

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 4, 2004

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- [Heard Announcements.](#)
- [Heard a report from AGSE/UAW.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA Manager.](#)
- [Heard a report from the ASUC Elections Council Chair.](#)
- [Heard a report from the ASUC representative to the GA.](#)
- [Heard a presentation by the Autonomy Committee.](#)
- [Heard a presentation by Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity and Chemistry Professor Angy Stacy](#)
- [Approved the recommendations of the Funding Committee for Round 6 of Grad Events funding and Round 4 of grants funding.](#)
- [Heard a report by the Finance Committee and approved recommended budget items.](#)
- [Approved Vivian Hwa as Alternate Graduate Council representative for the GA.](#)
- [Approved Carmel Levitan as Funding Committee Chair.](#)
- [Heard a report from the Affirmative Action Committee and approved Resolution In Support of Funding for the Recruitment and Retention of Historically Underrepresented Students in Graduate School, and approved the Resolution to Join the Pro-Integration Intervener Defendants to Maintain Voluntary Integration in Berkeley Schools.](#)
- [Heard and approved a report from the Advocacy Committee.](#)
- [Heard and approved a report from the Organization and Rules Committee.](#)
- [Approved Resolution on Registration Fee Name Change](#)
- [Approved, as amended, Resolution to Unambiguously Support Same-Sex Civil Marriage](#)
- [Approved, as amended, Resolution in Support of Prison Closures](#)
- [Heard a report from the Academic Affairs Committee.](#)
- [Heard reports from Officers.](#)

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Jessica Quindel at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Quindel said she'd like to welcome them. Delegates should sign in and get their name tags. She said it was great to see everybody there, and said they'll do great things for the rest of the semester.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approval of the agenda.

A Delegate moved to add a report from the External Affairs Committee. Ms. Quindel said they'd add that under Reports.

A Delegate asked to add a new item, from the Organization and Rules Committee, a call for Delegates for the Publications Committee. Ms. Quindel asked if they could hear that under Announcements.

Mr. Akiba said he would like to add approval of the December meeting's minutes. Mr. Sharma said that was an action item that would need to be noticed. Ms. Quindel said she noted that at the last meeting. The motion to add the item was seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate said he'd like to add a report from the Academic Affairs Committee under New Business. Ms. Quindel asked if there was an item. The Delegate said they're seeking support for a selection body for the Mentoring Award. Ms. Madon said it was an emergency item. Ms. Quindel said their usual procedure of introducing items beforehand may be waived by a two-thirds vote in the case of work stoppage, crippling disaster, or pending litigation. Mr. Akiba said this could be considered work stoppage. The Academic Affairs Subcommittee was charged with administering the Mentoring Award and would like to bring something before the Assembly. The motion was seconded. Mr. Sharma said this was a last minute item and he'd like to hear some explanation. Mr. Stagi said this was a desire for transparency and openness. Ms. Dugas said "work stoppage" dealt with employees of the University, or the organization. A Delegate asked if it was possible to just discuss this as an information item. Ms. Quindel said that with no objection, they would hear this as a report.

THE AGENDA WAS APPROVED, AS AMENDED, WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

On the minutes to the December meeting, Mr. Akiba said that on page 12, the third paragraph starting with "Mr. Akiba said" should start with "Ms. Quindel said," and all mention of "Mr. Akiba" in the paragraph should be replaced with "Ms. Quindel." On page 13, in lines 2 and 4, "Mr. Akiba" should be replaced with "Ms. Quindel."

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approval of the December minutes. A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 4, 2003 MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approval of the minutes from the February meeting. Mr. Akiba said that on page 8, line 10, "and that could lead to" should read "and cutting that could lead to." And on page 33, in line 4, "commercial fees weren't controversial" should read "treating commercial fees separately was a part of it."

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approval. THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 5, 2004 GA MEETING, AS AMENDED, WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

GA Announcements

Ms. Quindel said she had note cards to distribute and would love people to give feedback so the GA learns how to make the process better and find out what works well. Secondly, she wanted to announce that they're having a Chancellor search forum, hosted by Ms. Madon and Mr. Mata, from the ASUC. They'll talk about the process of the search, although they won't go into the details. They want to hear what people think about who should be the next Chancellor and for which qualities the Selection Committee should look.

Ms. Quindel said she also wanted to announce a fund that's available for events concerning access to public education and budget cuts. The fund has \$80,000 left. The Chancellor has a committee for national and international issues, and she sits on that committee, with Ms. Madon, and would ask people to please apply. Fliers were available, and she'd ask Delegates to post them. Also, there's a free event, the California Student Labor Teach-in March 12-14. People have been planning this for about seven months, including Delegates from the GA. So she would ask them to please post the flier and consider attending. Finally, she had some cards for them from the UC Labor Coalition.

Ms. Olorunnipa said she's a member of the Affirmative Action Committee, which was approved by the GA. and after discussion, they'd like to send a letter to Pres. Dynes in reference to the diversity on campus, and improve it as a collective unit, for diversity among faculty, staff, and grads. They have a template of a letter they'd like Delegates to write. If they don't feel comfortable writing the letter, they don't have to. The template talks about why they think diversity is important. If they decide to write, the Committee would ask them to put include information on why they think diversity is important. This is a personalized letter, and the Committee would like to collect it at the end of the meeting. Grassroots attempts at changing the campus have really worked in the past, and this is one of the things the Committee would like to do. Ms. Quindel said that the

Committee decided that if Delegates write the letters, the GA would put them in envelopes, put a stamp on them, and send them out. People could give their letters to Ms. Olorunnipa.

Mr. Kashmiri said the ASUC has again blocked the GA's attempts for autonomy. However, the filing deadline was still coming up for ASUC elections. If they can't beat them, they should beat them any way. If any grad wants to run, it takes about 200 people voting for one to get a Senate seat. It would be helpful to have a voice in the ASUC Senate. Mr. Kashmiri said he was a Senator last semester, but dropped out because of fee increases and other reasons. If people were interested in running for the Senate, they should talk to him later.

Ms. Davis introduced herself and said she was the Grad Support Services Project Coordinator. The next Dissertation Workshop is next Tuesday, 12:00 to 1:30. She hoped Delegates received an e-mail she sent about this. If they haven't, she would ask them to please talk to Mr. Cantor to get on the e-mail list.

Ms. Davis said she also wanted to draw their attention to her written report in the packet. She was trying to compile a list of any dissertation writing groups on campus, within departments or schools. If they're part of a group, or knew of one, she would ask them to pass on the contact information. Her goal was to create a section on the GA's Web site where students could see if any groups were in place that might meet their needs and goals. She'll get in touch with contact people before she puts the e-mails online.

Finally, Ms. Davis said she would like to do a quick poll, and said everybody can vote. She may have to do some prioritizing that semester. If they could have either a workshop on taxes, including some specific issues grads face with fellowships, or, a workshop on general financial management, budgeting, and investing, an overview of things like that, she asked which they would prefer. A straw poll was taken. Ms. Davis said she might try to do both.

Ms. Madon said that last month the Academic Affairs Committee was asked to write a letter to the Governor. The letter was included in the agenda packet, and some people have already signed it. She wanted to give people an opportunity to read it. If they agree with it and would like to sign, they'll pass around the letter they'll send. The letter is to Gov. Schwarzenegger but they'll photocopy it and send it to California legislators, to explain why tuition and professional fees should not be increased.

Mr. Cantor said that for people who weren't wearing name tags, he would ask them to please get their tag, and if they haven't signed in, would ask them to please do that as well. A sign-up sheet was available and people should check off their name. That makes them officially present.

Report from AGSE/UAW

-

-
Sue Wilson introduced herself and said she was Unit Chair, Local 2865, Readers, Tutors, and GSIs. She was present that evening to talk about an important change, the Union's political program it was taking on that semester. As many of them probably know, there are over 4,000 corporate PACs, or Political Action Committees in this country, which give millions of dollars to promote corporate legislators' agendas. For those who aren't corporations and don't have the same interests corporations have, it's important to have a mechanism to contribute to candidates who support their interests. The UAW voluntary Community Action Program provides that. They have representatives from their campus who participate on this body who participate in discussions, and it gives money to candidates and causes that are "labor-friendly," in a very broad sense. They promote ending tax cuts for the wealthy, ending corporate welfare, funding for public education, assurance for affordable health care, and workplace rights for undocumented workers in the US, as well as also creating better mechanisms for bringing those people into legal documentation. That's a sample of what the UAW program donates money to. A big change in their contract at Berkeley is a simple mechanism that allows them as individuals to contribute to the UAW Political Action Program. If they sign the form they get a choice to have \$1 a month deducted from their paycheck and donated, which they wouldn't notice, or \$3, or \$5 a month. The amount would be automatically deducted from their paycheck anytime they work for the UC, whenever they get a paycheck from UC. She'd pass out the forms if people were interested. She called for any questions, and said she wanted to thank them.

General Announcements

Michael introduced himself and members were present of the Committee on Student Fees and Budget Review. With the huge budget cuts to Berkeley, they really need to be more focused in giving more student input on the budget, which is what they're trying to do that year. They're requesting budget submissions from different department on campus to review and give student input. They currently have a bill to change the name of the Reg Fee that's being considered Statewide at the UCSA level, and they want Berkeley's backing. The bill proposes a change in the name of the "Registration Fee" to the "Student Services Fee." Money from the Reg Fee doesn't go to register anything and the name was misleading. This is a very good move. Instead of "Reg Fees," legislators would find that it a lot harder to target a student services fee. The Committee on Student Fees would like the GA's backing with the Council on Student Fees, the Statewide CSF. In conjunction with the UCSA, the Committee on Student Fees is working on the Office of the President level to change the name. This would be a simple step to prevent them from cutting services and increasing fees.

Mr. Mata introduced himself and said he was the ASUC Academic Affairs Vice President. Next week they'll put on a Lower Sproul Forum. They're trying to bring students together to start discussion around concepts for a new Lower Sproul. As they know, the Administration and the Chancellor are going to start working on how to revamp that entire area. For instance, they may tear down Eshleman Hall. They want input from grads on this subject. The forum is on Thursday from 2:00 to 3:00. The Chancellor will be there from 2:30 to 3:00 and wants to listen to students. Mr. Mata said he would ask grads to please bring their ideas and what they think should be on this complex, because it's their student center and they need to make their words heard and indicate what they want to see happen. The Forum will be in the Student Union, West Pauley Ballroom. If people have any questions, they could send him an e-mail. He wanted to thank them.

Mr. Akiba said he'd like to give an update on the Code of Student Conduct revision, the new disciplinary process. There will be a hearing panel, a lawyer representing the University, but the student would have to be on his or her own. Under the current process, students have the full right to legal representation. The Committee is trying to revise that and say that generally, students would not be allowed to have a lawyer, except when the hearing panel thinks it would be beneficial. On the other hand, the University would have a professional lawyer representing its University case. If they or someone they know thinks this is unfair, he would ask for those who were interested in this to please talk to him. This will be finalized in a matter of two or three weeks, and students would lose rights. If people have anything to contribute to the process, he would ask them to please send him an e-mail.

Ms. Quindel said that Mr. Madan, the Student Advocate of the ASUC, and the Advocacy Committee, are asking for a one-page summary on big issues that they could provide to different departments. Mr. Akiba said he'd provide a monthly summary. This issue was really urgent, and he would ask people to please contact him if they could participate.

