decide whether they want to support summer research, non-resident tuition, or whatever they want.

As for benefits of this program to students and departments, that was more obvious. It would increase the funds available for graduate student support. That was one of their primary goals. These offers will stay

Address from Graduate Dean Szeri (cont'd)

- 12 -

competitive over time, so they will allow the campus to win the competition for the best students. The program was structured so it reached grads in every graduate program in every degree-granting graduate program run by a school, college, department, graduate group. All get block grant allocations from the Grad Division. So they all had the raw material that they need to support the endowment gifts to support their students. So it's conceived in a way that will reach students in every program, not just the wealthier ones.

The final point was something grads probably didn't hear that much about, but departments were really keen to learn that fellowships established under this program would be under local control. That meant that the department itself could decide which student will be supported each year.

Mr. Szeri said that University-wide, if they take together this entire program, they can reach the goal of \$350 million in new graduate student support. So of the \$3 billion overall campaign for Berkeley, \$350 million was the target for graduate student support.

As for where they currently stood, so far they've raised about \$75 million in the quiet phase of the campaign, over almost two years. If they use \$10 million of their block grant money to support this \$350 million of new endowment, that would establish a total of 450 competitive fellowship packages that were equivalent to their most prestigious fellowship, the Berkeley Fellowship. Those packages would include nine-month stipends, plus fees, non-resident tuition, plus summer awards, plus a top-off award.

Delegates may be interested to know that the Graduate Division gives out only 70 Berkeley Fellowships a year. So this program represents a major increase in the school's ability to support grad students.

Mr. Szeri said that as he mentioned, the main idea was to develop a more stable source of graduate student support that was not subject to the fluctuation of the State budget or the federal research budget. And he believed they'll achieve that.

Mr. Szeri said he would like to pass around a glossy brochure, which they worked with University Relations to produce. It highlights graduate students and their contributions and was intended for use in conversations between fundraisers and donors to help excite them about the idea of supporting graduate students and to get them on board with the program. It describes the fellowship programs he talked about. It's designed to be expandable, so they can develop inserts that were customized to department, schools, or colleges.

Ms. Szeri said GA leadership has been discussing with him some graduate student life initiatives, or GA initiatives, for which the GA would like some help in fundraising. The Grad Division would be happy to do that. He had in mind trying to develop an insert so when fundraisers talk to donors about graduate student support, that would go along with the package and would be a part of the conversation. So he was grateful to GA leadership for bringing to the table the idea to include that.

Mr. Szeri said the last slide showed partners in developing the Graduate Fellowship Matching Program. First of all, they had to persuade the Chancellor and the EVCP that they could have a dedicated target within the campaign for graduate student support. Mr. Szeri said he was hoping for a really big target. They also worked a lot with the Vice Chancellor for University Relations, Scott Bidy, and others. He's discussed this to death with deans of schools and colleges and was currently involved with a series of meetings with each school, college, or division of a school or college, and their chairs, and also the dean.

Address from Graduate Dean Szeri (cont'd)

- 13 -

In fact, one grad in the room was present at a meeting the other day, Diana Arya. They especially invite graduate students of Education, where students were invited to the dean's meeting with the policy committee.

Mr. Szeri said they've also talked several times to campus fundraising to bring them on board with the program and get them excited about it. They've talked to department managers and people who actually move money around on the campus. They're important to have on board to help them with matches. The same applied to chief administrative officers, graduate advisors, faculty heads of graduate programs, and graduate student affairs officers, who will actually process the awards. So it's been a long effort to put all of this together. He was happy to entertain questions on this, or something else. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Dean Szeri. (Applause) A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. Mr. Szeri said he's never been voted on like that before, and it was a humbling experience.

A Delegate asked why the gap widened over time, and if it was because inflation rose faster than the stipend. Mr. Szeri said that was correct. The rate of inflation for competitive stipend was greater than the rate of increase in the payout over time. The gap might close for a few years with a really exceptional market, but with conservative assumptions, that doesn't happen.