A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Madon asked how many people were chairing a committee for the GA that semester, and said she was asking in the interests of "The Electronic Grad," their monthly newsletter. They'll soon get an e-mail asking for information about committees and when they meet. If they could please send to the GA Media Coordinator any information about their committee, such as when it meets and what they're talking about that semester, it would be appreciated by the entire student body, because it will enable participation by everyone.

REPORTS

-

Report from the GA Manager/Advisor

Ms. Dugas said she wanted to draw their attention to the budget cycle, listed in the agenda packet. Mr. Sharma, as Chair of the Finance Committee, will give them more information. It was really important that once the budget is posted, that Delegates go online and read it. The entire document can be up to 60 pages, and to make a 60-page document for 50 to 50 people was a lot of copying. So they post the justifications of the budget online and then they bring the spreadsheet to the GA. But it's important for Delegates to read the justifications and then make comments or ask questions they may have. The spreadsheet will be available at the meeting. She called for any questions on the budget process. At the next Finance Committee meeting they'll look at those particular budgets.

Ms. Dugas said she also wanted to congratulate staffers who did some really excellent work on their projects. Wendy Davis continues to put on successful workshops around orals and dissertations and gets excellent turnouts and evaluations, as well as Tiffany, the Events Coordinator, who did an excellent open house two days ago that was well attended and had lots of good comments. Ms. Dugas said she wanted to make sure the GA recognizes staff for these things.

Mr. Akiba asked about Delegates with a concern about the budget bringing that to the attention of people in charge before the budget comes to the group in April. It's not like they'd be able to debate a whole lot on the floor. Mr. Sharma said there's a timeline in Ms. Dugas' report, and there's a comment period. Budget recommendations will go online by the 24th and they'll send an e-mail to the entire list to notify people. The comment period allows Delegates to look at the budget in detail and submit comments to the Finance Committee as a whole. Throughout the budget process, budget drafts, as they're developed, will go online, so people Delegates can comment on the entire process. The final review period will the last week in March. When a draft comes out, there will be a comment period, with comments to be incorporated by the Finance Committee or the Delegates.

Ms. Dugas said that if people are thinking of something now they want to look at, the next meeting is March 12, and she would recommend directing concerns to Mr. Sharma. There's also Fi-Comm's listserv. Mr. Sharma said that if people have items they want included in the budget, they should send him an e-mail and he'd forward the information to the Committee.

Ms. Quindel said agenda packet includes a call for proposals. The deadline was extended to Monday because they wanted to make an announcement at the GA meeting. A list of the projects the GA does was included, and if Delegates feel they want to propose a project for this budget cycle, it explains how that can do that.

Report from the Autonomy Committee

Ms. Ahn said the purpose of the report and the slide show was to update Delegates on what's going on with autonomy and the plan the Autonomy Committee decided on. The Autonomy Committee has been very busy coordinating with the ASUC and the Attorney General on how to go forward. The slide showed the original timeline. First, they thought they'd set up the framework and the petition, to change the ASUC Constitution, and develop a structure for autonomy. Then they'd discuss the financial arrangements. So from structure of government they proposed where the ASUC and the GA would be separate and autonomous bodies, and then negotiate the details about the Store Operations Board.

Ms. Quindel said that due to problems with the projector, they'd move to a report from the ASUC Elections Council while they figure out the technical problems with the slide presentation. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Report from the ASUC Elections Council Chair

Leslieann Cachola introduced herself and said she was the Elections Council Chair, in charge of administering and organizing the ASUC elections, which are scheduled to take place April 13, 14, and 15. She would apologize for not reporting to the GA sooner but she was just appointed right before Winter Break and didn't get to go to the GA's February meeting. Ms. Cachola said she's a third-year Political Science undergrad. She had a bunch of updates for the GA.

Ms. Cachola said she wanted to give the GA an update on what she's done in the past month and what she was starting to do at that time. They moved the dates of the election from April 6, 7, 8 to the 13th, 14th, and 15th. The change was made because there would be religious holidays, Holy Week and Passover, for the original week. The thought was that some students would be marginalized, because many students go back home to celebrate those holidays. The Elections Council is fully formed. It is very difficult to recruit students to do this, although she placed an ad in the Daily Cal, fliered, and sent out e-mails. They found people, and her Assistant Chair is Angela Brewer, a third-year student, who was the Publicity Coordinator last year. Rebecca Simon is a third-year Poli.Sci. major, and is Publicity Coordinator. Gunjan Gole is a second-year Psych. major and will be Poll Coordinator. Ms. Cachola said she also hired someone to handle the technical side of the elections. Last year was the first year they turned to electronic voting, and for the coming elections, she's not knowledgeable in computers. Right now, the candidate filing period for the elections was open, to both undergrads and grads. The deadline to file is next Friday, March 1, at 5 p.m. People can file on the 4th floor of Eshleman. The cost to file is \$5 per candidate and \$20 per party.

Ms. Cachola said that in the next few weeks she'll hold meetings with the ASUC Auxiliary, because there are many operational things that have to be handled, from the technical side to the logistical side, since there are 11 polling stations on campus and about seven off-campus, and voting goes on throughout the day. So there are a lot of things to coordinate. They're meeting with a representative of the League of Women Voters, a neutral third-party, which oversees provisional ballots in case students need to cast ballots if computers aren't working. Ms. Cachola said her main goal was to secure a company to rent computers. Last year they rented laptops and they'll do that this year as well. They possibly will buy some, so she would welcome the expertise of any Computer Science grads, e.g., because they need help on that side.

Ms. Cachola said the ASUC Senate will consider a bill to do away with the polling site at Albany Village. That's because perhaps four students voted there last year, and that's been the case for the past three years.

This amounts to hundreds of dollars per vote, for the polling site. Last year there was an effort to publicize the elections there, so she didn't think it was the Elections Council's part. But this year she thought the Senate will vote having a poll at Haas, and she would hope that would make up for the loss of Albany Village. That bill will be voted on next week. If people have questions or concerns, she would ask them to please contact her.

Begin written report from the ASUC Elections Council Chair

Elections Council Written Report

Submitted By: Leslieann Cachola, Chair

Graduate Assembly Meeting

March 4, 2004

I. Introduction

Apologize for making report so late; just appointed right before Winter Break

II. Elections

1. Moved from April 6,7,8 to 13,14,15 due to religious holidays of Holy Week and Passover. Moved because of fear of marginalizing many students in the community.
2. Elections Council now fully formed:
 - It was really difficult to recruit workers, especially a Technical Coordinator, despite mass e-mails, flyering, and Daily Cal ads.
 - Angel Brewer, 3rd year. Publicity Coordinator; last year, Assistant Chair.
 - Rebecca Simon, 3rd year Poli. Sci. major, Publicity Chair
 - Gunjan Goel, 2nd year Psychology major, Poll Coordinator

- Devin Jones, former UCB student, to handle technical stuff

III. Candidate Filing Period

- Began this past Monday, March 1st and ends next Friday, March 12th at 5:00 p.m. Filing forms for candidates need to be filled out by next Friday. Parties need to turn in forms by the Candidates Meeting, Tuesday, March 16, which all party signatories are also required to attend. They'll discuss rules, timelines, etc.
- Both forms available 4th floor Eshleman, \$5 per candidate, \$20 per party.
Publicity person is sending e-mails, putting up flyers.

IV. Meetings

20 hrs/week for all the meetings & e-mails)

A) Past meetings

1. Judicial Chair, Mike Davis - discussed Election By-laws
2. Attorney General, Ryan Powell

Written report from the ASUC Elections Council Chair (cont'd)

3. Student Affairs Officer, Jan Crowder - meet weekly
4. David Fullmer - MIS w/ ASUC Auxiliary

B) Future Meetings

1. Will begin to hold weekly Elections Council meetings
2. Will begin to hold weekly coordinating meetings with the ASUC Auxiliary, including Tom Cordi, Student Affairs Director Jan Crowder, Head of MIS Dave Fullmer, and Head of Building Operations, Tom Baker
3. League of Women Voter Representatives, neutral third party
 - oversee provisional ballots
 - hold keys to ballot boxes, now have passwords
4. Main goal right now: securing a company to rent computers from (any expertise from GA would be greatly appreciated); toying w/ idea of going wireless but there are concerns with security of system.

V. GA issues

1. Bill - Albany Village Poll
 - low voter turnout, less than 10 past 3 years at least last year I think 4 voted
 - this amounts to hundreds of dollars per vote
 - much difficulty in recruiting poll worker to work there AND in finding transportation

- takes away resources that could be better put on campus
- this is in the interest of ALL students
- I believe that the Senate voted for Haas to have a poll

VI. Contact information:

Leslieann Cachola

Elections Council Chair

(510)395-1143

- I welcome any and all comments and concerns
- Who could I arrange the Publicity Coordinator to speak with?

End written report from the ASUC Elections Council Chair

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

Ms. Khanjari said that in addition to election stuff, the Senate on Wednesday voted to consider overturning a GA Resolution that was passed in February. The Senate doesn't usually look at GA Resolutions, but this bill dealt with the GA President being able to litigate on behalf of the GA and the ASUC. Ms. Quindel said the GA passed that in December, and it dealt with the question of student fee policy. Ms. Khanjari said the bill to overturn that Resolution will go to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee. The Senate and the Attorney General keep trying to undermine the GA and grads, overturning Resolutions, not okaying wording for GA Resolutions to separate from the GA, and not approving any grads nominated for the Judicial Council. Ms. Khanjari said that had the GA asked to Senate to approve putting an initiative on the ballot to separate, she could guarantee that it would not have been approved by the Senate. That was something to keep in mind.

Ms. Dugas said she believed there's a clause in the ASUC Constitution giving the Senate a certain amount of time in which to consider GA Resolutions. Ms. Quindel said the Senate made it within the time limit, and did it within the third week. Ms. Dugas said she didn't think it had to do with when its reported, but from the time the GA approved it. Ms. Quindel said it was within three meetings.

Ms. Khanjari said the Senate doesn't usually consider GA Resolutions, but if the Senate votes that it thinks something the GA passed affects the ASUC as well as the GA, then the Senate can move to overturn the GA's Resolution.

Report from the Autonomy Committee (cont'd)

Ms. Ahn said that in the original framework, they set up a constitutional structure. They're working with the terms of the ASUC Constitution in how the GA would be released from the greedy grasp of the ASUC. After that, they would then do the financial contracts, which are separate from the ASUC Constitution. That would be followed by a vote, and then enactment. As the slide shows, they were to do have a petition on a constitutional structure, and collect signatures in January and February, and then negotiate the financial contracts regarding the Store Operations Board and commercial agreements in February and March and April. The vote would occur in March and April, and it would be enacted in June. The reason they started off with the petition on the Constitution is because the structure of the government dictates the way the resources are allocated. Resources like income and profit from the Store are unstable over time. In 2002 the State had tax surpluses, and now there are deficits. The problem with basing a government structure on availability of resources is that it makes government structure very unstable. The Constitution recognizes fundamental rights and trumps other laws, and changes and cause greater disruptions. So they want the Constitution to be stable and not change.