A Delegate asked about any problems with this idea. Mr. Szeri said one problem he was working on was the decentralized nature of the Campaign for Berkeley, the fundraising campaign. That meant that the fundraisers who actually had the conversations with donors were attached to schools and colleges. So the fundraisers in the College of Engineering, or L&S, were fundraising for engineering programs, L&S programs, and so forth. However, there were programs out there, especially graduate groups, that were interdisciplinary and tended to span schools and colleges. For example, 14% of doctoral students will receive their degrees from interdisciplinary graduate groups. He asked how many people in the room were in a graduate group. He was also in a graduate group, Applied Science and Technology, and he just graduated two PhD students. So he was mindful of this problem. He was worried that fundraisers wouldn't naturally champion the cause of graduate groups. So this was something he was hotly pursuing.

Ms. Hsueh asked if there were administrative fees associated with each endowment. Mr. Szeri said there generally was a small administrative fee, a quarter or one-half a percent or so, each year. That was included in the payout. But the Graduate Division didn't take any fee. It was only the UC Berkeley

Foundation that took that fee. The Graduate Division did its work for free, or for love, or some combination of the two.

Ms. Arya asked what the GA they could do concretely to support this. Mr. Szeri said he would like to thank her for the question. If they receive a call from somebody in their department who was trying to make the case for graduate student support in their discipline, saying they need good stories about current students, grads could really help by providing good stories about their every-day activities, the research they do, the social engagements they have, those kinds of things. That was really important because it provided the raw material that professional fundraisers use in conversations with potential donors. So if they receive that kind of a call, he would ask them to please answer. Mr. Daal called for a motion to extend speaking time. A motion to extend by one minute was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Dean Szeri once again. (Applause)

UC Student Association

- 14 -

UC Student Association Announcement

Christine Byon herself and said she was a Field Organizer for the UC Student Association. The UC Student Association is a non-profit coalition of all student governments, both graduate and undergraduate, across the UC System. They advocate on higher education issues, especially surrounding lowering student fees, putting more money toward financial aid programs, research, etc.

The UCSA is student-run and student-led. At the end of every summer, when school was about to start, students from all over the UC System get together and vote on campaigns they want to work on, to make change on issues affecting them. Student fees, tuition, and UC fees have increased dramatically. For undergrads over the past five years, it's increased 8%, and for grad and professional students, it's been even higher. Grads and professional students contribute to the whole UC System and it was really important that the UC stay as accessible as possible. That included grads being able to sustain themselves. The UCSA has a Board comprised mainly of schools' external affairs vice presidents, such as Mr. Ortega. The Board has monthly meetings. The GA also has a Campus Organizing Director.

Ms. Byon said the UCSA has a lobbyist, who keeps track of important legislation and of their State Assembly members, State Senators, and the Governor, to make sure what was happening was in the students' agenda and the higher education agenda. The UCSA also had a University Affairs Director who kept in communication with UCOP and kept track of Regental news, especially since they have a new UC President, Pres. Yudof, who just got appointed.

Ms. Byon said the UCSA was currently working on its student vote project, trying to register 40,000 students across the UC System. That was really important because not only were there really important candidates and propositions on the ballot, but it was important to mobilize students to build student power and to keep their elected officials accountable. Elected officials really cared who shows up at the polls. Campuses were located in very important cities across the State, so it was really important that students keep their elected officials listening to what students care about. If people had any questions, Ms. Byon said they could talk to her or to Mr. Ortega about any of these issues. If people have changed their address, even if they just moved around in Berkeley, they had to register to vote. She had registration cards and the UCSA could mail it in for them.

Mr. Ortega asked if she could talk about the agendas being considered. Ms. Byon said they were mainly working on the Student Vote Campaign. At the summer conference they choose their action agendas, the campaigns they'll work on for the whole year. They usually work on three Action Agenda items a year. The one that got the highest votes was putting more funding towards graduate and undergraduate student research. They have a graduate/professional committee within the UCSA to see what issues were pertinent to those students, and what was on their agenda. They also worked on the California DREAM Act, which was vetoed on Wednesday by the Governor. It would have made undocumented students eligible to receive financial aid, as currently they were unable to do so. These students pay the same amount of fees as everyone else, but can't get financial aid. Those were the main issues that were chosen.

Ms. Byon said the UCSA will have a Board meeting that weekend. They hold monthly meetings, and it will be in Santa Cruz that month. They'll figure out a timeline for the whole year.

A delegate asked if the UCSA endorsed candidates or propositions. Ms. Byon said they're a non-profit, a 501(c)(3), which basically meant that they do non-partisan work. So they're not allowed to endorse.

UC Student Association (cont'd)
Report from the ASUC
Report from the Funding Committee

- 15 -

They can work with other coalition partners, like No on Prop. 8. But the UCSA can't give out material that says "No on this," or "Yes on that." They can only tell people where their polling sites were and give them non-partisan information.

REPORTS

Report from the ASUC

Ms. Flores introduced herself and said she was a third-year, a double major in Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies. She's one of 20 Senators in the ASUC. She wanted to give the GA a quick update on some bills the Senate passed. One was previously mentioned, a bill opposing Proposition 8. They've also passed bills in support of the DREAM Act and of the AFSCME workers strike. There's a strike going on and University workers have been fighting for livable, minimum wages from the University. They have yet to be given a contract. Another bill they passed affected the ASUC's Constitution and By-laws, supporting the Disability Accommodation Fund, which mandated a minimum of \$6,000 for people who suffer disabilities. The Senate also appointed an Attorney General and Solicitor General, who will work together to interpret the vagaries of the ASUC Constitution and By-laws, and to be the ASUC's representatives if the ASUC was sued. Lastly, they decided on their three Advocacy Agenda committees. One will address equity and inclusion in terms of student health and spiritual well being. It will work towards finding a space where students can practice their religion or spirituality. The second committee will work on short- and long-range academic resources, meaning improvement and security of employment for faculty and staff. Lastly, they'll work to bring businesses to Lower Sproul that demonstrate strong values of fiscal, environmental, and social responsibility. People should feel free to visit a Senate meeting on Wednesday nights. They start at 7 p.m. and go on indefinitely. Last night it lasted until 4 a.m. The Senate was definitely open to graduate student advice, opinions, and concerns, and the Senate could defi-

nately learn from the GA about how to be more effective and efficient in running their meetings. Ms. Flores said she'll be the GA's ASUC representative.

Mr. Daal asked if she could give a one-minute plug for the Judicial Council. Ms. Flores said the ASUC was looking forward Judicial Council members. If people were interested in that, they could contact the ASUC President, Ms. Winston, at president@asuc.org.

Report from the Funding Committee

Mr. Podesta said the Funding Committee reviewed group resources and grants for Round 1. The global cuts were a little higher than the Committee would like to see. For Grants it was actually over 50% and for Resources it was about 50%. That was much higher than the Committee had hoped, but they had a lot of applications for groups looking to do go on things that the Committee wanted to support. The Funding Committee's report was distributed.

Report from the from the Funding Committee (cont'd)
Officers' Reports
Resolution Referral

- 16 -

Mr. Daal called for a motion to approve the Funding Committee report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT, ROUND 1 GRANTS, \$11,247.95, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Officers' Reports

Mr. Daal said Officers, per GA By-laws, submit written reports unless they're specifically requested to give an oral report. The written reports were part of the agenda packet. People could take a moment to look at them and to ask any questions they may have.

Mr. Froehle asked why they couldn't receive the reports via e-mail, before the meeting, so people had a chance to read them beforehand. Mr. Daal said they could if Officers would sent them in on time. He would love to put reports online. A Delegate said that even getting reports earlier in the day would be fine. Mr. Daal said they could try and do that next time.

A Delegate said that regarding the letter Mr. Daal wrote protesting the elimination of three grad student funding opportunities, that was a concern to a lot of students in his department. He asked if there was anything individual students or departments could do to protest as well. Mr. Daal said that was a good question. Perhaps they could approach him afterwards to discuss that. The GA was writing a letter to Pres. Yudof to encourage prioritizing a \$10 million graduate student funding package that would be disbursed this budget year. People could be involved in writing that letter.

Mr. Ortega said that for a quick announcement, the External Affairs Committee will meet on October 15, Wednesday, from 4:00 to 5:00 in Anthony Hall.

Mr. Klein asked if they have an Attorney General. Mr. Daal said they don't. Mr. Klein asked what would happen if the GA got sued. Mr. Daal said the ASUC rep was actually talking about the ASUC being defended by the Attorney General if the ASUC was sued by a student. Mr. Klein asked if the position was part of the student judicial process. Mr. Daal said it was. However, student government did have a lawyer, and if the ASUC or the GA were sued, which has happened before, they would have counsel.