Ms. Ahn said that was the original idea, a petition that's certified, on how to change the ASUC Constitution and how the GA would be is autonomous. As to how a petition happens and how a constitutional amendment gets on the ballot, there's a petition and at least 1,000 signatures have to be collected and presented to the ASUC Senate. The petition is supposed to have two sentences that summarize the description of the changes being proposed for the Constitution. Before petitions can be gathered, they need certification from the ASUC Attorney General. The AG said has said that the two sentences they had were not an accurate description of the proposed changes. After getting the wording certified and the signatures gathered, they're presented to the Senate, after which the initiative is placed on the ballot and voted on in the regular elections. This is how the petition process happens, and the process the GA planned on, and planned to have finished up by this point. However, the ASUC was using certification as a sword hanging over the GA. Even though it may be an accurate reflection of the changes, the Attorney General was not comfortable with the wording and didn't agree with what he wanted, and withheld his certification. So the GA can't gather signatures.

In December 2003 the GA developed petition language, the sentences to be listed on the ballot. The Executive Committee approved it, as per the GA's Resolution. They gave that language to the Attorney General in December. On February 3 he said it sounded good. On the day of the GA meeting, he retracted that and said he didn't like the language any more and wanted information about liabilities and commercial activities. Ms. Ahn said this was a big problem for the Autonomy Committee because of the question of why stuff about contracts and income should be in the ASUC Constitution. The Constitution was supposed to be a broad structure of government. On February 22 the Attorney General agreed to new language. Ms. Ahn said she understood the Constitution was not supposed to be a financial contract. The new language did not have anything about financials in it, but broad language that the GA wanted to be autonomous and have control over its spending. Two days later he retracted his approval again, because he wanted to go to the Senate and see if the Senate agreed with the

language. The Senate didn't like it because it was too biased. One problem they had was the word "fair" was too biased, as in treating the GA "fairly," and what that meant. So the ASUC kept adding more clauses to these important two sentences. They kept on adding semi-colons, and were cheating. If one is a random student and they looked at this gargantuan paragraph, it would be hard to read, would discuss commercial revenue, and would have semi-colons. She asked if they thought people would vote for it, and it wouldn't happen.

The GA talked to Mr. Powell about how nobody would understand the language. On February 29 Mr. Powell said he was open to changes. The GA suggested going back to the previous petition that had been agreed to, but Mr. Powell didn't want to do that. So they have a longer paragraph, and he shoved all sorts of things into this two-sentence description. The Committee didn't want that. So that's where they currently stand. The GA has no petition, they're not certified, and they're stuck in this process. They're stuck with setting up the framework because the Attorney General and the ASUC Senate believe the word "fair" is too biased. So the GA wants to go through the stuff they need to do before it goes into effect. A motion to extend speaking time by ten minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Ahn said that voting on a constitutional change and being autonomous, the question was, what that meant. The question remains as to what they'd do with the ASUC Auxiliary, services, profits, salaries, etc. If they don't work out the financial contracts but the constitutional change is enacted, not only is the ASUC in trouble, but the GA would be in trouble as well. So they decided to shift to the new timeline.

With the new timeline, instead of doing it in January and February, they'd use January to March to try to finish up the petition and the constitutional structure, and try to still get the petition certified. But if they don't get the petition certified before the end of the filing period for that year, it automatically is put on the ballot for the next year. So they can guarantee that they have set language to go on next year's ballot. That will give more time to work out the financials. From March to May they'll negotiate the contracts. So before the end of this year, they'd work out the financial arrangements and the vote would happen next year. They'd try to work with the Organization and Rules Committee for the GA's governing documents and get as much done as possible that year, so all they have to do next year is just vote. The next step was to deal with the financials. They're still working on the petition, and they'll also work on the financials, so they work on it before the end of the semester. The objective is to certify the petition language, gather 1,000 signatures, arrange the financials, the GA Constitution and By-laws, and vote on this in the spring of 2005. The financials mean they meet with various parties to develop a proposal through the relevant bodies.

Ms. Ahn said they'll develop the first iteration of a financial proposal with all interested parties, which include ASUC Senators, Executive Officers, the GA, the Executive Committee, the GA Manager, the Business Office, the ASUC Auxiliary Director, people affected by the financial structure of the ASUC. This is important because they'll keep the ASUC Auxiliary as the GA's fiscal agent, and the GA has to make sure that

connection is maintained in a new fashion, as autonomous bodies. So they'd develop a series of financial contracts and then they'd have to go to the Store Operations Board, which is like a board of directors. The SOB will look at the proposal that's developed with the relevant parties, and approve, amend, or reject it. If the SOB rejects or amends it, the proposal would get kicked back to step one, and they'd make sure it's okay with the Senate, after which it would pass to a new iteration. The proposal has to be approved by the ASUC Senate, since the GA was still working with the ASUC's governing structure.

Ms. Ahn said that in the first step of the process they want Senators in line with the GA's vision, because otherwise, when it's presented to the Senate, it wouldn't be approved. After the Senate passes the proposal, it has to be signed by the relevant fiscal parties, including the Chancellor and GA and ASUC Presidents. At each point, if the proposal isn't approved by one party, it's kicked back up and goes through the process again if there's an objection. So this may take a very long time.

Besides the financial elements, there are GA governing documents they need. The charge of gathering together those documents for the GA is with the Organization and Rules Committee. Ms. Ahn said they talked to Mr. Akiba. The Committee voted to not develop a constitution that year because it was afraid of being over-burdened. So the Committee will focus on internal GA By-laws. Ms. Ahn said her only concern, as part of the autonomy process, is that she didn't want autonomy to go through with the GA being without governing documents. So she thought the current proposal Mr. Akiba mentioned, if the Committee agrees, would be to use the current By-laws as a temporary governing structure until something permanent was developed.

So the campaign will be in March, 2005. That meant they need to get 20% of the total student body to vote yea or nay, period. And of that 20%, 50%-plus-one need to vote in favor of autonomy. That's a high percentage yield of people saying yes, so as long as there's some groundwork, she wasn't too concerned there will be a rigorous campaign against their petition, especially if they negotiate the financials and the ASUC and the GA have signed on to the financial stuff that year.

Ms. Ahn said she wanted to say "thank you" to the Autonomy Committee, because it's worked super hard, Vivian, Kristen, Ben, Susan, and Mo, and Ms. Quindel, and the Executive Committee, for scrambling and trying to approve the different iterations of the petition language that Mr. Powell tossed at them. That's been a huge factor in being part of the situation with internal ASUC politics. The ASUC didn't mind the GA as long as the GA wasn't doing anything. A motion to extend speaking time by ten minutes was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote. Ms. Quindel said that perhaps people could ask their questions on the side. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Ahn said she thought it was a control issue. Senators were okay as long as the GA didn't do much. Now there's not really very much clarity over what the GA has control over, and what it represents, and who really represents grads, and how that works into what the ASUC deals with. The ASUC is thinking about overturning a GA Resolution. She asked if that meant the ASUC represents grad issues and if the ASUC was the voice of grads. When the GA didn't do

much, these conflicts never arose, because there was never a situation for them to arise. Now that they're arising more and more, it's causing more friction between the two bodies.

A Delegate said that since there's no way to hold the Attorney General accountable, and no way to see if the petition language is fair or unfair, and this depends on the intent of Senators, she asked if the only way to get this done was to not opt within the system, which is biased against the GA, but to go outside the system and write a memo to the Chancellor. She asked why the GA should operate in a system that's built against them. The other option was to run Senators for office. Ms. Ahn said she would rather work as hard as possible to preserve the relationship with the ASUC because they'll be tied by money, because of the connection with the ASUC Auxiliary. So they'll have to negotiate on that and to the extent that they can maintain some comity and camaraderie, it would be better. Secondly the actual intervention by the Chancellor was shaky. They say the ASUC is the only independent student government, but the reality is that the Chancellor has a lot of power over the ASUC. To try to call that in and ask the Chancellor to break their ties from the ASUC by himself, by fiat, and constitute a new government for a section of the students, could be a dangerous precedent. At some point they wouldn't want the Chancellor to have that power, even though it might serve grads in the short-term. Ms. Quindel said she wanted to thank Ms. Ahn. (Applause)

SPECIAL GUEST -- Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity and Chemistry Professor Angy Stacy

Ms. Quindel said she worked with Ms. Stacy a long time and she does great work in terms of hiring of women and faculty of color. This has been a topic the GA has discussed before, and they wanted to hear an update. She wanted to thank Ms. Stacy and welcome her to the meeting.

Ms. Stacy said she was delighted to be there. She's a professor of Chemistry, hired 20 years ago as the second woman in the history of the Department. She thought she'd give the GA a few numbers and then have a dialogue, and hear their concerns vis-à-vis faculty diversity, and suggest where they can work together on initiatives that can help expand that diversity.

Ms. Stacy said their faculty is 76% male and 84% white, not very diverse. They've had terrible hiring patterns for a while, especially post-Prop. 209. The hiring of women went down to 21% in 1999. That was incredible, given the expanding pools of women. But in the last year it was 48%, so that's really a remarkable change, thanks to a lot of pressure that came from the State Senator Jackie Speier, who ordered an audit of hiring practices. It's been a great turn around. To go along with that, they've also been changing policy that they think supports the hiring of women. In particular, they're thinking about family leave policies. This was very critical. As the average age at which one is hired to faculty goes up, if they're not thinking of having a child as a grad, or post-

doc, as a new faculty member, they can run out of time. So they have really strengthened their policies and they have some of the best policies in the country right now, where one has a year off the tenure clock for each child, and modified duties. They think this concerns both men and women, because this is very rapidly becoming a male issue as well. The campus really has strength in these policies. One doesn't have to beg for them any more, and it's not a special favor, but one's right. The campus thinks that will attract more women, who are hesitant coming in, wondering whether they can balance work and family.

Ms. Stacy said racial and ethnic minorities is where they need help. As she mentioned, they have 6% underrepresented minorities. That's shocking in a place like Cal. They're doing well hiring Asian faculty, whose numbers have been increasing. The campus was very pleased with that. They need to continue increases. But their big problem is in hiring and retaining Latino/Chicano, African American, and Native American faculty. Those numbers were really dismal. They had a total of 92 in 1994, and in 2002 it's 94. It didn't change. But they've hired 50 new underrepresented minority faculty over that time period, so there was a real turnover. They've looked at this, but don't entirely understand it. There are many different reasons. Everyone is very, very aware of these numbers at that time and she thought a lot of really good things were going on. A lot of deans are really insistent that they'll expand the diversity of their faculty and were going out and finding really outstanding people, and saying they don't care if they have an opening, that they need to hire this person. So that's happening, but needs to happen faster and more often. She was looking to find an initiative that cuts across the disciplines for a new research agenda that will pool many, a larger diversity of faculty there. This is something she'd like to discuss. They do great research there, but all of the great research they could be doing was tiny in the huge space of possibilities. The people who are there define that research, so the question was, how do they break it open so people with different research ideas are welcomed and attracted in. That's the agenda.

Ms. Stacy said that as soon as they can expand the diversity of the research they do, they'd automatically expand the diversity of faculty they hire, because they'd have a different value system. Ms. Stacy said she'd like to hear what was on grads' minds. She holds the position of Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity. It's a recent raising of the status of positions that have always been there that monitored equity. But now it has a better title and has resources. She sits on the Chancellor's Cabinet, so she's in his space every week, with data. The campus has made a commitment to have someone like her as the watchdog and the person who's really pushing the agenda.