Mr. Daal said he would take this time to make a quick announcement and ask people to please fill out the Delegate feedback form. It was very, very important. It's the GA's way of taking attendance and the questions feed back into what their priorities were and how they chose to spend their time.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

For Resolution 0810A, To amend the GA By-laws with Regard to Funding Practices, Mr. Daal said he would refer the bill to the Rules Committee, the Funding Committee, and the Campus Affairs Committee.

For Resolution 0810B, By-law Amendment for the Determination of Delegate Seat Allocations, he'd refer to the Rules Committee.

Resolution Referral (cont'd)

- 17 -

Resolution to Promote Accountability and Effectiveness for Action Agenda Items

For Resolution 0810C, Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching By Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics, he'd refer to the Campus Affairs Committee.

For Resolution 0810D, To Amend the GA By-laws to Promote Fairness and Transparency In Funding Allocations, Mr. Daal said he'd refer to the Rules Committee, the Funding Committee, and the Campus Affairs Committee.

RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

The following Resolution, Resolution, 0809A, was authored by Mr. Daal and Mr. Armstrong:

RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS FOR ACTION AGENDA ITEMS

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Graduate Assembly (GA) to strive to be as effective an organization as possible because this maximizes its service to graduate students; and

WHEREAS, the success of the GA's Action Agenda is a direct measure of its effectiveness; and

WHEREAS, effectiveness can be encouraged by choosing measurable goals, identifying leaders to work toward those goals, and holding those leaders accountable for their work toward those goals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Section 6.5 of the current GA By-laws be replaced with the following text:

6.5 Action Agenda Items

6.5.1 Definition

An Action Agenda Item is a quantified goal, together with a specific plan for achieving that goal, determined by the Graduate Assembly. The Graduate Assembly may not have more than three (3) Action Agenda Items at any one time. Each Action Agenda Item shall have a Coordinator, who is elected by the Delegate Assembly and supervised by the President.

6.5.2 Adoption

During a Delegate Assembly meeting, any Delegate, Chair, or Officer may introduce a proposed Action Agenda Item, provided that the Graduate Assembly does not already have three Action Agenda Items. The proposal must be in writing, and must contain the name of at least one (1) person who has agreed to serve as Coordinator for the proposed Action Agenda Item, if elected. The President shall refer each proposed Action Agenda Item to the Rules Committee and the Campus Affairs Committee. The Delegate Assembly will consider adoption of the proposed action agenda item at the Delegate Assembly meeting

Resolution to Promote Accountability and Effectiveness for Action Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 18 -

RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS FOR ACTION AGENDA ITEMS (cont'd)

following the meeting at which it was Proposed. A two-thirds (2/3) vote is required to adopt an Action Agenda Item.

6.5.3 Coordinators

Immediately after the adoption of an Action Agenda Item, or upon the resignation of an Action Agenda Item Coordinator, the Delegate Assembly shall elect an Action Agenda Item Coordinator. If no Coordinator is elected for two (2) consecutive meetings of the Delegate Assembly, the Action Agenda Item is considered dissolved. An Action Agenda Item Coordinator does not serve on the Executive Board.

6.5.4 Reports

Action Agenda Item Coordinators shall make regular reports, in writing and orally, to the Executive Board and the Delegate Assembly. Reports shall include an update on the progress made towards the quantified goal.

6.5.5 Amendment and Dissolution

An Action Agenda Item may be amended or dissolved a by two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly, but notice of the proposed amendment or dissolution must appear in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda, and the full text of any amendment must be included in the Delegate Assembly meeting's supporting materials.

Ms. Pannu said Section 6.5,2, talks about appointing coordinators. She asked what would happen if a coordinator vacated the position. Mr. Armstrong said 6.5.3 addressed that question, and upon resignation of a coordinator, the Assembly would elect another. If no Coordinator was elected for two consecutive meetings, the Item was dissolved.

Mr. Rheume said he thought this was an excellent Resolution, and thought the GA had to pass something like this. He would add one thing. For those who were there last year, they'll remember he was part of the Teaching Improvement Committee and found he was mostly working solo. He hoped the Assembly will take into account a suggestion that was made, to assign these Action Agenda matters to a committee. He actually submitted a Resolution about this that the GA will consider next month. He thought Delegates should be able to fulfill their committee responsibilities through an Action Agenda Item committee. He thought having a team of people working on something would be more effective and hopefully promote accountability.