Ms. Shenker said issues they're facing with women or people of color is closely tied to the budget issue. The School of Public Policy lost a top candidate because the offer they could give wasn't good enough, compared to other universities. She thought the two issues go hand-in-hand. This will become more acute, so she would urge Ms. Stacy to get on the side that's fighting against cutbacks. Ms. Stacy said she thought that was a great comment, and that was pushed when Pres. Dynes was there. She had some resources, so if she sees someone she thought the campus needs, she's been trying to

bring in resources for that, and was trying to put a package together, with a partner, or spouse, to attract them.

Ms. Hwa asked about the other reasons that candidates give as to why they don't come to Berkeley. Ms. Stacy said that Berkeley attracts a large number of candidates to whom they make offers. They do quite well, certainly, on average. They lose out on some of the underrepresented minority faculty and they're trying to determine the reasons, whether it was because they weren't welcoming enough; or the candidate didn't want to be the only person in a research area, and not have colleagues; or they stayed on the East Coast because of family; or went to another department because of a collaborator. The campus doesn't do as well with underrepresented minorities.

A Delegate asked about retention and attraction of minority faculty, and asked if there was an old boy's club working towards tenuring people doing different research for faculty members who are minorities or female. Ms. Stacy said the numbers are small for underrepresented minorities, but many women have identical tenure rates. She was going to release studies of a climate survey. When happens when one is younger is that they're not in power, and it's easy to be included; so younger faculty feel quite positive, especially younger women. It's when one gets older, when they're more of a competitor, that women and minorities report they don't feel as included. So it's a climate issue. At some point they don't think people value what they're doing and they withdraw. Community building efforts are really at the root of this, and not feeling isolated as the only individual who comes from a certain group. People want to feel like they have people to work with.

Mr. Bailey said he expected there being other obstacles at the University that may prevent retention, in particular, of black faculty. He thought there are less than ten black women faculty and almost half are in African American Studies; and they just lost one in Geography. Ms. Stacy said they just made two great hires in African American Studies. Mr. Bailey said they also have two positions that are still open. He's been told that there's a hiring freeze, and the Department was waiting on whether they can get those positions. He asked if there were some bureaucratic problems, because many times it takes a long time, and they miss out on people because of the amount of time involved. They had two searches that failed, and because of budget cuts, they've been told they may not get one of those searches back. It seems that would be a big loss, since their Department is a great opportunity to bring black faculty in, particularly black women. He asked what things might be done to speed up the process. Also, there are departments that have no faculty of color, many in Barrows Hall. He asked what was being done about that. Ms. Stacy said they could spend hours talking about that. She was concerned about growing African American studies because it has suffered some losses of really stellar faculty who, for different reasons, have left. One thing they did in African American Studies that she'd like to do across campus is a cluster hire. What was done was to be very strategic about bringing a couple of people in with related research interests who feel they could collaborate and set new research agendas. They were successful in hiring two out of three, and it was unfortunate that Santa Cruz stole the third one from under Cal's nose. They contacted the person instantly and he really wanted to

go to Santa Cruz. The idea was great and the two younger people coming in really loved the fact that what they were invited, and came and met each other. The campus doesn't do enough of that. One goal she had was that if they can define a cross-cutting research agenda, they could think about advertising a collection of positions over a number of different social sciences and professional schools that have some link to research agendas that are more likely to attract African Americans and other underrepresented minorities. Another thing that gets her upset was in tracking applicants, the majority of African American candidates competed with each other for positions in the Department. That's a worse scenario. So the question is how get other departments interested in some candidates who applied to African American Studies. They'll have more positions, but they need to integrate with other groups. That's an agenda item, how to get more candidates. They had a stellar group who applied.

A Delegate said that Ms. Stacy was giving special leaves to people with children, and he asked how that wasn't discriminatory for those with alternative lifestyles. He asked what the rationale was for adopting such a policy. And secondly, she seemed to imply a problem with hiring minority faculty was to break open new research areas, and asked if she had statistics to suggest that minorities working in different research areas than current faculty would accept positions. Ms. Stacy said she thought that's something they'd like to try to understand. She talked with minority faculty who might be the only minority in their department or school, and they said they're using research methodologies they don't have anyone else talk to about. She thought there was evidence that the people there have defined the research agenda, and there are a lot of other research areas, and other people who would come in and be attracted to those research areas. That's not the only solution. She was worried about his other question because it was a really important issue for her. They offer this to everyone, irregardless of lifestyle. She would like to see it expanded to be family-friendly, period. So she meant any kind of family, where there's an issue of a work-life balance. When it's severe enough, they can give time to take care of someone who's ill, e.g., and have the flexibility to still do their work, and get a break. As for childbearing, they're losing out on women candidates. They collected data and it's very clear that in the UC System, male assistant professors have more children than female assistant professors. Women have to make the choice, and can't do both. And she'd say men do, too. And this applies to alternative families, with partners who want to start a family and adopt a child. So this goes for adoption as well. There is resistance of older faculty, "aren't these people getting away with something?", and the campus is saying no, they're being given a break so they can balance their career and family. They'd get promoted a year later, so their salary is lower. So they do give up something. The campus feels pretty strongly that this should be inclusive.

Mr. Sharma said he's at the Law School, and one thing students feel has been successful in recruiting new women and minority faculty, including the new Dean, is that they've lobbied for years to get students on search committees. And it's a coordinated effort and involves the research agenda of candidates. The GA has pushed departments to use students for that, and if they could coordinate student involvement in faculty searches with candidates' goals, it would be a powerful case. Ms. Stacy said she agreed. Some

departments do this so well. This is something she has not really bothered to pursue. If students speak out against a candidate, that candidate doesn't get hired. She didn't know if the reverse was true. Mr. Sharma said that Law students have lobbied for candidates who didn't get an offer. Ms. Stacy said that's a real issue. They need people like him and Ms. Quindel on the search committees. They'd need training, but that's something they could take up jointly. That's a potential agenda in trying to make this a campus-wide policy, that students are involved. There are some issues they'd have to think through, such as to what degree students would be allowed access to candidates' files. They can work those things out.

Ms. Madon said they polled departments and got anecdotes of grads on search committees. The Academic Senate will look at encouraging departments to share techniques and including grads on search committees. Ms. Stacy said in addition, they'll get more serious each year with training the new group on the search committees. Ms. Madon said there are other ways to get involved, such as through SWEM, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities. Ms. Stacy said SWEM is an Academic Senate committee and was very, very active. They have a grad student representative. Another committee has not been active, and she's been agonizing what to do, and whether to reinstate it. What's happening now is the Chancellor's diversity initiative, which will lead to a campus-wide set of discussions among students, staff, and faculty, and it seems like instead of bringing back something that may not have a real purpose, they should put their efforts into this diversity initiative. There will first be roundtable discussions that students are involved in, and then an analysis and a forum.

Mr. Stagi said that in his Department, when they get people of color, they're helpful for people who need guidance and mentoring. There's a conflict between academic mentoring and putting out research. Faculty who take care of students are screwed for tenure. He asked if the campus could try to change some of the balance and decision making that would help to retain diversity. Ms. Stacy said she reviews all the spaces and fights for that, but that may not be enough. They're slowly shifting in recognizing efforts in teaching and to recognize efforts that go into service and mentoring. Minority and women faculty feel very strongly about mentoring and diversity initiatives. They spend a lot of time on that and they feel departments undervalue that. So she will put that in big letters when she reports the results of the survey. They need to start acknowledging that.

Mr. Fisher asked what she would recommend that the GA do to support increases in faculty diversity. Ms. Stacy said that what the GA has been doing was great, because they've applied pressure. They need to continue. She has dreamed of getting students on these committees as a way of applying pressure out in the units. She'd like to see a research agenda that couldn't be turned down and would really attract a much more diverse group of faculty. If people have ideas about how to craft the research agenda, that would be good. The School of Public Health thought about the term "disparity" because that cuts across some disciplines. What do disparities in health care result in for education. She'd throw that out to them to think about. Mr. Fisher asked why cluster hiring had an obstacle. Ms. Stacy said it's work in the more non-traditional, of

nanoscience, bioengineering, infomatics. There were extra FTE not affiliated with a department, but with nanoscience. Research became diverse and nanoscience hired three women out of five hires, and there will be four out of six. The more that the research isn't narrow and focused, the more opportunities they have to reach out to all kinds of people.

Ms. Vulic said she's a representative to the Graduate Council and grads on the Council have been charged with finding out how deans envision the role of grads in searches. She asked if Ms. Stacy could help them out, because they're not sure they have the clout to get people to respond. Ms. Stacy said the research was the first step. That's a concrete thing they could follow-up on. That could come out of her office. If she sent a survey out, they'd have the information and where departments are doing it well, they could talk to them and find out what they're doing. A motion to extend speaking time by ten minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Day said she had a solution to propose about retention and hiring. Faculty of color have an automatic community in departments with underrepresented minority faculty. Ms. Stacy said that was a way to deal with the burden of extra advising. Ms. Day said this is expiration of an agreement from the 1999 Ethnic Studies strike to hire faculty. She asked if there will be a renewed commitment to hiring in Ethnic Studies. Secondly, regarding the American Cultures Requirement for undergrads, she asked if there was a commitment to require all departments to create a course and hire their own faculty. African Americans are teach that and take away from other departments. Ms. Stacy said the American Cultures Requirement is undergoing a revision, so that's a positive step. She, the Chancellor, and others, went to UT-Austin, to a conference, "Educating for a Diverse America." She thought the President of UT-Austin's theme was that one could not be at the highest levels of education and do well in society today unless one understands diversity. So that plays into American Cultures. It's an important part of being educated. Ethnic Studies will continue to get FTE. They need African American Studies, Ethnic Studies, and Women's Studies Departments and to think about how to elevate their status.

Ms. Preciado said she's in Mechanical Engineering and they've had problems losing faculty, particularly women. She's part of Latino Grads, a small group, and the only Latino group in Engineering Science. The great majority would not want to work at Berkeley. Maybe Ms. Stacy could ask students who will become potential faculty why they wouldn't work at Berkeley. Ms. Stacy said that 5% of all professors are women in chemistry, despite the fact that one-third have been women. Ten percent applying to Berkeley are women. Her colleagues don't get it, and think, "We're the best. Why don't they want to come here?" Women and minorities see this is not an environment they want to be in. Part is shifting the environment. There's no question they need a climate shift. Behavior is slowly changing and takes time. Secondly, she didn't think they do a great job selling this. She has three kids and her son, e.g., gets the Chancellor's basketball tickets. There are great things going on that she didn't think grads see. Ms. Stacy said she was well aware they're not getting applicants for this reason. These are problems they're trying to figure out, and grads have to help people solve them. They

can't just tell the Chancellor to do this and have to suggest something for him to do that's doable.

Mr. Vaughan said he's in the Optometry School, the only African American student there. He's doing his research project geared on optometry in the African American community. A question that's important is why diversity was so important, and why they need black folks there. If blacks were a majority and white folks tried to come in, he'd think "Why do we need white folks, it's fine the way it is." He could understand why diversity was so important, and the School was learning through him being there that it's good to have black students. There are patients who would have gotten poorer care had he not been there. One guy wasn't taking his blood pressure medication and the doctor had told him it made men impotent. But Mr. Vaughan said he did some research, and found that 3 in 1,000 become impotent, and the patient promised to take his medication. The patient wouldn't have heard that from a Caucasian male. Those are the values the School was seeing. Mr. Vaughan said he's learned he can't wait for a committee to decide, but talked to people about his research who will do something about this. He's talked to Career Counseling on things that need to change, and people see his passion and do something about it. So you have to look at their own passion and the passion of the community. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Stacy said they need to educate about diversity and excellence. People were killed with airbags because they were designed for the white male of average height and weight. If they don't have people in this institution addressing research, it wouldn't get done.

Ms. Olorunnipa said that when faculty, especially minority faculty, come to an institution, they want to feel like they're needed. If they don't get that from faculty they work with, there are people who are okay getting it from the students. Over time, with the addition of more faculty, they'll feel better about being where they are. Everything was related. If there aren't students in a department, faculty of diverse or underrepresented background might not feel there's anybody they can identify with. If there's no faculty students may not feel the same connection. She had a special connection with her female African American professors. It's very integrated and she would encourage the Grad Council committee to see how the hiring of underrepresented faculty is connected to students there. Ms. Stacy said that was a really good point. They have tendencies and feel more comfortable around people who share a common background, for whatever reason. But at the same time, they don't want to stereotype. She didn't mean to stereotype woman and African Americans and other minorities into certain research areas, but to say that research areas have been defined by people who are here. They should welcome women and minorities in research, and maybe she was suggesting they'd be interested in other areas for a while, rather than if all they did was study European history.

A Delegate said he'd suggest procedure from the other direction. He was thinking of vice presidents and provosts, and it's difficult to figure out, but he was willing to guess that most are white males. If they had a Chancellor who was not a middle-aged white male, that would be an excellent first step. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes

was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The Delegate said this might help put pressure from the top. The other thing people have said this is coming down to money to fund offerings, packages, release time, etc. Members of the Advocacy Committee have noted that department library budgets were being cut, and support, but something that's not addressed yet was the number of provosts and other administrators. He asked what the Administration was willing to do to take money they're spending on good, but overhead in management, and put that towards core research and teaching agendas. Ms. Stacy said people are making arguments along those lines. They have a tight budget situation. Dean Maslach made a real plea for classrooms and to upgrade them, was convincing with the data, and money was shifted. Their advocacy needs to keep pushing data and information so it happens. She knew that was a problem.

Ms. Quindel said she would like to thank Prof. Stacy for coming, and said the GA appreciated it. (Applause)

NEW BUSINESS

-

Report from the Funding Committee

A motion to go to New Business was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Day said the report was on the last page of the agenda packet. There were \$36,458 in requests for Grad Events and they awarded \$11,164. Most groups got approximately 40% of their request. For grants, Ms. Day said she wanted to make some corrections, and said there were errors on the list. The Berkeley New Music Project was listed as being allocated \$0, but the group received \$600. Also, the East Bay Community Law Center student group received \$1,500, not \$500.

A motion to approve the recommendations from the Funding Committee was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, ROUND 6 OF GRAD EVENTS AND ROUND 4 OF GRANTS, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Quindel said committees are active but haven't been used to having so many actions, so they'll work with the Organization and Rules Committee to think of a better way to present new business and maybe separate information items from action items.

Report from the Finance Committee

Mr. Sharma said the report included in the agenda packet. There are two amendments that were not included, so there are six action items.

Mr. Sharma said he would like to amend the report to be in line with what the GA just approved from the Funding Committee. Number four on the original reads \$10,000 for Grad Events. He'd like that to read that and \$6,600 for grants in general and \$3,400 for the Grad Events budget. The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Akiba moved to amend the amendment, and said he would like to float the idea to allocate the entire amount, \$15,000, to student group funding, at the Funding Committee's choice. Student requests are in high demand and haven't received enough. So he'd rather allocate the entire contingent \$15,000. Ms. Quindel said the amendment, then, wouldn't fund \$5,000 for the Business Office. Mr. Akiba said it's \$15,000 to grad student funding and grants of funding committee's choice. Ms. Quindel asked if he wanted to wait for the original amendment to pass. The motion to change it to \$6,600 for grants and \$3,400 for Grad Events, instead of \$10,000 for Grad Events. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Sharma said the six items on the report are what they did at the last Finance Committee meeting. They need to train people to take over. The autonomy issue failed to get certified, so autonomy would only get \$3,000. The remaining \$15,000 would be divided, \$5,000 to the Business Office for additional staff time, because it's behind in processing reimbursements, and it would give them more staff hours process that, which the Committee felt was of primary concern. The remaining \$10,000 of that split would go to Grad Events and Grants, in recognition that those programs need money. The Executive Board is supposed to forward budget policies by March 1 so they can begin to formulate the budget. The Executive Board couldn't do that because it failed to meet quorum. This gives policy authorization directives to allow the Finance Committee, in consultation with the Organization and Rules Committee and the Executive Board, to fill out the budget without the Finance Committee having to take on a policy role, which they're not really designed to do. They just work out the numbers. Number six on the amended report deals with a Resolution of the Justice Funding Resolution, which has been pending for some time. The Executive Board failed to meet, and this was added as a direct action item.

Mr. Akiba said it's \$5,000 in four, and the contingent allocation was separate. Mr. Stagi said they'd get \$10,000, or \$5,000 for training and \$5,000 for additional staff training.

Ms. Madon asked if there was a reason why (4) would direct the Finance Committee to maintain the status quo to March 10. She asked why March 10 was signified. Mr. Sharma said the Finance Committee is meeting on March 12 to formulate the first draft of the budget, and this is a complete first draft. They wanted to iron out a budget that includes a budget picture for every program and project funded by the GA. They feel that to have budget recommendations by then, it's incumbent to fill those policy matters. The Finance Committee is charged as a fiscal body, not a policy body. This is a ten-day extension on the Executive Board's deadline.

Mr. Akiba said the deadline, then, for submitting projects is 10 a.m. next Monday. The Board will have a chance to review it at 3:30 p.m. and it's meeting at 4:30 so they have two hours to consider any new proposal. Mr. Sharma said that's why this date wasn't March 8. If the Executive Board doesn't feel it has enough time they would now have two additional days to meet.

Ms. Dugas said she sent an e-mail to the Executive Board that she'd try to get things compiled and disseminated early, and try to get an electronic version, if that helps.

Ms. Madon said she believed they have in the By-laws a provision that the budget should be presented to the Delegates after the Executive Board meets. It's expected to process everything and get input. She asked if she was saying that by adopting this report, if the Board doesn't come to resolution on policy, they'd present a budget to the Delegates without possible input from the elected representatives. Mr. Sharma said the By-laws require the Executive Board by March 1 to transmit to the Finance Committee policy recommendations with budgetary effects. The reason is that gives the Finance Committee the entire month of March to formulate the budget and propose it in April, enough in advance to have meaning in the budget process. The Executive Board did not meet the March 1 deadline and he didn't feel comfortable asking the Finance Committee to make policy decisions. This proposal would give the Executive Board an additional ten days to work these things out. If it fails to do it by Wednesday, the Finance Committee is back to square one, and being asked to make policy decisions. In formulating the budget, there are inherent policy decisions. In the Executive Board fails to meet the March 10 deadline, the Finance Committee has a back-up policy standard. That's better than letting the Finance Committee, which is blind to policy issues, fumble around in the dark.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Begin written report from the Finance Committee Chair

Finance Committee Report
24 February 2004

The Finance Committee met for the second time this academic year, on Friday, February 20th at 1:00 pm in Anthony Hall. Seven voting members and one ex-officio staff member was present: Rishi Sharma (Law), Marion Bailey (African American Studies), Duane De Wilt (City & Regional Planning), S. Nzingha Dugas (GA Business Manager/Finance Officer), David Garcia (Chemistry), Vivian Hwa (Economics), Erick Munoz (Law), and Robert Ricketts (Business). Committee members discussed a variety of current fiscal issues, including budget planning for FY 2004-2005, mid-year adjustments, and pending financial controversies. The following action items were approved by consensus and are now forwarded for consideration by the Assembly:

1. Berkeley Global Justice Funding

The committee recommends a \$1,500 reduction in the Student Activist Grant (SAG) budget that is specifically set aside for reimbursement to Berkeley Global Justice for travel expenses incurred in reliance on funds from the Student Activism Grant (SAG) as previously approved.

2. GMSP & GWP Budget Realignment

The committee recommends a \$22,000-\$ 18,000 split in the Graduate Division \$40,000 grant to the Graduate Minority Students Project (GMSP) and the Graduate Women's Project (GWP). In addition, the Committee requests both programs to resubmit budgets reflecting these amounts.

3. Line-item Transfers

The committee recommends closing the CRECNO and Leadership Conference project trustee accounts for a combined savings of \$20,000. The committee also recommends the Training and Technical Consulting line-item be reduced \$5,000 as the Business Office will only use that much.

4. Supplemental and New Appropriations

Business Office Staff

The committee recommends a supplemental appropriation of \$5,000 to the Business Office Staff line-item in light of personnel changes this academic year and persistent demand.

Autonomy Initiative

The Committee recommends appropriating \$18,000 to the Autonomy Initiative, under the auspices of the ad-hoc Autonomy Committee, for purposes of a non-partisan information campaign about the initiative on the spring ASUC ballot if the Attorney General certifies the ballot initiative and the Autonomy Committee agrees to pursue its placement on the ballot.

If the underlined qualification is not satisfied, then the Committee recommends appropriating \$3,000 to a non-partisan information campaign related to GA autonomy under the auspices of the Autonomy Committee.

Written report from the Finance Committee Chair (cont'd)

Contingent Allocations

If the underlined qualification above is not satisfied in regards to the Autonomy Initiative, then the Committee recommends appropriating an additional \$5,000 to the Business Office Staff line-item for increased staff hours and \$10,000 to the Graduate Events budget under the auspices of the Funding Committee.

Respectfully Submitted, Rishi Sharma, Chair, GA Finance Committee
24 February 2004

Finance Committee Chair's Amendments to the Report of 24 February 2004
2 March 2004

5. FY 2004-2005 Budget Policy

(1) The Finance Committee is authorized to allocate new salary and related expenses as part of the administrative realignment currently under consideration by the Executive Board.

(2) The Finance Committee is authorized to modify historic budget categories as part of the structural realignment currently under consideration by the Organization & Rules Committee.

(3) The Finance Committee is authorized to realign existing programs/projects only insofar as necessary to ensure institutional and program accountability, fiscal responsibility, or efficiency.

(4) The Finance Committee is directed to maintain the status quo in programs/projects absent the transmission of budgetary policy recommendations from the Executive Board by 10 March 2004.

These directives/authorizations are necessary to ensure maximum flexibility while still providing the policy, administrative, and programmatic guidance necessary for the timely and successful completion of the FY 2004-2005 Budget. Normally these issues would be resolved by the Executive Board, but it has consistently failed to meet quorum and the statutory deadline to provide policy guidance has passed.

6. Berkeley Global Justice Funding Resolution

In light of (1) Funding Committee and Delegate approval of the Berkeley Global Justice (BGJ) Student Activism Grant (SAG) request, (2) BGJ's reliance on the availability of these funds, and (3) the Finance Committee's recommendation to reallocate \$1,500 from the SAG budget for BGJ reimbursement, (4) the Business Office is directed to reimburse BGJ out of the funds made available by the Finance Committee's recommendation in line with normal budget processes not otherwise usurped by this directive.

Further delay in reimbursing Berkeley Global Justice, particularly in light of the Committee's discussion and recommendations on the issue, is inequitable and requires immediate action by the Delegates in the absence of meaningful consideration by the Executive Board because of a failure to meet quorum.

End written report from the Finance Committee Chair

Election of Grad Council Representative and the Funding Committee Chair

Ms. Day moved to go to item E of New Business. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote. Ms. Quindel said the positions of Grad Council rep and Funding Committee Chair also sit on the Executive Board.

Ms. Quindel said they would do the election for the Grad Council representative first. She called for any nominations as alternate Grad Council representative. Mr. Sharma nominated Vivian Hwa. Ms. Hwa said she's been active in the GA and wanted to get more involved. She's in the Economy Department and was a third-year. She called for any questions. Ms. Quindel said that seeing no questions, she would ask the nominee to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE VIVIAN HWA AS ALTERNATE GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Quindel called for any nominations for Funding Committee Chair. A Delegate nominated Carmel Levitan. The motion was seconded. Ms. Levitan said this was her second year on the Funding Committee and she would do the job. Ms. Quindel called for any questions. Ms. Quindel asked the nominee to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CARMEL LEVITAN AS FUNDING COMMITTEE CHAIR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the Affirmative Action Committee

Ms. Olorunnipa said the Committee's report was included in the agenda packet. They submitted two Resolutions, In Support of Funding for the Recruitment and Retention of Historically Underrepresented Students in Graduate School, and secondly, a Bill to Join the Pro-Integration Intervener Defendants to Maintain Voluntary Integration in Berkeley Schools. There's a suit to stop integration in Berkeley schools and the School Direct was being sued by the Pacific Legal Foundation, a conservative, pro-segregation group. The ASUC signed on to this on Wednesday and the Resolution would have the GA to sign on to this as well, being in support of the school district as it goes through this tough time.

Ms. Quindel called for any questions.

Ms. Preciado asked if the schools in Berkeley were engaged in busing. Ms. Olorunnipa said it's bringing people in from other places to integrate the schools.

Mr. Sharma asked if the GA would be joining in the legal sense and joining the suit, or in solidarity. Ms. Quindel said it's bringing people in from other places in order to integrate the schools. Mr. Sharma asked if they're joining in the legal sense or joining in

solidarity. Ms. Quindel said they're joining in the legal sense. This is a bill to add the GA as a third-party intervener.

A motion to call the question on the report was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote. Ms. Quindel said that if the motion was approved, both Resolutions would be adopted.

Ms. Hwa asked what it meant in a legal sense to become an intervener, and if they would incur any legal expenses. Ms. Quindel said they wouldn't. Approval would add the GA's name as a third-party intervener. Ms. Olorunnipa said the ASUC and other parties are agreeing to be on the side of the defendants as a third-party defendant. That means the GA was in support of the integration that's in practice. The GA wouldn't pay legal fees, which will be paid by the school district. The GA would be saying that it supports the District's position in this case. The GA would intervene with the defendants. Ms. Quindel said there would be no legal costs involved. The title of the GA would be listed as one of the intervening parties.

Mr. Barnes asked if this didn't violate Prop. 54. Ms. Quindel said there's no money involved, and the GA can take any position it wants. When money is involved, they'd have to look further into the details.

Mr. Bailey asked about the positions of the parents whose kids were being integrated into the school, and how they felt about being bused to schools. Ms. Olorunnipa said they didn't go into detail about how parents felt about the suit because they didn't have that information from the presenter. Mr. Sharma said the parents group has intervened to defend the integration policy.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, APPROVING THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF HISTORICALLY UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENTS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL, AND APPROVING THE RESOLUTION TO JOIN THE PRO-INTEGRATION INTERVENER DEFENDANTS TO MAINTAIN VOLUNTARY INTEGRATION IN BERKELEY SCHOOLS.

Begin written report from the Affirmative Action Committee Co-Chairs

March 2004 Report: Affirmative Action Committee to the GA

Submitted by Co-Chairs Joshua Fisher & Ronald Cruz

A highly effective measure to increase support for diversity on campus is to write many letters, ideally personalized with individual stories, to upper administration. Today we will be setting aside 5 minutes for the GA delegates to write a short letter to President

Dynes in support of diversity on campus, whether in the form of students, faculty, staff, or otherwise. The Affirmative Action Committee will collect the letters and send them to President Dynes to save you the stamp. We will write up some talking-points for you to use in a few sentences of foundation, and then you can include some personal stories.

Dean Mason spoke previously about the budget cuts to outreach, the results of which will impact underrepresented minorities disproportionately. In our meeting discussion, we pondered the idea of following the lead of Anthropology's Archaeology in that they require all of their graduate students to do outreach. We include a Resolution here for you to amend/pass/reject that shows our concern and support for outreach.

Written report from the Affirmative Action Committee (cont'd)

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF HISTORICALLY UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENTS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL

WHEREAS, the percentage of underrepresented graduate students at the University of California, Berkeley has dropped significantly since 1997; and

WHEREAS, diversity is correlated with academic excellence and signifies a world-class institution; and

WHEREAS, the multiplicity of viewpoints, lifestyles and cultures prepare students to be global leaders and citizens in an increasingly international arena; and

WHEREAS, the recruitment and retention of a diverse graduate student body enhances UC Berkeley's prestige and competitiveness;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley, that it calls for the continued funding for the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minorities in the Graduate Division.

In our Committee, we also discussed the pressing situation in Berkeley public schools, where parents and students face a historic lawsuit challenging voluntary K-12 integration in their schools. This is a case that may lead to the weakening of Prop 209, or a legal ban on voluntary integration in California. We discussed drafting a bill joining the Berkeley community members who seek to become a party to this litigation in defense of the integration plan.

Here is our proposed language:

RESOLUTION TO JOIN THE PRO-INTEGRATION INTERVENER DEFENDANTS TO MAINTAIN VOLUNTARY INTEGRATION IN BERKELEY SCHOOLS

WHEREAS, the Berkeley Unified School District (BUSD) was the first district in the country to voluntarily integrate its K-12 schools in response to the Brown v. Board of Education decision and the growing civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s; and

WHEREAS, BUSD is now being sued by the Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF) for successfully maintaining equal, integrated schools. If the PLF's suit prevails, Berkeley and other school districts across the State would be legally barred from racially integrating their schools, resulting in a new form of de jure segregation in California; and

WHEREAS, resegregation in Berkeley schools would increase the inequality between the schools, and increase the difficulty for black, Latino, and other minority students in Berkeley to gain access to UC Berkeley and other competitive colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is a proud defender of affirmative action, which are integration plans for higher education, and has repeatedly supported increasing educational opportunities for Latina/o, black, Native American, and other minority students in California; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is also on record opposing the Statewide ban on affirmative action in public institutions, Proposition 209. The outcome of this case will play a historic role in the strengthening or weakening of Proposition 209. Fundamentally, it will determine whether Brown v. Board of Education is a living principle that our nation continues to strive for, or an empty shell; and

WHEREAS, more than 200 Berkeley children, parents, teachers, school employees, and UC Berkeley students have filed with the Alameda Superior Court to join the lawsuit as pro-integration intervener defendants, in order to represent the voice of the students, families, and surrounding community. The California Alliance of African American Educators (CAAE) and the California State Employees Association (CSEA) have also joined the intervener defendants. They are being represented by the United for Equality and Affirmative Action Legal Defense Fund (UEAALDF). Miranda Massie, one of the organization's attorneys, successfully represented the student intervener-defendants in the University of Michigan Law School Supreme Court affirmative action case, Grutter v. Bollinger. The contest over the future of school integration is too important for the very people who will be most impacted by it to be sidelined while others argue their future for them; and

WHEREAS, as the voice of graduate students at UC Berkeley, the Graduate Assembly's commitment to integration, including outreach to minority students in K-12, will be strengthened by a victory in this case;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly will continue its support for integration and equality in education by joining the pro-integration intervener-defendants' case. The Graduate Assembly will send a copy of this motion to UEAA-LDF and the Daily Cal to inform them of our support.

Kira Blaisdell-Sloan (Anthropology), Delegate; Mydria Clark (Journalism), alternate; Ronald Cruz (Education), Delegate; Tiezhu Dong (East Asian Languages & Culture), alternate; Joshua Fisher (Environmental Science, Policy & Management), Delegate, Chair; Funmi Olorunnipa (Law), Delegate; Virginia Platt, (Bioengineering), Delegate; Jessica Quindel, GA, President; Richard Tran (Rhetoric), Delegate; Kofi-Charu Nat Turner, GA, Graduate Minority Students Project Coordinator.

End written report from the Affirmative Action Committee Co-Chairs

Report from the Advocacy Committee

-
-
Ms. Quindel said the Committee dealt with a number of issues. Regarding affordable housing, they're asking for the UC Regents to formally define affordable housing. They're asking for a public presentation of data collected by the Graduate Dean regarding the affects of housing costs on grads' acceptance rates and drop-out rates. The rents at Albany Village are being doubled and the Committee is trying to address the Regents about this problem. Regarding the Student Code of Conduct, they're asking for a fact sheet to help get the word out about the changes. For fee increases, they've suggested formal administrative overhead cuts, perhaps doing a study on that how that could happen. They're not asking for particular cuts, but to study this more. In terms of mandatory student fee policy, the bottom line is that fee policy was the main reason for the problems with Prop. 54. There are good and bad things in the updated policy. The main good aspect is that they're allowing registered campus organizations, meaning any groups that apply for funding from the GA, to do anything the groups want, on or off campus, because anything that's done as a student is educational, and the University, the Office of the President, finally agrees with that. And they agree with viewpoint neutrality. They can't not fund somebody because of their viewpoint. The University finally agrees that just because you fund an anti-Holocaust speaker, you don't have to fund a pro-Holocaust speaker and have one of each. The GA is saying the Supreme Court says you can't not fund someone. As for negative policies, there are two fundamental things. One is the University saying lobbying is only lobbying the University and government officials face to face and by e-mail contact. Lobbying cannot happen through a ballot initiative, which was the GA's big issue. They made this policy because of the confusion with UCOP's own policies. UCOP is now saying that students cannot lobby on ballot initiatives. The students are arguing about what the difference is between lobbying on student fee increases when something like Prop. 55 and Prop. 56 could have been passed by the Legislature but was passed by the electorate. So the question is, why there is a distinction between certain kinds of lobbying, and why

lobbying legislators was okay but not lobbying the electorate. They're both a legislative process.

The other bad policy change dealt with campus revenue. UC is saying that the only way to get a fee increase for student groups would be to go through the GA as a whole. So the only way to increase the amount of money that goes to student groups like their big groups, such as SUPERB, or Recruitment and Retention Centers, would be to increase the allocation to student government.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE GRADUATE ADVOCACY COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Report from the Organization and Rules Committee

Mr. Akiba there were two large issues. One was quorum, because the Executive Board had terrible meeting quorum last month. The issue was whether they should round down or round up the number needed for quorum. The Committee doesn't have an interpretation. The practice of the Funding Committee and the Executive Board has been to round up. Regarding amendments to the Charter and By-laws, they only have about a month, so they have prioritized on things to concentrate on. They'd edit the Charter and By-laws that they currently have and perhaps use that as a provisional Constitution in the case of autonomy. That's the direction the Committee was heading at that point. If people have other areas of concern to address in the current review process, they should contact him.

Mr. Sharma said that as a member of the Committee, the quorum vote was 3-2, and the Committee Chair cast the ballot creating a tie. That was just to clarify.

A motion to call the question passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Resolutions

The following Resolution was authored by the Committee on Student Fees and was sponsored by GA President Jessica Quindel:

RESOLUTION ON REGISTRATION FEE NAME CHANGE

WHEREAS, Registration Fees pay for all non-academic student services that play a vital role in contributing to the campus climate; and

WHEREAS, changing the name of the Registration Fee to the Student Services Fee will help students better understand that this Fee supports student affairs units, and provides the financial resources for the non-academic services available to those students; and

WHEREAS, the current name of the Registration Fee does not accurately describe the allocation and the use of the Fee on campus;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly encourages the University of California System to change the name of the Registration Fee to the Student Services Fee.

Ms. Quindel said she's working with the Committee on Student Fees. As to what was said earlier, they're supposed to look at the service part of fees. Right now, the Administration takes money from Reg Fees, money that is supposed to be spent on student services. That money has been put into departments' and into instruction budgets, which is why student services were seeing bigger cuts than departments. So the Committee wants to change the name of this Fee to the "Student Services Fee." That would make it harder to cut and easier to monitor these funds.

With no objection, the question was called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION ON REGISTRATION FEE NAME CHANGE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was sponsored and authored by Ms. Madon (some language taken from GLAD (Gay and Lesbian Advocates & Defenders) GA Committee on Academic Affairs):

RESOLUTION TO UNAMBIGUOUSLY SUPPORT SAME-SEX CIVIL MARRIAGE

WHEREAS, marriage is a unique legal status conferred by and recognized by governments the world over. While civil unions provide legal protection at the state level only, and lack federal protections as well as the dignity, clarity, security, and power of the marriage institution; and

WHEREAS, federal law currently denies recognition of same-sex unions for the purposes of all federal programs and requirements, and federal and California State leaders have further threatened the rights of Americans by seeking an amendment to the United States Constitution that would ban same-sex marriage and institutionalize governmental discrimination both in practice and in principle; and

WHEREAS, the University of California's gay and lesbian students, faculty, and staff have consistently been denied basic equality and fairness, in being denied the legal right to establish partnership benefits and the right to civil marriage, as well as the hundreds of rights, responsibilities, and protections that marriage provides; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom recently granted marriage licenses to same-sex couples in the City of San Francisco, and as a result, Governor Schwarzenegger has expressed willingness to support a State law enabling same-sex civil marriage if it is popularly supported, suggesting that California State officials might be willing to follow the peoples' voice in this matter: and

WHEREAS, popular support for same-sex civil marriages must be voiced immediately by advocates across the State, including student governments and city councils, to show Governor Schwarzenegger that Californians demand equal rights for all; and

WHEREAS, gay and lesbian students, faculty, and staff, and their children and families, are a central part of the social fabric that constitutes our University community, therefore it is clearly within the interests of graduate students to advocate for the rights of same-sex couples; and

WHEREAS the Graduate Assembly has consistently opposed any form of discrimination on the basis of sexual identity or orientation, and as a body it has advocated on behalf of graduate students to ensure that equal rights and access are guaranteed for all graduate students and members of our community;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Graduate Assembly opposes any and all efforts to discriminate against gay men and women, their children and families, by constitutional amendment, State legislation, or other means preventing same-sex civil marriage.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly unambiguously advances its support for same-sex civil marriage in California and lauds San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom for actions taken to promote legal marriage for gay and lesbian couples.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA President will write a letter to California Governor Schwarzenegger, Berkeley Chancellor Berdahl, State Attorney General Lockyer, and other influential officials, encouraging Governor Schwarzenegger to establish California State law sanctioning same-sex civil marriages, with strong support from UC Berkeley's graduate student community.

Ms. Madon said the Resolution allows the GA to get involved in lobbying efforts at the State and federal levels to weigh in on their support of legal marriage. Mr. Cantor said that a quorum was 21. They'd lose quorum if they lose two more people. Ms. Madon said they're not just supporting civil unions that don't afford federal and international protection. Rather, this would be a civil marriage, and there's a distinction.

Mr. Stagi said he and his partner will be getting married and he'd appreciate their vote. A Delegate David said he was married to his partner on February 12, and would appreciate their vote. (Applause)

Ms. McElroy said she had trouble supporting Mayor Newsom. She agreed with the ideal, but thought he acted in a questionably illegal manner, and she wasn't sure the GA should support illegal acts of politicians who overstep, so she'd like to strike mention of Mayor Newsom in clause four, and from the Resolved Clause. The motion to amend was seconded. A motion was made to call the question.

With no objection, the question was called. The motion to approve the amendment failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Hsu said that since there are legal questions, such as with constitutionality, he asked if the proper recourse shouldn't be to allow the courts to carry the process, and not assume that a Resolution would influence what judges think in the California Supreme Court.

Ms. Madon said it's not clear to her this will be resolved in the courts. It's a matter of efficacy, and Gov. Schwarzenegger said he's willing to consider a law for equal rights. It would be incumbent on grads to advocate that.

Ms. Hwa asked if it was possible to applaud the Governor's intentions if not his actions.

Mr. Bailey said he thought the question of Mayor Newsom was moot, and while he wasn't trying to celebrate Newsom, the Mayor did the right thing. Before *Brown v. the Board of Education*, people who resisted were also breaking the law. Also, he didn't appreciate being interrupted on a Resolution he was interested in, and said it was disrespectful.

Ms. Quindel asked speakers to direct comments to the Chair. That's the procedure in a heated debate, according to Robert's Rules, to try to be respectful. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Hsu asked about the status of the lawsuit being brought by the Attorney General against the City of San Francisco. Mr. Sharma said the California State Attorney General filed suit to enjoin San Francisco from issuing marriage licenses. The California Supreme Court refused to enjoin, but ordered to hear legal arguments, on Friday, he believed.

Mr. Stagi said he would propose an amendment that this be e-mailed by the President on Friday. Also, he wanted to thank Mr. Bailey and Ms. Madon. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

A Delegate moved to amend the second Resolved Clause, to change wording "actions" to "intentions," to read, "Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly... lauds San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsome for his intentions to promote legal marriage for gay and lesbian couples."

The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO UNAMBIGUOUSLY SUPPORT SAME-SEX CIVIL MARRIAGE, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was authored and sponsored by External Affairs VP Dawn Williams:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PRISON CLOSURES

WHEREAS, the California Department of Corrections has issued a memo stating that, due to budget cuts and corresponding legislative reforms enacted last year, it is developing a plan to reduce the number of people locked up in California prisons, by 15,000, by June 2005, which states, "With the population reductions estimated at approximately 15,000 in the 2004/05 fiscal year, it must be assumed that we may be facing prison / facility closures."; and

WHEREAS, in his budget released January 2004, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger calls for the creation of "a Commission [to] proactively evaluate and recommend future closures for both CDC and the Youth Authority" and has mandated this commission to develop a "detailed reform proposal with associated budget reductions" to submit to the Legislature as part of the Governor's May Revised Budget; and

WHEREAS, the California Department of Corrections' (CDC) has a written commitment to reduce its prisoner population by 15,000 by June 2005; and

WHEREAS, the CDC has stated that closures of prisons are assumed; and

WHEREAS, the recognition in the Governor's budget that "entire institution closures nearly double the potential savings [of a smaller prison population] by avoiding fixed costs"; and

WHEREAS, the Governor has created a commission to study and recommend prison closures; and

WHEREAS, the Delano II prison is being funded with Lease Revenue Bonds, voters were not allowed to vote on Delano II. Poll after poll has found that Californians favor cuts to prison spending over any other area of state spending. The Delano II prison will cost over \$700 million to construct and approximately \$100 million a year to operate; and

WHEREAS, Pelican Bay State Prison (PBSP) is one of the State's most notoriously brutal prisons. It is an isolated institution in the northwestern-most corner of the State. With an operating budget of \$115 million (not including legal costs incurred fighting lawsuits stemming from inhumane conditions), it is one of California's most expensive prisons to operate; and

WHEREAS, human rights abuses and medical neglect at Valley State Prison for Women (VSPW) are widespread and well-documented by the United Nations Special Rapporteur Against Violence Against Women, Amnesty International, California Prison Focus and other groups -- located in the Central Valley in Chowchilla across the street from the Central California Women's Facility -- is known as the Pelican Bay for women and it costs \$63 million a year to run Valley State; and

WHEREAS, in 1998, the FBI launched a civil rights investigation into the Susanville penitentiary around the role guards played in the beatings and killings of several prisoners, following a number of prisoners' assaults and deaths and costs \$101 million a year to run California Correctional Center, Susanville, making it one of the most expensive prisons in California; and

WHEREAS, closure of the above four prisons would decrease the State's prison capacity by 16,574 beds, just slightly more than the projected drop in the State's prison population;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly of the University of California at Berkeley call upon the Governor, the CDC and the Legislature to take the following actions:

1. Do Not open the Delano II prison
2. Close Pelican Bay State Prison
3. Close Valley State Prison for Women
4. Close Folsom State Prison
5. Close California Correctional Center, Susanville.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA External Affairs Committee bring these concerns to the legislature, the Governor and the CDC.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA External Affairs Committee bring these concerns to the legislature, the Governor and the CDC.

Ms. Williams said the State in the last decade built 23 prisons and built two universities. The Resolution supports the closing of five prisons because the State is not at the prison population predicted for the year 2003. The current prison population is 161,079. They're proposing that with stop construction of Delano Prison and close four prisons. There's a 2,000 prisoner buffer regarding space. Mr. Valeé wanted her to amend the bill, to add "the media" to the last Resolved Clause, to read:

"Further Resolved, that the GA External Affairs Committee bring these concerns to the legislature, the Governor, the CDC, and the media."

The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Madon asked if closing the listed prisons would cause overcrowding in the remaining prisons, and if people knew that they're not inhumanely overcrowded. Ms. Williams said there is a real population and a design population. The design population is one person per cell and the real population is two people. The proposal had a list of supporters that was available.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PRISON CLOSURES, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Report from the Academic Affairs Committee

Ms. Preciado said they met regarding the Faculty Mentoring Award and discussed the make-up of a task force to give recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee regarding the Award. They're talking about a group of three to seven grads, including Delegates and grads at-large, and two faculty members.

Officers' Reports

Ms. Quindel said that for the President's Report, she followed-up on Resolutions and was caught up and done with what was asked of her. If people were interested in the letters that were sent, they should let her know. She's in ongoing work with the Albany Village Residents, in almost daily communication with them, trying to support the fight against doubling their rents. Next Tuesday there will be a Chancellor search forum. If people have feedback on who the new Chancellor should be, she would ask them to please attend. There will be media present. Ms. Quindel said she talked about funding

opportunity for access to education. Also, they're working on a forum on the budgetary crisis, "Where the Money Has Gone." They're working on this with the ASUC, Chancellor Berdahl, and Assemblymember Loni Hancock. They'll try to get somebody from the Governor's office. They hope to hold the forum on April 15. Lastly, regarding the ASUC Auxiliary Store Operations Board, Ms. Quindel said she and Ms. Molina are back on the Board. Ms. Molina's term ends in July, so if anybody was interested in sitting on the SOB for the two-year term, they should let her know. It's a great opportunity to have a huge impact with not a lot of work. It takes background understanding of the ASUC Store Operations Board in making commercial activities. Ms. Quindel said she's graduating and Ms. Madon was graduating, so if people are interested in elected positions, they should talk to them early and often. Officers would love to talk to people about what it entails. They love what they do and want to make sure it continues. People could talk to them about any position.