Mr. Rheume asked to discuss including the suggestion that was made by the Campus Affairs Committee. Mr. Daal asked if that was a motion. Mr. Rheume said they could start with a discussion, people could weigh in, and they'd see. Mr. Daal said that according to their rules, when they vote on the Resolution, they could only vote it up or down. Minor errors could be corrected, but if they wanted to change something about the Resolution, they couldn't incorporate that and vote on that evening. What they could

Resolution to Promote Accountability and Effectiveness for Action Agenda Items (cont'd)

- 19 -

do is that upon adoption or rejection of the Resolution, they could also approve a motion to observe whatever suggestions were put forward for a new By-law amendment.

Mr. Marchand asked why bills were sent to committee if committees couldn't suggest amendments. Mr. Armstrong said they could suggest amendments, but the By-law amendment would have to be reintroduced at the next meeting. The GA could vote the bill down, re-introduce it, then have it go back to committee, and then vote on it in a month.

Mr. Daal said they could also patch it with a motion and follow it up with a By-law amendment.

Ms. Berkeley asked if they could approve the Resolution in its current form and add an additional section. Mr. Daal said that as a By-law amendment, that would need proper notice and would need to be a Resolution.

A Delegate asked if Action Agenda coordinators were paid positions. Mr. Daal said they weren't.

Ms. Pannu said she had a question about how this would impact the role of the Officers and asked if someone could explain how current Action Agenda Items go forward. She asked if the Executive Board was responsible for making sure they went forward. Mr. Daal said that under the current By-laws, Action Agenda Items are recommended at a Delegates meeting and the GA votes them up or down, by a simple majority. Mr. Armstrong said he thought that what was being asked was the mechanism for accountability for Action Agenda items at that time, and the answer was that there was none.

Ms. Pannu asked if the GA were to adopt an Action Agenda Item at present, if no one would be responsible for making sure it happened. Mr. Armstrong said that was the case, except for the offices of the GA generally being supposed to carry out the will of the GA. Ms. Pannu asked why the Officers didn't just do that. It sounded like there was a concern over how resources were prioritized in terms of Officer's time.

She was confused as to why they had so many additional requirements and coordinators and didn't understand why the Action Agenda didn't have the priority of the Executive committee. Mr. Daal said it was a priority. The Resolution would change the way Action Agenda Items were coordinated.

A Delegate said the Resolution would also add more permanence to Action Agenda Items because they usually expire every year. Basically, nothing would get done because most of the things people want to accomplish would take a lot longer. She would imagine that having a coordinator would help to perpetuate them. Each Officer had their own job and had nothing to do with Action Agenda Items.

Mr. Rheume said that informally, all Action Agenda Items have a coordinator who may or may not be a member of the Executive Board. The Resolution would formalize the relationship. Ms. Pannu asked if there was anything in the Resolution to ensure that Items don't dissolve. Ms. Berkeley said they could dissolve, and the GA would choose a new Action Agenda Item. Mr. Armstrong said section 6.5.5 talks about dissolution, as does 6.5.2.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0809A, RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS FOR ACTION AGENDA ITEMS, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Action Agenda Items Resolutions

- 20 -

Ms. Parrish asked if they could move to add the three-person bit, the recommendation out of committee. Mr. Armstrong said there was nothing in the By-law amendment that says there couldn't be an informal committee and he would suggest the GA operate like that. Requiring three coordinators would make it difficult to approve Action Agenda Items than if there were only one or two. Somebody just needed to have their name connected to an Item so there was accountability. But having three would make it burdensome. He would suggest that the GA operate informally. If they decide to have three, then someone might have to submit a By-law amendment to strike the word "three" all over the place and do it that way.

Mr. Rheume asked if he could move to amend the Resolution they just passed. Mr. Armstrong said he couldn't amend the bill because it was now a By-law, but the GA could amend the By-laws again. Mr. Rheume asked if they could do that now, or if he should write something and submit it at the next meeting, and consider it for a vote in December. Mr. Armstrong said he just needed to have the text. As soon as he had that ready, now or at any time in the future, the GA could vote.