For the External Affairs Vice President's report, Ms. Williams said they've done work on what they can do about the budget cuts. In June, 2003 the car tax was increased and in November 2003, Gov. Schwarzenegger repealed the car tax. In June 2004, there were \$500 million in cuts to higher education, because the car tax was repealed. The total cuts to UC are \$33.3 million cuts, with a 40% increase in grad fees. Financial aid and outreach have been cut. The next slide shows outreach, the hand-out Dean Mason gave them last month. In 1997, Prop. 209 was enacted. In 1999, outreach money was started, and there was continued improvement. In 2003, outreach money was eliminated. So they could make their own judgment as to what would happen. The next slide shows grad fee increases, in yellow, for this year, and in red, estimated fees for next year, assuming a 10% undergrad increase and 40% grad increase, and a \$5,000 increase for professional schools for business, medicine, and law. This puts professional students over the federal loan cap, so they'd have to supplement their tuition with other loans. Another way to look at it is in-State grad fees, which have had an 85% increase over two years, including over \$8,000 for next year. As for the impacts of the grad fee increase, departments would not be able to fund as many grads. Fewer grads means would mean fewer GSIs and GSRs, so class size would increase, they wouldn't get as many publications, departments couldn't fund as many out-of-State and international students, and because of their debt, students wouldn't do public work. Top students would start going elsewhere and rankings would drop.

Ms. Williams said they put together a basic timeline. On Monday, March 8, the Senate Subcommittee on Education starts meeting. If people would like to go to that meeting, she'd be willing to drive. They won't speak but they'll wear Cal T-shirts. She said Mr. Kashmiri talked to the Governmental Affairs Office in charge of lobbying for Berkeley, who said it would be great if students could be there and make a presence, and law makers would love to see them there.

Also, March 9 is the UC-wide Day of Action, and activities were being planned. Ms. Williams said they'll, have a Mock Graduation, with 400 empty chairs set up, and the graduation song playing, with nobody sitting in the chairs. The UC Regents meeting is

March 17-18. The Regents have the final say on what's done with the money. Sen. Perata is involved in the Subcommittee on Education and is doing a series of town hall meetings. The first is April 16. April 19 is UC Lobby Day, UC-wide, and it's a good day to go to Sacramento. May 14 is the Governor's May revise and June 15 is when the House and the Senate have to pass the budget. So there wasn't much time. And since grads will be gone by May, they need to get their butts in gear. The primary message from Kathleen and Mr. Kashmiri is that the State can't afford further cuts in higher education because UCB is the launching pad for the State and an engine for job creation. That's along with personal messages to legislators. They can write letters to editors, print out buttons and brochures, and make this issue visible. And with Mr. Kashmiri, they're looking to set up a meeting with campus groups. They want to use the Web site for grassroots activism and they need to lobby. There's a message to the Governor that should be sent to their departments, friends, and parents.

Ms. Quindel said the time for reports had expired and they've lost quorum. If people were not on a committee yet and were interested in helping with budget cuts, they should join the External Affairs Committee, which will meet on Thursday at 7:00.

Ms. Quindel said she would like to thank them for attending such a lengthy meeting.

This meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

Present at the March 4, 2004 GA Meeting

Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan
History, Matthew Sargent
Political Science, Bob Tamadon
Marion Bailey
Architecture, Sahar Fard
Bioengineering, Matt Eckerle
Lola Odusanya
Chemistry, David Garcia
Stagi
City & Regional Planning, Justin Doull
Oma Shaugnessy
Economics, Vivian Hwa
Education, Ronald Cruz
EECS, Mustafa Ergen
Kamakate
English, Kathryn Vulic
Ethnic Studies, Iyko Day
Geography, Jason Strange
History, Candace Chen
IEOR, Deborah Pedersen
Valisa
Journalism, Chad Heeter
Takeshi Akiba
Landscape Architecture, Blaine Merker
Law Funmi Olorunnipa
Law, Rishi Sharma
Science, Johanna Franklin
Gerdes
MCB, Andro Hsu
MCB, Susan Mashiyama
Jessica Preciado
Nuclear Engineering, David Bames
Performance Studies, Monica Stufft
Physics, Miguel Daal
Political Science, Matt Baxter
Ornston
Public Policy, Allison Cole
Rhetoric, Richard Quang-Ahn Tran
Greene
Social Welfare, Sara Ortega
Hollowell-Fuentes

Business Admin, Regina Eberhart
Journalism, Mydria Clark
African Diaspora Studies,
Architecture, Aditi Rao
Chemical Engineering,
City & Regional Planning, Jay
East Asian Languages & Cult,
Education, Charles Hammond
EECS, Yatish Patel
Energy & Resources, Fanta
ESPM, Josh Fisher
Folklore, Ryan Sayre
German, Robert Schechtman
History of Art, Jessen Kelly
Italian Studies, Sylvia
Jurisprudence & Social Policy,
Law, Catherine Ann
Law, Mo Kashmiri
Logic & the Methodology of
Mathematics, Peter
MCB, Kathryn McElroy
Mechanical Engineering,
Optometry, Collin Vaughan
Physics, Matthijs Randsdorp
Physics, Trevor Lanting
Political Science, Darius
Public Policy, Anat Shenker
Social Welfare, Maayan
Sociology, Maria

Sociology, Sarah Anne Minkin
Officer - President, Jessica Quindel
Madon
ASUC Representative, Bahar Khanjari
Staff - Bus. Director, Nzingha Dugas
Cantor
Staff - Funding, Shayla Moore
Staff - Legislative Liaison, Claudia Medina
Robeson Taj Frazier

Vision Science, Paul Macneilage
Officer - VPAA, Temina
Officer - VPEA Dawn Williams
Staff - Dept. Liaison, Chris
Staff - GSSP, Wendy Davis
Staff - Media Relations,

Resolutions Amended at the Meeting

-

Resolution to Unambiguously Support Same-Sex Civil Marriage (as amended at the meeting)

Whereas, marriage is a unique legal status conferred by and recognized by governments the world over. While civil unions provide legal protection at the state level only, and lack federal protections as well as the dignity, clarity, security, and power of the marriage institution: and

Amended Resolutions (cont'd)

- 36 -

Resolution to Unambiguously Support Same-Sex Civil Marriage (cont'd)

Whereas, federal law currently denies recognition of same-sex unions for the purposes of all federal programs and requirements, and federal and California State leaders have further threatened the rights of Americans by seeking an amendment to the United States Constitution that would ban same-sex marriage and institutionalize governmental discrimination both in practice and in principle; and

Whereas, the University of California's gay and lesbian students, faculty, and staff have consistently been denied basic equality and fairness, in being denied the legal right to establish partnership benefits and the right to civil marriage, as well as the hundreds of rights, responsibilities, and protections that marriage provides; and

Whereas, San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom recently granted marriage licenses to same-sex couples in the City of San Francisco, and as a result, Governor Schwarzenegger has expressed willingness to support a State law enabling

same-sex civil marriage if it is popularly supported, suggesting that California State officials might be willing to follow the peoples' voice in this matter: and

Whereas, popular support for same-sex civil marriages must be voiced immediately by advocates across the State, including student governments and city councils, to show Governor Schwarzenegger that Californians demand equal rights for all; and

Whereas, gay and lesbian students, faculty, and staff, and their children and families, are a central part of the social fabric that constitutes our University community, therefore it is clearly within the interests of graduate students to advocate for the rights of same-sex couples; and

Whereas the Graduate Assembly has consistently opposed any form of discrimination on the basis of sexual identity or orientation, and as a body it has advocated on behalf of graduate students to ensure that equal rights and access are guaranteed for all graduate students and members of our community;

Therefore Be It Resolved, the Graduate Assembly opposes any and all efforts to discriminate against gay men and women, their children and families, by constitutional amendment, State legislation, or other means preventing same-sex civil marriage.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly unambiguously advances its support for same-sex civil marriage in California and lauds San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom for his intentions to promote legal marriage for gay and lesbian couples.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the GA President will write a letter to California Governor Schwarzenegger, Berkeley Chancellor Berdahl, State Attorney General Lockyer, and other influential officials, encouraging Governor Schwarzenegger to establish California State law sanctioning same-sex civil marriages, with strong support from UC Berkeley's graduate student community. To be e-mailed by the President on Friday.

Whereas, the California Department of Corrections has issued a memo stating that, due to budget cuts and corresponding legislative reforms enacted last year, it is developing a plan to reduce the number of people locked up in California prisons, by 15,000, by June 2005, which states, "With the population reductions estimated at approximately 15,000 in the 2004/05 fiscal year, it must be assumed that we may be facing prison / facility closures."; and

Whereas, in his budget released January 2004, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger calls for the creation of "a Commission [to] proactively evaluate and recommend future closures for both CDC and the Youth Authority" and has mandated this commission to develop a "detailed reform proposal with associated budget reductions" to submit to the Legislature as part of the Governor's May Revised Budget; and

Whereas, the California Department of Corrections' (CDC) has a written commitment to reduce its prisoner population by 15,000 by June 2005; and

Whereas, the CDC has stated that closures of prisons are assumed; and

Whereas, the recognition in the Governor's budget that "entire institution closures nearly double the potential savings [of a smaller prison population] by avoiding fixed costs"; and

Whereas, the Governor has created a commission to study and recommend prison closures; and

Whereas, the Delano II prison is being funded with Lease Revenue Bonds, voters were not allowed to vote on Delano II. Poll after poll has found that Californians favor cuts to prison spending over any other area of state spending. The Delano II prison will cost over \$700 million to construct and approximately \$100 million a year to operate; and

Whereas, Pelican Bay State Prison (PBSP) is one of the State's most notoriously brutal prisons. It is an isolated institution in the northwestern-most corner of the State. With an operating budget of \$115 million (not including legal costs incurred fighting lawsuits stemming from inhumane conditions), it is one of California's most expensive prisons to operate; and

Whereas, human rights abuses and medical neglect at Valley State Prison for Women (VSPW) are widespread and well-documented by the United Nations Special Rapporteur Against Violence Against Women, Amnesty International, California Prison Focus and other groups -- located in the Central Valley in Chowchilla across the street from the Central California Women's Facility -- is known as the Pelican Bay for women and it costs \$63 million a year to run Valley State; and

Whereas, in 1998, the FBI launched a civil rights investigation into the Susanville penitentiary around the role guards played in the beatings and killings of several prisoners, following a number of prisoners' assaults and deaths and costs \$101 million a year to run California Correctional Center, Susanville, making it one of the most expensive prisons in California; and

Whereas, closure of the above four prisons would decrease the State's prison capacity by 16,574 beds, just slightly more than the projected drop in the State's prison population;

Amended Resolutions (cont'd)

- 38 -

Resolution in Support of Prison Closures (cont'd)

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly of the University of California at Berkeley call upon the Governor, the CDC and the Legislature to take the following actions:

1. Do Not open the Delano II prison
2. Close Pelican Bay State Prison
3. Close Valley State Prison for Women
4. Close Folsom State Prison
5. Close California Correctional Center, Susanville.

Be It Further Resolved, that the GA External Affairs Committee bring these concerns to the legislature, the Governor and the CDC.

Be It Further Resolved, that the GA External Affairs Committee bring these concerns to the legislature, the Governor and the CDC, and the media.