Ms. Pannu asked why they couldn't consider committee amendments to Resolutions. Mr. Armstrong said that some Resolutions were sent to three committees. Ms. Pannu said it seemed inefficient for a small but helpful amendment to have to go back to committee. Mr. Armstrong said they do that because that was the way the By-laws were written. If they could make By-law amendments on the floor, they could have a lot of Trojan Horse By-law amendments. If amendments were allowed on the floor, a nefarious person could make improper By-laws. They can't draw a line saying things had to be done in the spirit of the motion. They could either amend things on the floor or they couldn't. If people were interested in this, he would suggest that they attend meetings of the Rules Committee, because these were the kinds of things they talk about.

Mr. Daal called for any motions for Action Agenda Items.

Mr. Froehle asked what they needed to do to make a motion for an Action Agenda Item. Mr. Armstrong said that 6.5.2 states that during a Delegate meeting, any Delegate, chair, or Officer may introduce a proposed Action Agenda Item. Mr. Daal said they didn't have to do that at that time, but people could start thinking about it and they could have a discussion as to what Items they might have in the future.

Ms. Klein asked for clarification and as examples, what the last three Action Agenda Items were. Mr. Daal said there was TEACH Us, which was Mr. Rheume; access to health services for graduate students; and the third was non-resident tuition. They are issues that were core to graduate student life, and the Action Agenda Items support those causes.

Ms. Berkeley said that this, then, wasn't an extension of last year's Action Agenda Items, and others had to be approved. Mr. Daal said that was correct.

Ms. Parrish asked if they were looking for a quantifiable goal, e.g., access to health care, and asked what they would be looking for. Mr. Daal said it would include access for health care. Ms. Parrish asked if, for non-resident tuition, they'd look for five less students that had to pay non-resident tuition in a year. Mr. Armstrong said that would be an example of a quantifiable goal. She asked if committees should write a survey to show improvement, and asked if there was something they were looking for.

Ms. Berkeley asked if their recently adopted By-laws allow for shorter-term Action Agenda Items, ones that last for less than a year. Mr. Daal said it was until they're dissolved. These are also quantifiable

Action Agenda Items Resolutions (cont'd)

- 21 -

goals as determined by the Delegates, who approve them. Ms. Berkeley said that was the answer she was looking for in terms of who determines what was quantifiable.

Mr. Work asked what was required to propose an Action Agenda Item, and if it was supposed to be a written proposal or a one-minute talk. Mr. Armstrong said that 6.5.1 states that it had to be a motion passed by the Delegate Assembly.

Mr. Daal suggested a recess. Mr. Froehle moved to recess for 15 minutes to consider Action Agenda Resolutions. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Armstrong noted that Action Agenda Items had to first go to the Rules and Campus Affairs Committees, so that had to happen by the end of the meeting in order to vote on them next time.

The motion to recess for 15 minutes failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Pannu moved to recess for two minutes, to allow people to write Action Agenda Items to refer to the Chair. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote. This meeting was recessed.

Mr. Daal said he has received a Resolution 0810E, To Amend the By-laws to Allow Committee Participation for Action Agenda Items. Mr. Rheume said it would add a new By-law to allow Delegates to fulfill their committee obligation with regular participation in an Action Agenda Item committee. He read the Resolution. Mr. Daal said he would refer 0810E to the Rules Committee, the Campus Affairs Committee, and External Affairs.

Mr. Work said he had a motion to propose an Action Agenda Item. The Resolution is titled, "To Create a Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item," and to work on that project. He read the Resolution. Mr. Daal said he would refer the bill to the Campus Affairs Committee and to the Rules Committee.

Ms. Parish said she had an Action Agenda Item on Access to Mental Health Care. She read the Resolution. Ms. Parish said she would be the Coordinator, with Sarah Hubbard. She read the Resolution. Mr. Daal said he would refer the Resolution to the Campus Affairs Committee and to the Rules Committee.

Ms. Berkeley said she had another Action Agenda Item, Teach Us, an Action Agenda Item, to make improvements in teaching and mentoring of graduate students. Ms. Berkeley said she would be a Coordinator. She read the Resolution. Mr. Daal said he would refer that Action Agenda Item to the Rules Committee and the Campus Affairs Committee.

Ms. Pannu moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

This meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary