

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

May 5, 2011

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting, concluding Spring Semester, was called to order at 5:31.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ASUC Report

The GA heard from opponents of a proposed City ordinance that would make it illegal to sit on the sidewalk during the day, disproportionately affecting the homeless, and voted to oppose the ordinance.

Upcoming GA Events

There's a petition at SAGE Coalition.org regarding a cut in federally subsidized loans being cut in the 2012 fiscal year budget.

Business Office Announcements

The GA will have three open, stipended positions: Editor of The Berkeley Graduate, Coordinator of the New Grad Student Orientation, and Coordinator of the Women of Color Initiative. WOCI puts on the Women of Color Conference, which will have its 27th anniversary.

Update on Operational Excellence

Badr Albanna, liaison to Operational Excellence, said OE was leaving the design phase and was entering the implementation phase. Over 40 proposals were being vetted. The Student Operational Excellence Committee was concerned that OE didn't have structures to keep it accountable and to hear the student voice. SOEC put together a series of proposals, including a DE-Cal, having a larger stakeholders committee, a research group, working with other campus organizations to address OE, and to create some unified messaging around the student response to OE.

GA Budget Memo to the Chancellor

The GA is writing a budget memo to the Chancellor on priorities grads have on how Student Services Fee money is spent. Ideas came from the GA's satisfaction survey and from Delegate feedback forms. They emphasized health care issues, childcare services, funding decentralization, priorities on spending Professional Degree Supplementary Tuition, Temporary Academic Salaries, and retaining funding for Grad Student Advisory Officers.

Student Services Fee Surplus

For the first time there will be a surplus in Student Services Fee money, \$780,000. The Chancellor's Advisory Committee will make recommendations to the Chancellor about how it should be spent. GA

members of the Committee went through the survey and Delegate feedback forms and will recommend money go to Counseling and Psychological Services in UHS; childcare subsidies; open 24-hour libraries during RRR and finals week; and a research advisory service for undergraduate students.

Resolution were fast tracked.

Consent Calendar

The GA approved the following bills under the Consent Calendar:

1103a, On a By-law Amendment to Facilitate Communication. The bill amends the By-laws to require Delegate e-mail addresses.

1104d, On Directed Action to Create a Communications Workgroup. The bill calls for the Workgroup to work on the GA Web site, on departmental e-mails, and on goals.

1104e, On Directed Action to Allow Funding of the Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator through June 30, 2011.

Approval of GA 2011-12 Budget

\$420,000 comes to the GA through student fees and the Budget Committee tried to keep the GA budget at about that amount. There was no cut to student group funding, at \$110,000, the same amount as last year. Project programs weren't cut.

A motion to amend the budget by equalizing the stipends of the Budget Officer and the Rules Officer failed by voice-vote. An amendment to equalize the stipends of the Treasurer and the Rules Officer failed by voice-vote.

A motion to equalize the stipends of the CAVP the EAVP offices at \$6,500 each passed by voice-vote.

The GA 2011-12 budget, as amended, passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Funding Committee Report and Funding Guide

The Funding Committee approved student group funding per its rules for the end of the semester. Six applicants were awarded about \$1,391.

Funding dates were amended and approved.

Contingency Funding Rounds were approved, including \$2,000 for online funding development; \$450 for the purchase of sound equipment for groups; and \$550 for the bar code scanner.

The Funding Report was approved unanimously by voice-vote, awarding \$1,391.14.

Election of Graduate Council Representatives

A motion to leave one seat open for a professional student failed by hand-vote.

The Chair's ruling to hold the election by choosing the four highest vote getters was overruled.

A motion to vote on each candidate to see if they passed a threshold, and then rank representatives passed by hand-vote.

The GA elected three reps to the Grad Council: Tiffany Ng, Liz Boatman, and Sam Saxena. No Alternate was elected.

Communications Workgroup

The Communications Workgroup was formed by a Resolution passed under the Consent Calendar. It would work on ways in which the GA communicates, draft best working practices for the GA to communicate, and revise content on the Web site. Volunteers for the Workgroup were Michael Ellison, Evan Davidson, and Bradley Froehle.

Thank You's for Outgoing Officers

The GA thanked people who were leaving the GA: Miguel Daal, Daniele Love, Apple Williams, Tiffany Ng, Jordan Zachritz, Allison Pymer, Ashely Russel, Kara Young, Kim McNair, Lucy Diekman, Brad Froehle, and Lindsay Cast. (Applause)

Resolution Discussion and Vote

The GA approved 1103c, On Directed Action to Implement the Recommendations of the Outreach Workgroup Committee and Provisions for the Extension of Its Mandate. It calls for measures to increase outreach opportunities and extends the mandate of the Workgroup on Community Outreach.

The GA indefinitely tabled 1104b, By-law Amendment to Create a Grammar Officer and Grammar Committee.

The GA passed 1105b, On Establishing a Summer Funding Workgroup and Directed Action. It establishes a Summer Funding Workgroup and has the Executive Board review and approve contingency recommendations of the Summer Funding Workgroup. Summer (May-August) contingency funding shall not exceed \$8,000. Volunteering for the Workgroup were Bradley Froehle, Michael Ellsworth, Allison Pymer, Aleks Polosukhina, Ian Herbert, and Danny Yost.

The GA tabled indefinitely 1104f, Resolution on an Epicurean Approach to Meetings and Events.

The GA approved 1104g, On Updating the GA Charter. The bill brings the Charter up to date and called for an e-mail vote to approve the Charter revision. [It was noted that the e-mail vote did not receive enough votes to approve the Resolution.]

The GA approved 1104c, as amended, On Directed Action to Implement Online Funding Applications. The bill has the Funding Chair investigate and implement online funding applications for the coming school year. Paper applications would still be allowed.

The GA passed 1104h, On By-law Amendment to Specify Executive Board Quorum. The bill amends E-Board quorum. A motion to amend the bill to three members failed. The bill was approved, calling for E-Board quorum to be four members.

The GA passed 1105c, On Suggested Revisions to the Graduate Assembly By-laws from the 2010-2011 Rules Committee's Annual Review. The bill amends several By-laws, including amending the GA's mission and clarifying rules for quorum.

The meeting adjourned for lack of a quorum, tabling 1102f, Budget Amendment and Directed Action regarding the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation; 1105a, Directed Action Regarding the SOB Charter Revision; and 1105d, Regarding Job Posting for New Project Coordinators.

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

End Summary of the meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Spring Semester, was called to order by Tiffany Ng at 5:31 in the Senate Chamber. Ms. Ng said she would like to welcome them to the final Delegate Assembly meeting of the academic year.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ASUC Report

Ms. Moos introduced herself and said she was an ASUC Senator. She wanted to thank the GA for having them. People at were present at the meeting to talk about a local City issue and to hopefully get the GA's support. The Senate Chamber was packed with students last night when the Senate considered this topic and passed by a bill about it by a vast majority. She would like to let some student group representatives talk to the GA about the issue. At the end, she would request that the GA take a straw poll to see if they would be willing to have the Executive Board write a letter in support. Ms. Moos said she was advised by Ms. Navab that this would be more convenient than dealing with a Resolution.

Chris introduced himself and said he was with the Suitcase Clinic. JP introduced himself and said he was with Cal Habitat for Humanity. They're part of a coalition that also includes CALPIRG.

Chris said they would like to talk about a sit ordinance that's been proposed by the City Council of Berkeley. The ordinance would make it illegal to sit on the sidewalk during the day and would have a

Announcements -- ASUC Report (cont'd)

- 5 -

Upcoming GA Events

Business Office Announcements

disproportionate affect on homeless folks who have no other place to go. As student groups that deal a lot with homeless issues, they really understand this population and think this ordinance was a really bad idea. They want to ask the GA to send a letter in opposition to the ordinance to the City Council and to the Mayor. On Wednesday the ASUC Senate voted 18-1 in favor of this position, and the Daily Cal Editorial Board was also in favor of this position.

JP said the City was trying to push this ordinance by using a tiresome economic idea to justify marginalizing an endangered population. He would appreciate the GA's support on this issue to show that the entire UC Berkeley campus was against the City of Berkeley doing something along these lines.

Ms. Moos called for any questions.

Ms. Navab said that if there were no questions, she asked if they could take a vote to see if the Delegates were in favor of having a letter written. She moved to direct the Executive Board to write a letter in opposition to the sit ordinance. **THE MOTION TO DIRECT THE EXECUTIVE BOARD TO WRITE A LETTER IN OPPOSITION TO A PROPOSED CITY SIT ORDINANCE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.** Ms. Ng said the Executive Board was so directed. Ms. Moos said she would like to thank the GA. Ms. Love said she would like to thank them for joining the GA the meeting.

Upcoming GA Events

Mr. Kehoe said that on behalf of the External Affairs Committee, none of whom were present, there were a few announcements. Delegates got an e-mail about federally subsidized loans being cut in the fiscal year 2012 budget. If people go to SAGE Coalition.org there's a petition they could sign. Currently, 700 people have signed, and they hope to get 2,000 signatures from Berkeley and 10,000 nationwide. He would ask Delegates to e-mail their departments about this. Also, Jonathan Stein, the External Affairs State Legislative Director, sent out an e-mail. If Delegates were interested in meeting with State lawmakers and will be around in May or over the summer to talk about issues going on at the State level, people could e-mail him at state@ga.berkeley.edu. There's also an External Affairs Committee meeting on Wednesday. People could send Mr. Ortega an e-mail if they want more information about that. Everything else was in the Officer report people received.

Business Office Announcements

Ms. Hsueh said that if Delegates had friends who were looking for jobs, the GA will have three open positions. She passed around announcements about them. People could also go to the GA Web site, where they'll continue to post jobs that are available. The openings were Editor of The Berkeley Graduate, Coordinator of the New Grad Student Orientation, and Coordinator of the Women of Color Initiative.

Kim McNair is the current WOCI Coordinator, and Ms. Hsueh asked her to say a little about the position. Ms. McNair said the Women of Color Initiative is responsible for programming and their main activity is the Empowering Women of Color Conference, and next March, 2012, will be its 27th consecutive year.

Business Office Announcements (cont'd)
Update on Operational Excellence

- 6 -

WOCI also co-sponsors the Gender and Equity Resource Center. The Project's main event is the Women's Empowering Symposium that happens in the fall, as one of the co-sponsors. Ms. McNair said that if people had any questions they could talk to her.

Mr. Mikulin asked if she could send Delegates a PDF of the announcement to the Delegate list to put up in departments. Ms. Hsueh said she could do that.

Ms. Navab said these are all paid, stipended jobs; and the stipends were actually pretty good.

Update on Operational Excellence

Badr Albanna introduced himself and said he was the liaison to Operational Excellence on behalf of the GA and the ASUC. They've been doing a lot of work that semester trying to get a handle on what was going on with OE and trying to figure out the best way to create a student response to make sure their voices were heard, but also to actually listen to that voice in considering all of the programs going forward.

Mr. Albanna said that OE was currently leaving the design phase. A series of proposals were put forward and they're entering the implementation phase. Over the course of the summer over 40 proposals were being vetted by the OE Coordinating Committee and passed on to the Chancellor and other members of the Executive Committee. These proposals are extremely far-researching in their effects and how students receive a lot of services. They affect staffing, and one of the more controversial things about OE has been organization simplification, which was responsible for about 200 staff cuts, among other administrative consolidations. All this was coming to a head this summer.

Mr. Albanna said he chairs the Student Operational Excellence Committee, has sort of reached a point where they're sort of pretty ambivalent about their relationship to OE in that there's been a push to try and get more representative students involved and on board, who are accountable. But that has moved along very slowly. It was pretty clear that as OE enters the implementation phase, as a program itself, it didn't seem to have structures built in to keep itself accountable, let alone to ensure student voices were not only heard, and were not sort of essentially cheap labor to work on OE, but were also implemented as representatives of the campus, and as sort of the main stakeholders of the academic mission of the University.

Mr. Albanna said they put together a series of proposals about which he'd like to get some feedback. If they couldn't do that at that time, perhaps they could arrange another e-mail, or he could give his e-mail. The student Operational Excellence Committee will meet over the summer. They want to push the cause of the student voice being inside OE committees, so they know what's going on and have a say, but to also create alternative structures they'd like to see in actually implementing these things, or briefly work through the current proposals. Right now, mostly for undergrads, they're working on creating a DE-Cal that would allow students to be representatives on these committees and also meet regularly with SOEC

and with institutions such as the GA to give updates on what was actually going on in these committees. They're also working on finding compensation for graduate students for this.

Mr. Albanna said another proposal was a larger stakeholders committee. There's been a lot of concern about OE from many different sectors of campus; and people with these concerns were all sort of

Business Office Announcements (cont'd)
Update on Operational Excellence
GA Budget Memo to the Chancellor

- 7 -

operating in their own vacuum, with limited information. So the proposal was to create a forum with student government and other bodies to have a chance to talk with each other, exchange information, and hear about broader concerns across campus. They'd also like to specifically put a research group together around organization simplification, since that's one of the most controversial aspects of OE and one that happened very early on, almost before any student involvement. So they actually have little knowledge about what happened, and they want to know more.

The fourth proposal was to work with other campus organizations to have more public fora to address administrative offices that are responsible for OE, as well as to create room for students and other stakeholders on campus to get a chance to hear from each other, hear what's going on, their concerns, etc.

Mr. Albanna said the last idea was to try to have the Student OE Committee serve as a place where the ASUC and GA could create some unified messaging around their response to OE. There currently hasn't been much communication outside of SOEC itself. So they want to play a more active role in contributing to messaging and to making suggestions to the GA and the ASUC as to what the Committee saw happening with OE.

Mr. Albanna said that was a brief rundown. He had a longer letter that explains this in more detail.

Ms. Ng said she wrote Mr. Albanna's e-mail on the Board.

Ms. Murrell asked if there's a place they can go to read about this. Mr. Albanna said that OE has a Web site. For reading all these things and keeping up, he'll probably write brief executive summaries and highlight aspects and hit concerns of the GA and the ASUC, and direct people's attention to things that might be more relevant. He'd be happy to send those out to the Delegate's list and to ASUC Senators as a guide for what people need to pay more attention to. That was a reason to have these fora, so people can get educated.

Ms. Murrell asked about the student hunger strike regarding Ethnic Studies and Operational Excellence. Mr. Albanna said he sits on the Coordinating Committee, and even at that level, the way OE has been operating, the details about some of the plans that have been executed in practice weren't apparent, even with all the information and even sitting in on all the meetings. Part of that was the nature of how everything was constructed. One reason they wanted to have an OE research committee was not just to get information from OE or from administrative offices, but also do polling. One suggestion that Naomi made was to poll the GA about what was happening on the ground in people's departments, because Mr. Albanna said he didn't think anyone had a coherent answer to that question. He's been talking to a lot of Ethnic Studies students who have concerns about this. He thought students should form their own coherent understanding of how things were actually playing out in practice versus proposals they get off the Web site.

GA Budget Memo to the Chancellor

Ms. Navab said the GA is working on its budget memo to the Chancellor on how they'd like Student Services Fee money to be spent and what priorities graduate students have, as the Chancellor makes his

GA Budget Memo to the Chancellor (cont'd) Student Services Fee Surplus

- 8 -

budget for next year. They made a summary version for the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services, which will meet on Friday. They'd report on that memo so people have a chance to give feedback as the final version of the memo gets written.

Ms. Navab said these things came from the satisfaction survey that Delegates filled out, as well as by Delegate feedback forms. They emphasized health care issues because that was something everyone kept bringing up, cuts to the Tang Center, long waits to see specialists, and not enough mental health providers. Also, childcare services continue to be cut year by year. And she believed some childcare facilities have been cut. They emphasize restoring funding there because one-in-ten graduates are student parents. They also emphasized concern with funding decentralization, which GSIs brought up. For the Professional Degree Fee, which is now called Professional Degree Supplementary Tuition, they want to see how these fees were being spent and to have them go back to the people who pay them.

For Temporary Academic Salaries, which was where GSI salaries come from, there's been some concern with benefits decentralization, things like that. Ms. Navab said they're going to see a move towards having lecturers rather than GSIs. So they want to emphasize funding for GSI salaries and benefits.

Ms. Navab said they also want to make sure funding stays intact for Grad Student Advisory Officers (GSAOs). These staff in departments tend to do a lot of work for grads.

Ms. Navab said those are things they emphasized in the memo, items that came from Delegate feedback forms and the satisfaction survey. If there are things were missed, she would ask Delegates to please send an e-mail to any Executive Officer or to her.

Student Services Fee Surplus

Ms. Love said the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services and Fees meets on Friday. For the first time they're going to have a surplus in Student Services Fee money. CACSSF will make recommendations to the Chancellor about how that should be spent. GA members of the Committee went through the survey and through Delegate feedback forms and talked to a bunch of people, and ranked the proposals they received. It was a strange process by which they had to receive proposals rather than proactively saying what they'd like to save money on.

Ms. Love said they're recommending funding a portion of the surplus for Counseling and Psychological Services in UHS; a portion to childcare subsidies; opening the libraries for 24-hours during RRR and finals week; and a research advisory service for undergraduate students. Some people thought the advisory service might be a stretch as to how that would help grads, but as a GSI, and something she was sure

many of them could attest to, she wished she didn't have to teach her undergrads how to write research papers. This service would also be open to graduate students.

Ms. Love said those were the four things they'll recommend funding for at Friday's CACSSF meeting.

Ms. Navab said she and John sit on this Advisory Committee, and there's one more graduate seat. If anybody was interested in sitting on the Chancellor's Advisory Committees on Student Services Fee they should talk to her or Ms. Love.

Student Services Fee Surplus (cont'd)

- 9 -

Debate Reminders

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

Ms. Murrell asked how much the surplus was. Ms. Love said it was roughly \$780,000.

Debate Reminders

Ms. Ng said she just wanted to make give some reminders about debate. She would ask people to please refrain from cross debate. Delegates who have spoken twice automatically get moved to the end of the speaker list if they're speaking on the same motion again. A point of information was an opportunity to ask a question, not to provide more input. For that, people should go on the speaker list. At any time people can call for a point of order, asking the Chair a question on the proceedings, or call for the orders of the day if someone finds that the discussion was off topic.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Ms. Ng called for any amendments to the agenda.

Ms. Pannu moved to move item 6.a., Resolution 1102f, to the end the agenda, regarding the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. She understood there may be a recess where they'll receive information to inform their votes. The motion to amend the agenda was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Pymer moved to fast track 1105c, Suggested Revision of GA By-laws. Ms. Ng said the motion would be to consider the bill that evening instead of referring it to committee. A three-fourths vote was required for approval.

Ms. Navab asked to amend the motion, to fast track all of the Resolutions under Resolution Referral. Ms. Pymer said she would accept that amendment. Mr. Froehle objected and said 1105c wasn't available and he felt uncomfortable voting on something he didn't have a copy of.

Ms. Navab said the one Resolution people had that didn't have a number was 1105b, and the wrong version was printed, although there was only a slight difference. The corrected version will be projected on the screen.

The motion to fast track all Resolutions under Resolution Referral passed by voice-vote, Resolutions 1105a (SOB Charter Revisions), 1105b (Summer Funding Workgroup), 1105c (Revisions to GA By-

laws), and 1105d (Job Posting for Project Coordinators). Ms. Ng said they'd be moved to the end of the agenda.

Ms. Ng called for any amendments to the minutes of the April meeting, and seeing none, said the minutes were approved. THE MINUTES TO THE APRIL 7 2011 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar -- 1103a, By-law Amendment to Facilitate Communication

- 10 -

Ms. Ng said they have grouped under the Consent Calendar a number of Resolutions that seemed to be uncontroversial. If anybody would like to have a Resolution discussed, they can move to pull to from the Consent Calendar and discussed under agenda item VI, with the other Resolutions. If people think any amendments were necessary to a bill, they should pull it from the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Froehle moved to pull 1104c from the Consent Calendar. There's an amendment he'd like to discuss. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Mikulin asked if anybody had a copy of 1104e.

Seeing no other motions to pull any bills, Ms. Ng the bills under the Consent Calendar were approved as a batch. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION:

The following bills were approved under the Consent Calendar:

1103a, By-law Amendment to Facilitate Communication

1104d, Action to Create a Communications Workgroup

1104e, Directed Action to Allow Funding of the Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator

The following Resolution, 1103a, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Bahar Navab and Dillon Niederhut:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION

WHEREAS, the efficacy of the Delegate Assembly is determined in part by the ability of its members to contact each other as needed; and

WHEREAS, each Delegate has a responsibility to be available to other Delegates and members of her or his program; and

WHEREAS, contact information for many delegates is not available through the Graduate Assembly Web site or UC Berkeley's online directory;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following changes be made to the existing By-laws:

2.2.4.5 *Availability Requirement. Every Delegate and Alternate must provide a valid e-mail address, to be used for official Graduate Assembly business, which shall be published to the Graduate Assembly Web site along with the Delegate or Alternate's name and department affiliation. The Delegate and Alternate shall be responsible for updating this e-mail address as necessary.*

2.2.4.56. Failure to Fulfill Responsibilities. Failure of a Delegate-Alternate pair to attend two (2) Assembly meetings during a given semester or failure of a Delegate-Alternate pair to fulfill the "Representation Requirement" subsection for the period spanned by two (2) Delegate Assembly meetings will constitute cause for

Consent Calendar -- 1103a, By-law Amendment to Facilitate Communication (cont'd) - 11 -
-- 1104d, Action to Create a Communications Workgroup
-- 1104e, Directed Action to Allow Funding of the Operational Excellence
Communications Coordinator

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION (cont'd)

dismissal as a Delegate. Failure of a Delegate or Alternate to provide and/or maintain a valid e-mail address for Graduate Assembly business will also constitute cause for dismissal. The President may dismiss the Delegate. If a Delegate is dismissed, the President shall duly notify the Delegate Assembly and the Delegate's Academic Unit of the dismissal. This does not preclude the Delegate from recertification in the following semester.

The following Resolution, 1104d, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Evan Davidson, Brad Froehle, Liberty Hamilton, Ben Kehoe, Jansen Sheng, and Richard Winslow:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO CREATE A COMMUNICATIONS WORKGROUP

WHEREAS, at the March 2011 meeting, the Delegate Assembly approved the implementation of new By-laws, scheduled to begin on July 1, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the new By-laws do not include an on-going Communications Committee, as is currently in place; and

WHEREAS, the Communications Committee has, over the past year, generated a list of goals to pursue in the coming years that will not be in the purview of any other designated Committee or Workgroup currently in place;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly institute a Communications Workgroup of at least five members as of July 1, 2011, and with a sunset date of no earlier than June 30, 2012, with the express purposes of: designing and rebuilding the Graduate Assembly Funding Web site to improve clarity and ease of use; redesigning printed materials and pamphlets relating to Graduate Assembly activities and projects; continued research on departmental e-mail access, specifically to design a pilot program to provide Graduate Assembly access to departmental e-mail lists in currently restricted departments; and to generate a vision docu-

ment outlining additional short, medium, and long-term goals to be approved by either the Executive Board or the Delegate Assembly.

The following Resolution, 1104e, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Miguel Daal and Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ALLOW FUNDING OF THE OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR THROUGH JUNE 30, 2011

WHEREAS, at the February 2011 meeting, the Delegates approved, as part of Resolution 1102c, to allocate \$1,600 from contingency towards an Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator (OECC) student position; and

Consent Calendar -- 1104e, Directed Action to Allow Funding of the Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator (cont'd) - 12 -

Election of Graduate Council Representatives
Approval of the GA 2011-2012 Budget

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ALLOW FUNDING OF THE OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR THROUGH JUNE 30, 2011 (cont'd)

WHEREAS, at the March 2011 meeting, the Delegates ratified the appointment of Badr Albanna to the OECC position; and

WHEREAS, at the March 2011 meeting, the Delegates approved Resolution 1103b, to allocate \$1,200 from contingency to the President's stipend staff budget, to hire a graduate student to draft a third Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Lower Sproul Student Center Project; and

WHEREAS, funding for a third MOU is no longer needed; and

WHEREAS, the \$1,200 could be instead used to fund the OECC position to the end of the current budget year (June 30, 2011);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Delegate Assembly directs the GA President to use the funding allocated by Resolution 1103b, as needed, to fund the OECC position to the end of June 2011.

ELECTION OF GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. Ng asked if there were any Grad Council candidates who wished to send in a statement who didn't have it printed. Ms. Navab said that at its last meeting, the GA decided to only take written statements for these positions. There was some confusion and not everyone got a chance to turn a statement in. So the proposal was to accept written statements that evening and open up the nomination process. They could consider this item later on in the agenda to allow people to submit text. Mr. Zachritz asked if there were any new candidates interested in a Grad Council position. Seeing none, he said it might be a non-issue.

Ms. Navab moved to consider Grad Council elections after Reports. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

REPORTS

Approval of GA 2011-12 Budget

Ms. Epstein said that per the Budget Committee's suggestion, they tried to cut down a fair amount from next year's budget. About \$420,000 comes through in student fees and the Committee tried to keep the entire budget at about that amount. She'll send out a presentation later. The Budget Committee cut the

Approval of the GA 2011-2012 Budget (cont'd)

- 13 -

budget for Executive Offices and put in a line item retreats. If people have any questions, they should feel free to ask. Ms. Navab suggested highlighting the differences between this year's budget and next year's.

Ms. Murrell asked where the savings came from. Ms. Epstein said they cut from a number of different columns. They also over-budgeted a number of IT line items, and there was an amount in the Business Office budget that wasn't used. Ms. Navab said a lot of the contingency budget was cut down for Projects, since it hadn't been used; and Executive Officers' contingency budgets were cut as well. Ms. Epstein said discretionary funding was cut. They did not cut student group funding, which was at \$110,000, the same as it was last year.

Ms. Navab said the GA also had to give less money to the ASUC for elections. They owed the ASUC money for that and paid that off, and that removed an expense. Ms. Epstein said the amount for last year and the year before was \$17,000, and this year it will be \$4,000. Ms. Navab said she also reduced one of the presidential staffmembers.

Ms. Epstein said that Ms. Navab and Ms. Love also got the Grad Division to help the GA fund new student orientations, which was another \$4,000.

Ms. Navab said the other thing to look at, was at the end of the budget, where there's a \$10,000 difference between Total Revenues and Total Costs. The GA usually has about a \$12,000 carryover that would cover the \$10K.

Ms. Epstein noted that last year they got \$10,000 from the Chancellor, which they couldn't count on this year.

Mr. Ellsworth said it would be useful to explain where carryover comes from. Ms. Epstein said that most of it comes from student groups that don't spend all of their budgets. Ms. Navab said the carryforward is from two years out, since it takes a year to make sure that students have filed all receipts. Whatever wasn't spent two years later was put into carryforward. Ms. Epstein said that carryforward has been pretty consistent, about \$12,000 for the past couple of years.

Ms. Navab said she would like to propose an amendment to the budget on behalf of somebody who wasn't there. For this budget they moved Delegate meeting meals into the Business Office line item. The amendment was to change the title of that line item so it was clear that it was Delegate Assembly money. Under the Business Office, "Meeting Meals" should be amended to read, "Delegate Assembly Meetings and Meals and Committee Meeting Meals."

Ms. Epstein said they are currently budgeting for Pauley Ballroom fees, when groups need to use Pauley. Ms. Navab said that Pauley Ballroom costs a lot more than they budgeted, but students get partial waivers from the ASUC Auxiliary, and the GA supplements the rest of those costs.

Mr. Trager asked what happened when the full cost of things wasn't used, such as with printing. Ms. Epstein said they cut a lot of line items for copying fairly substantially if not completely. Much of that was not used, and it gets rolled over for next year or is re-allocated.

Mr. Mikulin said printing and copying in the Business Office has increased by \$1,800, even though actual expenses were about half what was budgeted the previous fiscal year. Ms. Epstein said that's the lease

Approval of the GA 2011-2012 Budget (cont'd)

- 14 -

for the color copy machine. Mr. Froehle said they can now make color copies in-house. Ms. Epstein said they encourage groups to use that copier.

Mr. Mikulin said that from his calculations, overall reduction in anticipated expenses, from last year, to this year was, he believed, \$8-9,000. Ms. Epstein said that hopefully that won't impact anyone too substantially. Mr. Mikulin said that if cutting expenses was in the interest of long-term viability, that's how businesses operate. Ms. Epstein said they hoped to make this a sustainable budget and had a fairly long-term model to do that.

Mr. Yost said that Resolutions that are passed don't actually show up in the budget. Ms. Epstein said that any extra staff do show up in the budget. Mr. Yost noted that the President didn't have staff stipends. Ms. Epstein said stipends were all rolled up together. That's the way the accounting comes to her.

Ms. Navab said the actual expenditures shown are only those that hit the books by March 1, and there's been spending since then.

Mr. Froehle said he would like to talk about the amount of money going to Executive Offices versus to the Projects. The Exec Office budget as a whole has increased rather dramatically compared to last year. Some of that was due to the Charter revision and the AAVP position. But he would ask why they continue to fund some of the Project line items and would question the amounts going to Programs and Events. For some of the Projects, the cost of hiring the Coordinator was 50-60% or so of the total budget. It didn't seem effective to hire Project Coordinators and then not give them a budget. He would like to see Executive Office stipends come down a little and perhaps some of that given to the Projects.

Ms. Epstein said she thought it was pretty equitable, and they didn't cut Project programs. Ms. Navab said they went through the Projects and made sure none of the operating expenses or stipends were maintained. The only major cut was to The Berkeley Graduate, since it's no longer a print version and is a blog. The budget was done with the okay of the Projects and the Project Coordinator Liaison.

Ms. Pannu asked why staff stipends varied so significantly, such as EAVP at \$7,000 and the President at \$5,000, and nothing for the AAVP. She asked why they weren't equal. Ms. Epstein said a lot of this was

by request. Mr. Garcia requested that his staff stipend not be cut the way it was last year. Ms. Navab said the President and the CAVP will share staff. Ms. Pannu said she didn't see how offices would share staff.

Ms. Love said it was unclear to her why the two staff wouldn't be equal, the CAVP and the AAVP, and hadn't realized that was the case. They're sort of complementary positions, one doing internal advocacy and the other doing external. She thought they should get the same amount of money.

Mr. Mikulin said he would like to make a motion based on the understanding that the AAVP and the CAVP were splitting staff resources. He moved to have equal stipends and to charge expenses accordingly.

Ms. Navab said that Mr. Marchand's thinking was that the AAVP wouldn't need as much staff time because of the work the position does compared to the CAVP and the President. He didn't feel the AAVP needed 50% time staff.

Mr. Mikulin's motion was seconded by Mr. Ellsworth.

Approval of the GA 2011-2012 Budget (cont'd)

- 15 -

Mr. Mikulin said the motion was to allocate 50% of the total CAVP budget for staff stipend to the AAVP office, \$3,000.

Mr. Ellsworth said that while Mr. Marchand doesn't think he'll need much staff time, Mr. Ellsworth said he would feel more comfortable if they quantified that.

Mr. Yost said that if the Exec team finds they have to change things over time, a bill could be passed by the GA to change the budget. If the AAVP finds a staffmember was needed, the GA could move forward at that point. But he didn't think they should amend stipends if the Exec team thought it could run things effectively with the budget as presented.

Mr. Kehoe said that if VPs felt that's how percentage time of staffing should be allocated, he saw no good reason at that point to change this.

Ms. Pannu said she was uncomfortable cutting offices with the least amount of staff, especially if they share staff.

Mr. Mikulin moved to amend the budget amendment, to reflect the comments of Dan Yost and allow flexibility for the AAVP and other VPs re-amend the budget as appropriate, based on actual operations needs of the GA. Ms. Ng said that wasn't an amendment because a Resolution to amend the budget could be introduced at any time. Mr. Mikulin said he couldn't withdraw his amendment, but he'd urge a no vote.

The motion to approve Mr. Mikulin's amendment failed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Froehle said he would like to propose an amendment and shift around some stipend lines. The Budget Officer stipend line was \$7,000, and he would like to see that reduced to \$4,000. The Rules Officer stipend would be increased to \$3,000; and the remainder of the balance, about \$2,000, would be transferred to student group funding. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Murrell asked why he wanted this change. Mr. Froehle said they're already paying the Funding Officer \$2,000 a year and this sort of equalizes payment. The Treasurer is a new position. He wasn't sure if the Rules Officer was really 70% of the President's position. So he thought \$4,000 was a nice compromise. Since student group funding has been decreased, he would like to see the additional money go there.

Ms. Navab said the reason it looks like student group funding was decreased was because they got an extra amount of money from the Administration. That didn't come out of the GA budget. Mr. Froehle said the amount allocated still went down. Ms. Navab said the GA contribution was not less than it was in previous years. Mr. Froehle said it was \$3,000 less. Ms. Navab said it wasn't substantially less. She was in favor of cutting some of the Treasurer's budget, but thought that the amount Mr. Froehle wanted to cut was a little aggressive. The Treasurer will have to go to all of the Board meetings and will be heavily involved with BGSF and the Store Operations Board. So she thought the position would be quite a time commitment, definitely much more than Rules. So she thought it wasn't enough to be double the Rules budget, but she thought it needed to be a little bit higher than \$4,000.

Ms. Love said she would like to say even more strongly that the Treasurer position was much more than the current Budget Officer. This person will oversee all GA spending so they don't have issues they had

Approval of the GA 2011-2012 Budget (cont'd)

- 16 -

earlier that year, with the Executive Board spending money that wasn't approved. The position would also oversee all of the spending of the Project Coordinators to make sure they stay on budget as well. The position was a much more substantial job than has happened in the past.

Mr. Yost said he served as a Treasurer before, and the position could be a very important role on the Executive Board; and the position should be on the Exec Board to help it make decisions. The position would process things and provide vision for the budget. The person in the position would have more time to do that. The GA has had a remarkable job with the small amount of funding given to people who fill this role, and along with the AAVP, this position makes sure the democracy of the room actually was coherent with the vision they want, and actually was legal, and to make sure make sure the GA operated appropriately. He wanted to sow the seeds of success.

Mr. Trager said the Environmental Sustainable line items were actually in the wrong place. They should be under Officers, if he wasn't mistaken. Ms. Ng said that was off topic, but they could return to it.

Mr. Froehle said he understood what people were saying about the positions, but for a budget manager, they have the ASUC Auxiliary. If they have hired accountants to do the work, the question was why the Treasurer had to do so much.

Mr. Kehoe asked if that changes with the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation and how involved the Auxiliary would be. Mr. Daal said the Auxiliary would not be involved in the BGSF.

Mr. Froehle moved to amend the budget to reduce the Treasurer position to be \$5,000. It wasn't a motion, but maybe make the Treasurer at \$5,000, leave the Rules Officer alone, and give the \$2,000 balance to student group funding, up to \$1,200. He asked if that was more agreeable to people. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mikulin.

Ms. Murrell said this was a new position. The amount was \$2,000. It wasn't that much money. She would ask if they could have the person do the job and the GA would see how much time it took. The

amount, \$2,000, was nickel and diming things. Mr. Froehle said stipends never go down and always go up.

Ms. Pannu said she would apologize to the Business Office for saying this, but she didn't think the ASUC Auxiliary has done a very good job of keeping track of the GA's books. For example, \$500,000 of the GA's money was lost last year. It was important have someone watching over their funds full-time and it was also really important for the GA's long-term organization to make sure someone wasn't just being reactive but thinking about different aspects of the budget.

Mr. Yost said he served as the Treasurer and worked with the ASUC Auxiliary, which was awesome, but understaffed.

Ms. Cohen said it was also worth getting Ms. Epstein's perspective on how much time she anticipated this taking and what her stipend was. Ms. Epstein said people should make whatever decision they thought was right. Ms. Cohen said it looked like they have a lot of money in the budget, but if they calculate hourly rates for most of the stipended positions, they'd be way under minimum wage. She felt fine about keeping stipends as they were.

Approval of the GA 2011-2012 Budget (cont'd)
Funding Committee Report and Funding Guide

- 17 -

Ms. Navab moved to call the question and end debate. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Froehle said they were voting on the amendment to decrease the Treasurer position stipend from \$7,000 to \$5,000 and increasing student group allocations by \$2,000. The motion to approve the amendment failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Navab moved to call the question on the original amendment by Mr. Froehle. Mr. Froehle said the amendment was to reduce the Treasurer's stipend to \$4,000 and increase the Rules Officer's stipend to \$2,000, with the balance of the difference put into the student group funding line item.

The motion to approve the amendment failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Ng said they were at time on this item. A motion to extend discussion by five minutes failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Ng said they were at time on this item. A motion to extend discussion by five minutes was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote. A division was requested. The motion passed by hand-vote.

A Delegate asked what would happen if they didn't approve the budget and asked about the process for amending it in the future. Ms. Ng said that if the budget wasn't approved that afternoon, approval would be delegated to the Executive Board over the summer in order to make anything happen.

Mr. Mikulin moved to amend the budget to have the staff stipends for the CAVP and the EAVP offices at \$6,500 each. The motion was seconded by Ms. Navab. Mr. Mikulin said the motion would have the stipends at the same amount, rather than one getting \$6,000 and the other \$7,000.

Ms. Love said the positions were equal in their roles in the GA. She previously had no idea they were allocated differently and she wouldn't want Ms. De La Torre to be on an unequal basis with her External Affairs counterpart.

Mr. Kehoe moved to call the question. The motion to end debate and move to a vote passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE GA 2011-12 BUDGET PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Pymer moved to call the question on the budget. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE GA 2011-12 BUDGET, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. (Applause)

Funding Committee Report and Funding Guide

Ms. Navab said that both Ms. Williams and Mr. Sheen couldn't be at the meeting that evening. There were two quick things to point out. The Funding Committee made some allocations since, according to

Funding Committee Report and Funding Guide (cont'd)

- 18 -

their procedures, the Funding Committee can approve what's left of student group funding the last three weeks of the semester.

If they look at the Contingency allocations, or student group allocations, it shows six applicants that were awarded about \$1,391. The other things they allocated money to was to approve \$450 for the GA to buy a sound system, including speakers, microphones, and other things. The purchase was because they keep getting requests from student groups to rent this equipment. So instead of paying student groups to rent sound equipment, they decided to buy it in-house and have student groups able to check the equipment out from the GA. The equipment has already been purchased and has been used by one student group, which was really thankful for this being accessible to them. They got what they needed, and more, because the GA now has more equipment than the campus can offer. So the group was really excited about that.

Ms. Navab said that for the rest of the money that was left in Contingency, they moved to spend \$550 to see if they could put in a bar code system so they could bar code all of the equipment the GA rents out. They'd get a scanner to read bar codes and read student IDs and standardize how equipment is checked out, rather than having a lot of paper forms floating around. Instead, it would be all electronic.

Ms. Navab said there was about \$2,000 left in the Contingency Fund that the Funding Committee suggested adding to the IT budget in order to increase the budget for whoever makes the GA's online funding application system next year.

Ms. Navab said those were the allocations that the Funding Committee put forward.

As for other changes, Ms. Navab said that if they look at the yellowish-greenish colored form, the Business Office suggested changing some of the dates of the funding rounds, not the deadlines, but the notification deadlines. The original notification deadlines were the same day as the rules happen. Instead, the

amendment would move the notification deadline forward one day so that the Business Office had time to notify student groups. The amendment would also change the due dates for receipts and would move them back about a week or two, to match what the Business Office needed for its internal accounting. Those were the big changes. If they approve the changes, those will go into the Funding Guide, which would match the funding rounds on the yellow sheet.

A Delegate asked if this would change the notification date. It originally was September 8, which was the date of the first GA meeting, and the change would make it September 9.

A Delegate said receipts would be due June 15, but currently they're due May 9. Ms. Navab said that they're currently May 9, but what was approved for the next funding round was actually June 30. It would be moved to June 15 because they need to have everything in the books before the end of month. The change would move it from June 30 to June 15.

Mr. Yost asked if the dates will be available online. Ms. Navab said they will be, and as soon as the GA approves them, the changes will be made.

A Delegate asked why groups couldn't have been budgets during the summer. Ms. Navab said the GA passed a bill last month for summer funding, a summer Contingency Fund; and there was a bill in the packet that evening about how those funds should be allocated.

Funding Committee Report and Funding Guide (cont'd)

- 19 -

Mr. Kehoe moved to amend both the summary and the guide. One thing they ran into several times that year was groups submitting funding requests in excess of the allowed amount, and as a result, getting their funding cut to zero. The only place in the Funding Guide that he could find that mentioned that was on page 5, the third paragraph, which states, "Applications requesting in excess of the maximum funding limit of the appropriate categories may be summarily rejected." His motion would be to amend that.

Mr. Yost asked why the GA should penalize groups that honestly ask for too much money, requesting something over budget, and instead of giving them a full budget, just reducing the amount that's given out to whatever their budget limit is. He asked why a request should be summarily rejected.

Ms. Navab said they don't automatically reject groups, and the language says they "may" be rejected. One thing the GA implemented that semester was to contact student groups who ask for things in excess and ask them to revise their budget requests to the amount the GA could give. Most groups have been accommodating and have made changes.

Ms. Pannu said she liked the amendment. It was a point of contention in the Funding Committee about whether or not to do this. They didn't have quorum when they created the Guide, but given the high number of applications that are thrown out with the new system, it would make sense to make this change.

Mr. Kehoe said that it made sense to allow for rejection of applications that are in excess so people don't request as much money as they could get. They have to accurately estimate how much they're actually going to use. But this may also become a moot point with an online funding application, which could actually check applications and let people know if their request was in excess of what was allowable, so they could change that.

Ms. Yost said that this was for funding applications and not receipts. He now understood.

Mr. Ellsworth said the Funding Committee allocates for particular expenditures. If they want to cut things to just be within the amount that was actually in keeping with what a student group can request, they'd have to cut some random thing out of a group's request. The GA would have to cut a specific item because the group would be reimbursed for a specific item. The GA couldn't really do that. They can ask student groups to revise their requests so that the GA could actually budget appropriately.

Mr. Yost asked if a group would have an opportunity to revise its application if it turned in an application on a deadline date that asked for too much, and it was rejected for that reason. Ms. Pannu said she could talk to him about that on the side. The long answer is that this was a huge debate last semester. Members of the Funding Committee could brief him on the side. This is the currently adopted policy of the GA. Changes to the funding procedures would have to happen with full notification. Ms. Navab said the online funding application wouldn't let groups submit requests that were over the limit. Mr. Yost said this wasn't procedure, then, but was just telling people how it works.

Ms. Navab moved to call the question. The motion to end debate and come to a vote passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Kehoe said there were three places regarding text. The text was on page 5, paragraph 3 of the Funding Guide, "Applications requests in excess of the maximum funding limit of the appropriate categories

Funding Committee Report and Funding Guide (cont'd)

- 20 -

may be summarily rejected." That text should be bolded and on page 12, at the third paragraph, that same text, in bold, should be inserted. Similarly, that text, not in bold should be inserted on the second page of the "2011/2012 Graduate Assembly Funding Summary," in item 2 of the section, "How to Apply for Funding Awards."

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FUNDING GUIDE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A Delegate said he had a question about deadline dates, and said the Round 1 deadline date was August 25, which was the first day of classes. There's a chance people might just be getting back. He asked if there was a way to move those deadlines to later. Ms. Hsueh said the reason they picked August 25 was because the Business Office needed to process things and take about a week, and ready to process at the first Delegates meeting in September. It needed to be approved by the Delegates. That's how they came up with these dates. If the dates were moved back, they might not be able to start in September.

Ms. Navab said the Funding Committee took that into consideration. New groups coming in could apply for contingency funding, and that didn't need to go into the regular funding process. Ms. Hsueh said that Contingency funds were ongoing.

The Delegate said he was just concerned about student groups just getting back. Mr. Froehle said that the semester actually officially starts the week before, although classes start on the 25th.

Ms. Navab said the system wasn't ideal and they'd need to make more changes to it next year anyway.

Ms. Hsueh said that while August 25 was the Round 1 deadline, they receive applications way before that. People submit applications in the summer. The GA will have things online, and hopefully have online applications available.

The Delegate said he understood, but people will be away all summer and might just get back that day, or soon before. Ms. Navab said that hopefully they'll have the online version by then.

Mr. Mikulin said he was in favor of deadlines as they were currently set. Based on previous funding years, even though they have two less rounds in this new structure from the number they had in previous years, he believed they were at least a week prior to the 25th. Ms. Hsueh said it was August 2.

Mr. Mikulin said they needed to have people settle in. He was checking to see if the contingency allocation would be on par with the second round, so people who typically apply in Round 2 would still have sufficient event funds to access through contingency should they choose to apply.

A Delegate said that most of the other funds on campus that groups can apply to for events during the school year have to apply in the previous spring. So it seems that the GA rules would give a lot of extra time, rather than cutting groups short. To start events at a reasonable time in the semester, it made sense to let applications happen as scheduled.

Ms. Navab moved to approve Contingency Funding Rounds and the other expenditures that were read into the minutes. Ms. Ng asked to have the motion clarified. Ms. Navab said the motion would approve the verbal funding report, including \$2,000 for online funding development; \$450 for the purchase of sound equipment for groups; and \$550 for the bar code scanner.

Funding Committee Report and Funding Guide (cont'd)
Within Officer and Staff Reports
Budget Memo
Hiring of Project Coordinators

- 21 -

Mr. Kehoe asked if GA approval was necessary. Ms. Navab said that technically this didn't need to be approved by the Assembly in the last two weeks.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Ellsworth.

The question was called and debate closed. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING REPORT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, CONTINGENCY FUNDING, MARCH ROUND, AMOUNT REQUESTED, \$2,111.14, AMOUNT AWARDED, \$1,391.14.

A Delegate asked if there was somewhere on the Web site where student groups can learn what they can check out from the GA. Ms. Hsueh said she will ask Ms. Cast to post that on the Web site.

Written Officer and Staff Reports

Ms. Ng called for any questions on the reports, or elaborations from the Officers. Seeing none, Ms. Ng said they would move on.

Budget Memo

Ms. Navab said she gave this update earlier. Unless people wanted to comment on it, she would suggest they move on in the agenda. Ms. Ng said that seeing no comments, they'd move on.

Hiring of Project Coordinators

Ms. De La Torre said she an announcement for Delegates to send out to departments. It was in the newsletter that went out. They're hiring new positions, and she would ask for the GA's permission to hire during the summer. They're hiring The Berkeley Graduate editor/blogger; the Women of Color Initiative Project Coordinator; and the new Graduate Student Organization Coordinator. If Delegates had any people in mind for these positions, she would ask them to please let them know. People who were interested could send an e-mail to the GA.

Ms. Ng asked if she needed a go-ahead for any other job openings. Ms. De La Torre said there was a Resolution that was fast tracked.

ELECTION OF GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES (cont'd)

Election of Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)

- 22 -

Ms. Ng asked if there were any additional statements that have been sent. Ms. Cast said there was one.

Ms. Navab asked how many seats were open. Ms. Ng said that all four seats are open. Votes will be taken and tallied for all of the candidates and the person with the fourth highest number of votes would become the Alternate.

Ms. Ng asked if Mr. Daal could describe the Grad Council. Mr. Daal said he was on the Grad Council for a year. It meets once a month, 2 p.m. on the first Monday of every month. So people had to be available at that time. The Grad Council is a subcommittee of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. It considers policy matters related to graduate student programs. Ms. Ng said that some recent activities have included reviewing the affects of OE on graduate academics and research, enabling the submission of electronic dissertations, reviewing normative time for various programs, and presenting grad perspectives on the implementation of the Dean's Normative Time Fellowships.

Mr. Daal said that one thing that's always pointed out is that many times, Grad Council members are asked not to distribute information that comes up during the meetings.

A Delegate asked how many candidates they could vote for. Ms. Ng said that three have submitted statements that people should have in print, and there was one more.

Ms. Navab asked if they could change the Chair of the meeting since Ms. Ng was a candidate. Ms. Ng said she would do that at that time.

With Mr. Daal chairing the meeting, he said that he was told that the GA wouldn't hear candidates' speeches. He asked if people would ask the candidates questions. Ms. Navab said the GA decided not to do that. Mr. Daal said they would move to a discussion and a vote. He asked the candidates to leave the room.

Candidates for Grad Council representative were Chris Klein, Astronomy; Tiffany Ng, Music; Liz Boatman, MSE (Engineering); and Sam Saxena, Mechanical Engineering.

Ms. Cohen moved to leave one seat open for a professional student, and to elect two out of the three positions. The motion was to elect two reps plus an Alternate and leave one seat open for a professional student.

A Delegate said that it seemed like for several meetings they've been trying to get someone to run for the Grad Council. Delaying this again would mean they'd continue to have meetings with fewer students representing them than there otherwise would be.

Ms. Love said the motion was to elect two reps and an Alternate, so they'd have the full three people to represent the GA.

A Delegate said that since they've been putting this off and trying to get somebody to run, he asked if people thought it was likely that they'll keep not having another person.

Ms. Love said she thought that if they do outreach to professional degree students, which they haven't done, and which the GA has dropped the ball on in a serious way, they would have candidates. And Mr. Marchand will be doing that.

Election of Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)

- 23 -

Mr. Yost said he was a professional-degree student in GMSP and also knew that in Engineering there were a number of students in one-year, or year-and-a-half degree programs. He thought it would be a great opportunity to reach out to new and incoming students who are here for a short time and who are really affected by changes, and who otherwise would have little or no say on things, with no chance to serve on anything.

A Delegate said it made her uncomfortable to screw with this election because of a concern that could have been brought up at the last meeting. If people wanted to have proportional representation, she thought that should be in the By-laws. Perhaps the whole structure of the GA should have proportional representation. This seemed too provisional to do in the middle of an election that has been postponed.

Mr. Ellsworth said there will be a great many more people present at the first GA meeting of the year than they've had in the last few meetings. So the potential pool of candidates would be larger, especially if the possibility of such an election was well noticed to people representing their departments. On the negative side, it was very difficult for incoming people to the GA to know how to vote on something like this. For him, the overall negatives outweigh the positives. It would be hard to explain to people what Grad Council representation was about and how to vote.

Mr. Kehoe said that if people felt very strongly about the current motion to have two elected reps and one Alternate, and if people felt strongly that this should take place, it should be moved to be the three representatives and have the Alternate be the position that was sort of provisional. If a position was held out

and they'd actually elect the three officials, that was essentially be the institution of a quota system for the Grad Council. He believed that should be through a proper Resolution.

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

Mr. Daal said the vote was whether to elect two Graduate Council representatives and one Alternate, instead of electing three reps and an Alternate.

A Delegate asked if the rep elected in the fall was designated to be just for professional students or one that everybody could run for, but for which professional students were encouraged to run. Mr. Daal said it was the latter.

The motion to elect that evening two Grad Council representatives and one Alternate failed by hand-vote 14-18-0.

Mr. Daal said they were back to the original motion. Mr. Daal ruled that the procedure for electing Grad Council representatives would be as it's outlined in the By-laws.

A motion to overrule the Chair's decision on election procedures was made and seconded.

Ms. Pymer said the three candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be the Graduate Council representative. The candidate receiving the fourth highest number of votes shall be the Graduate Council Alternate.

Ms. Navab said the By-laws don't specify the threshold for being elected, and Robert's Rules states that a majority vote was needed. That's what they're overturning.

Election of Graduate Council Representatives (cont'd)

- 24 -

The motion to overrule the chair passed by hand-vote 17-13.

Ms. Navab moved to adopt the procedures that Ms. Pannu outlined. Ms. Pannu said that first the GA would do a per candidate majority vote to determine the threshold. And then among those who receive a majority of votes, the GA would then vote to rank them.

Ms. Navab said first they would vote on each candidate. They'd vote yes or no for each candidate. If a candidate received a majority vote, they'd go forward in the process and they'd then vote again for whoever passed that threshold vote. People would vote as many times as there are candidates. The number of votes each candidate got would determine their rank. That would only be an issue if they have four people moving past the threshold.

The motion to adopt that voting procedure was seconded.

Mr. Ellsworth said their rules don't actually say that anyone had to vote for someone in order for them to get into the position. He didn't think the GA wanted to support that as a body. He was in favor of some mechanism to ensure that somebody at least wanted a person as Grad Council representative.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed by hand-vote 25-1.

Mr. Daal said they would proceed to a vote on Ms. Navab's motion.

Ms. Pannu said they'd have to do something to reach threshold.

Mr. Daal the vote was on Ms. Navab's motion. The motion to approve Ms. Navab's motion passed by hand-vote on voting procedure.

Mr. Daal asked everybody who could vote to please raise their hands in order to determine the amount of votes that would constitute a majority vote. Mr. Daal said there were 33 votes present, so the threshold was 17 votes.

A Delegate said that in the event that they only elect three people and there was no Alternate, he asked if there were any repercussions to the GA if one of those three people couldn't attend a Grad Council meeting. Mr. Daal said there was a repercussion in that the GA wouldn't have somebody there. If only three people move forward, then they have three principles and no Alternate.

Mr. Daal said speaking time was up, and the GA would vote.

Ms. Navab said the vote was on candidates to pass the threshold.

Votes were taken on candidates to pass the threshold and continue with the election process. Threshold votes were taken. Mr. Klein did not pass the threshold vote. Ms. Ng, Ms. Boatman, and Mr. Saxena passed the threshold vote.

Mr. Daal said the new three Grad Council representatives were Tiffany Ng, Liz Boatman, and Sam Saxena. No Alternate was elected. (Applause)

Communications Workgroup

- 25 -

Thank-You's for Outgoing GA Members

Resolution 1103c, On Directed Action to Implement the Recommendations of the

Outreach Workgroup Committee and Provisions for the Extension of its Mandate

With Ms. Ng chairing the meeting, Mr. Froehle moved to add five minutes to elections to constitute the Communications Workgroup, which was approved under the Consent Calendar. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Communications Workgroup

Ms. Ng asked Mr. Froehle to describe the positions. Mr. Froehle said the workgroup had stuff to do over the summer. It would be nice to at least have a chair. He asked for volunteers.

Mr. Froehle said they want to work on ways in which the GA communicates, so they're trying to draft the best working practices for the GA to communicate with grads and work on revising content on the Web site. Because funding is a mess, there's a list in the Resolution the GA approved earlier that evening,

Delegates who volunteered were Michael Ellison, Evan Davidson, and Bradley Froehle.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no other volunteers, the GA would accept those.

Thank You's for Outgoing Officers

Ms. Navab said she was asked to read a little "thank you" to all the current Officers who wouldn't be continuing. They wanted to thank Miguel Daal, Daniele Love, Apple Williams, Tiffany Ng, Jordan Zachritz, Allison Pymmer, Ashely Russel, Kara Young, Kim McNair, Lucy Diekman, and Brad Froehle, for all the great work they did that year. They hope that if they're going to be a continuing student, that they continue in some capacity with the GA, whether as a Delegate or working with the Exec Board or as a committee member. The GA wanted to thank them for the time and dedication they put in that year. She called for a big round of applause. (Applause) Ms. Navab said that cake was available. Ms. Ng said the cake was from the Business Office.

Ms. Navab said she also wanted to thank Lindsey Cast. (Applause)

RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

The following Resolution, 1103c, authored by Liz Boatman, Clara Botstein, Chris Klein, Adriana Mendoza, Dillon Niederhut, Alberto Ortega, and Apple Williams:

Resolution 1103c, On Directed Action to Implement the Recommendations of the Outreach - 26 -
Workgroup Committee and Provisions for the Extension of its Mandate (cont'd)

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OUTREACH WORKGROUP COMMITTEE AND PROVISIONS FOR THE EXTENSION OF ITS MANDATE

WHEREAS, at the December 2010 meeting, the Delegate Assembly approved the creation of a Workgroup to research the extent of and create recommendations for fostering community outreach in Resolution 1011a; and

WHEREAS, the Workgroup is to deliver the aforementioned recommendations at the March 2011 Delegate Assembly meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Workgroup conducted an online survey of the graduate and professional population, which garnered 304 respondents; and

WHEREAS, 40% of graduate and professional students report participating in outreach opportunities, mostly through non campus-affiliated organizations; and

WHEREAS, 21% of graduate and professional students report not wanting to participate in any outreach events; and

WHEREAS, 39% of graduate and professional students report an unmet demand for outreach opportunities, which, given the limitations of the survey, the Workgroup estimates to represent between 2,100 and 2,700 students; and

WHEREAS, the major factors preventing the 39% of interested graduate and professional students from engaging in community outreach are: lack of programs tailored toward graduate students availability and talents, and lack of awareness of outreach opportunities;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly empower its leadership to increase the awareness of outreach opportunities by: posting a list of local outreach organizations on the GA Web site; holding an outreach workshop during the orientation for new graduate and professional students in the fall; distributing information about local outreach opportunities to programs for use in their individual orientation activities; hosting a volunteer day each year where local organizations can set up booths to advertise and educate the graduate and professional student population about their efforts; creating an outreach calendar on the GA Facebook page where student organizations can post information about their outreach events.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Funding Committee shall encourage grant applications for outreach events held by graduate and professional student groups.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the mandate for the Workgroup on Community Outreach be extended in order to allow time for the establishment of recommendations on how the Graduate Assembly could successfully host its own outreach program.

Mr. Niederhut said the GA talked a lot about this at a presentation that occurred about three months ago. These are recommendations about how to encourage graduate students to conduct outreach efforts and

Resolution 1103c, On Directed Action to Implement the Recommendations of the Outreach - 27 -
Workgroup Committee and Provisions for the Extension of its Mandate (cont'd)
Resolution 1104b, By-law Amendment to Create a Grammar Officer and Grammar Committee

how that might be facilitated, and how they could continue the mandate for the Workgroup, so he could keep working on this over the summer.

Ms. Navab moved to approve. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mikulin.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1103c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE,
RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
OUTREACH WORKGROUP COMMITTEE AND PROVISIONS FOR THE EXTENSION OF ITS
MANDATE.

Ms. Ng said the next Resolution up for consideration was 1104b, By-law Amendment to Create a Grammar Officer and Grammar Committee. Ms. Pymer moved to table the bill indefinitely. The motion was seconded. Mr. Froehle objected and said he would like to have a minute to say his peace.

Mr. Froehle said he submitted the Resolution because the Environmental Sustainability Committee does great work, but they fit best in the GA as an organization as a workgroup. To point that out, he drafted the Resolution, and the text of the Resolution comes exactly from the text of the enabling legislation of the Environmental Sustainability Committee. For every mention of environmental sustainability, he transposed "grammar." And it still agreed. So either the GA needed more specificity about what the ES Committee was actually able to do because it was so vague and ephemeral, or maybe the Committee was better as a workgroup. What that, Mr. Froehle said he would humbly agree to tabling the bill indefinitely.

Mr. Trager said that since Mr. Froehle was using the Environmental Sustainability Committee for the basis of the existence for the Resolution, Mr. Trager said he thought he could put a piece for the Committee. As of next year, they're launching a fundraising campaign for fellowships and are applying for grants. They thought it might be useful to have a grammar officer to edit their papers. They thought such a position could impose some rules, or at least make suggestions. He wouldn't mind having someone edit papers.

Mr. Kehoe said that while he agreed that the ES Committee would function better as a Workgroup and fit better in the GA's structure, he thought the Resolution was juvenile and demeaned the institution.

Ms. Pannu called the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO TABLE INDEFINITELY RESOLUTION 1104b, BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO CREATE A GRAMMAR OFFICER AND GRAMMAR COMMITTEE, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab said they were losing people and possibly could lose quorum, and moved to go to the most pressing Resolutions first, and moved to go to 1105b. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Navab said the corrected version would be put on the screen.

Resolution 1105b, On Establishing a Summer Funding Workgroup and Directed Action - 28 -

The following Resolution, 1105b, was fast tracked and was authored by Bahar Navab, Philippe Marchand, and Mike Sheen:

RESOLUTION ON ESTABLISHING A SUMMER FUNDING WORKGROUP AND DIRECTED ACTION

WHEREAS, the Delegates approved a new two round funding structure at the April 2011 meeting; and

WHEREAS, this new funding structure specifies that funding for Events taking place between the end of May through August should come out of contingency; and

WHEREAS, the recommendations for first funding round for the fall will need to be made prior to the September Assembly meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Delegate Assembly is not in session during this period;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a Summer Funding Workgroup be established. This Workgroup shall have a minimum of four (4) and a maximum of eleven (11) delegates. The Workgroup will be chaired by the Funding Officer and will convene as necessary to consider contingency.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that since the Delegate Assembly is not in session over the summer, the Executive Board is directed to review and approve contingency recommendations put forward by the Summer Funding Workgroup. The authority of the Executive Board to act is limited only to summer contingency funding and shall only be valid until September 8, 2011 (date of first GA meeting).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that summer (May-August) contingency funding shall not exceed \$8,000 in total allocations. Round 1 funding in the fall will not be impacted by this cap.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Summer Funding Workgroup shall review Round 1 funding applications and make a recommendation to the Delegates for approval at the September 8, 2011 Assembly meeting. This Summer Funding Workgroup shall be dissolved as of September 8, 2011.

Ms. Navab said the GA approved summer funding out of contingency at its last meeting. They also changed the timeline for funding rounds. But what that did was to require things to get approved and to move forward in the summer. The Resolution would allow for a Summer Funding Workgroup to act after the Funding Committee. The Workgroup would make recommendations about contingency funding over the summer and the Executive Board would approve the Workgroup's recommendations. The Resolution also lets the Workgroup look at the first round of funding applications. So if they don't have quorum in the Funding Committee because Delegates left, since they cease being Delegates at the start of August, the Resolution would allow for Delegates to have input. If the GA approves this, they'll assign a Summer Funding Workgroup immediately afterwards. The Committees have looked at this Resolution even though it wasn't formally submitted to them.

Resolution 1105b, On Establishing a Summer Funding Workgroup and Directed Action - 29 -
Resolution 1104f, On an Epicurean Approach to Meetings and Events
Resolution 1104g, On Updating the GA Charter

A Delegate asked about chairing the Workgroup. Ms. Navab said the 2011-2012 Funding Chair/Officer would fund this because Ms. Williams would be there.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1105b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON ESTABLISHING A SUMMER FUNDING WORKGROUP AND DIRECTED ACTION.

Ms. Navab said they now needed to assign people to the Workgroup. She called for any volunteers to join the Workgroup. The following Delegates volunteered: Mr. Froehle, Mr. Ellsworth, and Ms. Pymer, and Aleks Polosukhina, Ian Herbert, and Danny Yost. Ms. Navab said that people could also participate electronically.

Regarding Resolution, 1104f, Resolution on an Epicurean Approach to Meetings and Events, Ms. Navab moved to table the bill indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kehoe. THE MOTION TO TABLE INDEFINITELY RESOLUTION 1104f PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON AN EPICUREAN APPROACH TO MEETINGS AND EVENTS.

The following Resolution, 1104g, was authored by Bahar Navab and was co-sponsored by the Rules Committee:

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly (GA) Charter was last updated in 2002 and is based on an outdated version of the ASUC Constitution; and

WHEREAS, a new GA structure was established in the By-laws, effective July 1, 2011; and

WHEREAS, much of the current Charter is out of date or no longer applicable to the current MOU between the ASUC and the GA;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following changes be made to the existing GA Charter, effective July 1, 2011:

- 1.1. The Graduate Assembly of the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC), Berkeley, is constituted under the authority of Article V Title X of the Constitution of the ASUC.
- 1.2. The Graduate Assembly is the official representative body of the graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley. The fundamental principles

Resolution 1104g, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 30 -

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

of the Graduate Assembly are the promotion of a vibrant student social life, inclusiveness, activism, community service, educational improvement, and professional development. In service to these principles the Graduate Assembly advocates for students, funds student groups on campus, and directly manages a variety of projects.

[...]

- 2.1.1. Each department, school, or college within the Graduate Division shall be entitled in the Graduate Assembly to one (1) Delegate for each one hundred (100) graduate students or fraction thereof enrolled within, except that within those schools, colleges, or departments which are functionally subdivided into two or more semi-autonomous academic units or divisions, each unit or division shall be entitled to Delegates in

accordance with the above rule. Determination of subdivisions shall be made by the Organization Academic Affairs Vice President (AAVP from here on) and the Rules Committee. Delegates shall be chosen in one of the following ways:

- 2.1.1.1. Selected by graduate students in their unit participating in a publicized meeting or responding to a mail ballot.
- 2.1.1.2. Selected by the representative student body of their unit.
- 2.1.1.3. Appointed by their department, school, or college with the concurrence of the representative student body of their unit, if any.
- 2.1.2. Students in other graduate degree programs, such as interdisciplinary groups and individual Ph.D. programs, are entitled to Delegates as determined by the ~~Organization~~ AAVP and *the* Rules Committee, subject to the approval of the Assembly.
- 2.1.3. The ~~Graduate Assembly~~ *Delegate Assembly* shall be the final judge of each Delegate's right to be seated.

[...]

- 2.2.2. Alternate Delegates from departments, schools, or colleges within the Graduate Division shall be selected in one of the ways specified in paragraph 2.1.1. The ~~Organization~~ AAVP and *the* Rules Committee shall determine selection procedures for Alternate Delegates from other graduate programs. While Alternate Delegates should attend as many meetings as possible, no unit shall be entitled to cast more votes than its number of Delegates allowed by section 2.1.1.

3. Officers and Elected Representatives

- 3.1. The Graduate Assembly shall annually elect a President, ~~who shall head the Assembly~~, *an External Affairs Vice President for External Affairs, an Assembly Affairs Vice President, a Campus Affairs Vice President, and a Treasurer (section 5.6 below)*, ~~and~~

Resolution 1104g, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 31 -

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

~~a Vice President for Academic Affairs~~. Election shall be by a majority of Delegates voting at a scheduled and publicized meeting of the Assembly.

[...]

- 3.4.1. The Graduate Assembly shall establish committees as needed, except that there shall be a ~~Finance~~ *Budget and Funding* Committees as specified in section 5.5 below.

[...]

4.1. The Graduate Assembly shall establish staff positions and hire staff as needed., ~~except that there must be a Finance Funding Officer (Section 5.6 below) and that ASUC and Graduate Assembly personnel policies and procedures must be followed (Section 5.9 below).~~

[...]

5.2 The Graduate Assembly shall receive funding from the ASUC *as specified in the most recent Memorandum Of Understanding between the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly.* ~~of an amount equal to at least thirteen fourteenths (13/14) in the year 2001 and at least seven sevenths (7/7) each year thereafter of the total amount of ASUC discretionary fees (mandatory student activity fees) paid by graduate student members of the Association, including those enrolled in the Schools of Law and Business.~~

~~5.3. In addition to monies derived from ASUC discretionary fees (mandatory student activities fees), the Graduate Assembly shall receive funding from the ASUC of an amount equal to at least thirteen fourteenths (13/14) in the year 2001 and at least seven sevenths (7/7) each year thereafter of the percentage of graduate students in the total University of California at Berkeley student population of the income, if any, allocated to ASUC governmental activities and student groups which derive from ASUC student side rental profits and any other mutually agreed upon sources.~~

[Renumber the following parts of the charter in section 5 appropriately. For example 5.4 becomes 5.3. The following sections in this text have already been renumbered as appropriate.]

[...]

5.45. The Graduate Assembly shall establish a ~~Finance Funding~~ *Funding Committee and a Budget Committee, each* consisting of at least five (5) and not more than eleven (11) Delegates. ~~to be responsible for preparing recommendations to the Assembly on the allocation of Assembly funds. The Finance Committee shall also be responsible for formulating policies for the allocation of Assembly funds, subject to the approval of the Assembly.~~

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

5.5.1 *The Funding Committee is responsible for preparing recommendations to the Delegate Assembly on the allocation of Graduate Student Group funding. The Committee will also be responsible for formulating policies for the allocation of such funding, subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly.*

5.5.2 *The Budget Committee is responsible for pre annual recommendations to the Assembly on the allocation of Assembly funds. The Funding Committee shall also be responsible for formulating policies for the allocation of Assembly funds, subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly.*

5.56. The Graduate Assembly shall ~~select~~ *elect* a ~~Finance Officer~~ *Treasurer and a Funding Chair*. ~~to be responsible for:~~

~~5.6.1. overseeing the expenditure of Assembly funds;~~

~~5.6.2. assisting the Finance Committee in exercising its responsibilities; and~~

~~5.6.3. other financial matters delegated by the Assembly.~~

5.5.1 The Treasurer is responsible for:

5.5.1 .1 overseeing the expenditure of Assembly funds;

5.5.1 .2 assisting the Budget Committee in exercising its responsibilities; and

5.6.1. 3 other financial matters delegated by the Assembly.

5.5.2 The Funding Chair is responsible for:

5.5.2.1 overseeing the allocation of Graduate Student Group funding;

5.5.2.2 assisting the Funding Committee in exercising its responsibilities; and

5.5.2.3 other financial matters delegated by the Assembly.

~~5.7. The Finance Officer must be confirmed by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Assembly and shall be considered a member of the Graduate Assembly staff.~~

[With the removal of the old 5.7 , sections 5.8-5.1 2 must be correctly renumbered.]

[...]

6.4. A quorum of the Graduate Assembly for the purpose of doing business shall consist of twenty-five (25) percent of the voting members, being the Delegates or their Alternates ~~and the Elected Representatives~~, plus one (1) voting member.

Resolution 1104g, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 33 -

RESOLUTION ON UPDATING THE GA CHARTER (cont'd)

6.5. All meetings of the Graduate Assembly shall be open to all members of the University community, except that a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegates present and voting may close a meeting, ~~subject to the provisions of Article IX of the ASUC Constitution.~~

[...]

- 6.7. All meeting announcements and agendas, and all motions and resolutions passed by the Graduate Assembly shall be forwarded to the Chair of the ASUC Senate ~~according to Article V, Section 1~~ *Title X, Article IV, Section 1* of the ASUC Constitution.

[...]

8. Changes to the Charter and By-Laws

- 8.1. This Charter may be amended by mail ballot by a two-thirds (2/3) or greater vote of the Delegates responding, providing that the total affirmative vote constitutes no less than a majority of the current Delegates., ~~except that changes in Part 6, Funding and Budgets, also require the approval of two thirds (2/3) of the ASUC Senate, according to Article V Section 2 of the ASUC Constitution.~~

[...]

Ms. Navab said the GA's Charter was really out of date. It's based on the 2002 Constitution and its clauses don't match any existing documents. The Resolution would put the Charter amendments to a vote of the Delegates. Unfortunately, after the GA approves a vote on this, it would have to go to an actual electronic vote after the meeting. So Delegates will have to actually vote electronically to change the Charter, and a majority of existing Delegates would be needed to approve the bill. Hopefully they'll get this e-mail vote, because otherwise, the GA's rules of order will remain substantially out of date. She didn't change anything substantially, and just made it match what current practice was.

Mr. Kehoe said that even if the GA approves of having a vote, they'd still get to review it before the actual vote took place. Ms. Navab said that what the GA would be voting on that evening was to just actually approve having a vote.

Ms. Pymer said she wanted to amend clause 6.3 of the Charter to bring it in line with the By-laws, for consistency. The Charter, 6.3, states that "At least 48-hours notice shall be given of any Assembly meeting, except that votes on budgetary questions and on the election and recall of Officers or Elected Representatives require at least one (1) week prior notice." In the By-laws, it says at least a week's notice shall be given. She would like to move to change "48-hours" to "a week." The motion to amend was seconded by Mr. Mikulin. This was clause 6.3 in the Resolution.

Ms. Ng called for any discussion on the amendment. The question was called and debate closed.

A Delegate asked what the difference was between the two times. Ms. Pymer said the By-laws call for at least a week's prior notice, and she was just bringing the language in the By-laws and the Charter into

Resolution 1104g, On Updating the GA Charter (cont'd)

- 34 -

consistency. Ms. Navab said "seven days" was more than "48-hours," so the By-laws met the Charter requirement and added something. So technically, the GA needed to change the Charter. That's why she didn't change the language in the By-law amendment.

As amended, the Charter would read as follows:

“6.3. At least one week notice shall be given of any Assembly meeting, except that votes on budgetary questions and on the election and recall of Officers or Elected Representatives require at least one (1) week prior notice....”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

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

Ms. Ng said that if Delegates have not been receiving e-mails from the Delegate's e-mail list, she would ask them to please get their e-mail address to Lindsey Cast, at execassist.berkeley.edu or just talk to her. She asked if anyone didn't get Delegate e-mails. It seemed like everybody did.

Ms. Navab said there was a sheet going around for people who will be around during the summer.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE SENDING RESOLUTION 1104g OUT TO AN ELECTRONIC VOTE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

[Note: Mr. Marchand and Ms. Ng asked to have the following e-mail added to the minutes.]

Begin Resolution 1104g e-mail

Subject: [Delegates] Resolution 1104g - failure
From: "Tiffany Ng, GA Rules Officer"

Delegates,

Resolution 1104g, "Updating the GA Charter," has failed. 48 votes were cast, which is 7 short of the number required for the result to be counted as valid according to By-law 6.4.1.6.

The Rules Committee may consider reintroducing the resolution in the fall. Thanks to Philippe and the Executive Assistants for running the voting process.

Best regards,
Tiffany Ng
GA Rules Officer

End Resolution 1104g e-mail

Mr. Mikulin said he had to depart. He was graduating and this was his last GA meeting. It's been a pleasure working with them all. It's been great being part of this community and he thought they've done a lot of good work over the last two years he's been there. He wished all the best for those who are continuing on in the studies. He was sure they'll do great work. For those like him going out into the job and professional world, he hoped they too do good work and help save the world in their own little way. He would

like to leave one word of encouragement. He thought the GA had a lot of potential and power on the campus. He hoped it will use some of that power and influence to encourage operational efficiency with respect to managing its resources, waste, energy, and water. He knew that Jason Trager, the new Environmental Sustainability Officer, was gung-ho, and Mr. Mikulin said he was sure he'll do good work. He hoped people in the GA engage in the Environmental Sustainability Committee and support the work Mr. Trager and Committee members intend to do. If people wanted to contact him, Mr. Mikulin said he'll be EPA office at San Francisco, mikulin.john@epa.gov. He wanted to thank them so much. (Applause)

Ms. Ng said she would like to thank Mr. Mikulin for his work in sustainability.

Mr. Kehoe moved to go to 1104c. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

The following Resolution, 1104c, was authored by Bradley Froehle:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO IMPLEMENT ONLINE FUNDING APPLICATIONS

WHEREAS, the 2010-2011 student group funding application process requires the submission of one original and two copies of each funding application, an unnecessary use of paper; and

WHEREAS, the funding application must be submitted in person to Anthony Hall, placing an unnecessary burden on student groups; and

WHEREAS, mechanisms exist for securely collecting funding applications electronically via e-mail or Web form; and

WHEREAS, the identity of the individual submitting the funding application could be verified using CalNet Authentication; and

WHEREAS, electronic funding applications would be easier to review in advance of funding committee meetings since they could be easily electronically disseminated; and

WHEREAS, the 2011-2012 Funding Guide is due for Delegate approval in April, before an online funding application system can be decided upon and implemented; and

WHEREAS, for a transition period of at least a semester and at most a year it would be feasible and prudent to accept both paper and electronic funding applications;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Funding Chair and Communications Chair jointly investigate and implement online funding applications for the 2011-2012 school year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Funding Chair may amend the 2011-2012 Funding Guide, with approval from the Executive Board, to reflect any additional policies necessary to implement an online funding application process, subject to the following restrictions:

1. Paper applications must still be allowed, and the process for paper applications must remain unchanged.
2. The process for online applications must be substantively the same as for paper applications.
3. Specific language must be added indicating that no preference will be given to electronic or paper applications in the funding approval process.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Funding Committee shall, at the end of the application process for the Fall 2011 semester, tabulate the number of electronic and paper applications received and recommend to the Delegate Assembly any changes or further adoption of the online funding application process.

Mr. Froehle said there were amendments out of committee. One issue they had was currently the Funding Chair won't be around, so the GA needed somebody to actually do the work. Rather than having nobody do it, Mr. Froehle said he would suggest they create a workgroup. So he would amend the bill to have "workgroup" in the title. As amended, the title would be "To Create an Online Funding Application Workgroup."

Mr. Froehle said the amendment would also add a suggested timeline of trying to get this done, with a target start date in spring 2012. The motion to amend was seconded.

Ms. Navab asked why they don't simply have Mike Sheen work on this instead of Ms. Williams. Mr. Froehle said he would therefore urge a "no" vote on that amendment, and they'd make that change afterwards.

A motion to call the question on the amendment was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to approve Mr. Froehle's amendment failed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Froehle said he would like to amend the first Resolved Clause, to delete "Funding Chair" and "and Communications Chair jointly," and replace them with "Funding Chair 2011-2012 will," to read as follows:

"Resolved, that the 2011-2012 Funding Chair investigate and implement online funding applications for the 2011-2012 school year."

The motion was seconded by Ms. Navab.

Mr. Kehoe said that as he understood it, it would have the implementation done by one person. Ms. Navab said they would investigate it. Mr. Kehoe said that was as opposed to the Communications

Committee, which adds a workgroup and a timeline. Ms. Navab said they already have an informal workgroup. Mr. Kehoe said it seemed to make sense to have a separate process.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. FROEHLE'S AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A motion to call the question and come to a vote on the bill was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1104c, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO IMPLEMENT ONLINE FUNDING APPLICATIONS.

The following Resolution, 1104h, was authored by Tiffany Ng, Rules Chair:

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO SPECIFY EXECUTIVE BOARD QUORUM

WHEREAS, the revised Graduate Assembly By-laws, effective July 1, 2011, specify an Executive Board membership of five (5) officers without explicitly specifying the number required for quorum at Executive Board meetings; and

WHEREAS, high attendance at Executive Board meetings may occasionally require one or several members to be present via teleconferencing technologies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the By-laws be revised as follows:

- 4.15.1.7. Attendance. Members of the Executive Board are required to attend every Executive Board meeting. *Any Executive Board meeting may be held by conference telephone or similar communication equipment, so long as all attendees can hear one another. All such attendees shall be deemed to be present at such a meeting.*
- 4.15.1.8. Quorum. *A quorum of the Executive Board for the purpose of doing business shall be four (4) of the five (5) members.*
- 4.15.1.98. Consensus. Although final decisions of the Executive Board shall be made by a majority vote of the voting members of the Executive Board, all reasonable efforts shall be made to reach consensus with all members of the Executive Board before making a final decision on behalf of the Executive Board. In the event of a tie vote, the motion under consideration shall fail.

Ms. Ng said that in the new GA structure there is a five-member Executive Board, which meant a quorum would consist of three members. The Resolution would change that and have quorum at four members.

It would also allow for Executive Board members to participate by teleconferencing, which has been a practice in the past. However, it's been slightly confusing as to whether such participation counted for quorum. The Resolution clarifies that.

Ms. Pannu moved to amend quorum from four E-Board members to three. It currently reads four out of five members would be a quorum, and that was an 80% threshold. While it was important for the E-Board to have high quorum, 80% sounded like it might not be workable; and she would rather change it to three members.

Ms. Ng said they could also move to strike the entire amendment, and leave quorum at majority. Ms. Pannu said there's been confusion over what "majority" meant, so the more specific, the better.

The motion to amend was seconded.

A Delegate asked why Ms. Ng wanted to have quorum at four. Ms. Ng said that since there's such a small membership, a serious decrease from the large membership of the previous E-Board. So it would be important to have almost all of the E-Board present at meetings if the number of members was so small.

Mr. Ellsworth asked how often the Executive Board meets. Ms. Ng said it was more than monthly. Mr. Ellsworth said that even if it was every two weeks, he didn't think it was an onerous burden to have at least four people get together, especially if people could meet over the phone.

Ms. Navab said that as the only member of next year's E-Board who was present, she thought a quorum of four would be fine.

A motion to call the question and end debate on the amendment was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to amend, to change E-Board quorum from four members to three members, failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Pymer said that the By-laws don't give a specific requirement of frequency for the E-Board to meet, although monthly meetings were encouraged.

Ms. Navab moved to call the question and end debate. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1104H PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO SPECIFY EXECUTIVE BOARD QUORUM.

Ms. Pannu moved to go to 1105c. Mr. Froehle objected and said he didn't have a copy. Ms. Ng said it was on the board. Mr. Froehle said he believed the By-laws state that a Resolution couldn't be fast tracked unless a printed copy was made available at the meeting. Ms. Pymer said he provided a week's notice. Ms. Navab asked if the bill was posted online. Ms. Cast said it was.

The motion to go to consideration of 1105c passed unanimously by voice-vote.

The following Resolution, 1105c, was authored by Allison Pymer, and revised by members of the Rules Committee:

RESOLUTION ON SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY BY-LAWS FROM THE 2010-2011 RULES COMMITTEE'S ANNUAL REVIEW

WHEREAS, the Rules Committee is charged with an annual review of the GA Charter as per article 4.15.3 of the Graduate Assembly By-laws;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following changes are made to the Graduate Assembly's By-laws:

- 1.1.1 Mission. The Graduate Assembly's mission is to serve the interests of all graduate students, who include all masters degree and professional students, at the University of California at Berkeley, and to advocate on their behalf. improve the lives of University of California, Berkeley graduate students and to foster a vibrant, inclusive graduate student community.
- 1.1.2 Representation. The Graduate Assembly shall speak for all academic and professional graduate students on the Berkeley campus of the University of California on matters of concern to graduate students, and to further those interests which are common to all graduate students.
- 26 2.2.2 Certification. Each Delegate and Alternate must be certified for the academic year by her or his academic unit. To do so, the academic unit shall submit a certificate of election or selection, signed by the person who conducted the election or selection, to the Graduate Assembly. See section 2.1.1 of the Graduate Assembly Charter.
- 2.3.5 Recall. Any Officer may be recalled by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly. The recall must be listed as an item of business for that Assembly meeting. See section 3.3 of the Graduate Assembly Charter.
- 2.3.10.9 Job Descriptions. These By-laws incorporate the job descriptions of each Officer into the responsibilities for each Officer. The job description for each Officer shall be reviewed annually by the Executive Board. Modifications to these job descriptions require a majority vote of the Delegate Assembly.
- Section 3.2 Special Meetings. The Delegate Assembly shall also have special meetings at such times as the Delegate Assembly shall deem necessary, by call of the Assembly Affairs Vice President, or upon the receipt of the written petition of at least fifteen (15) Delegates. The Assembly Affairs Vice President shall call a special meeting of the Delegate Assembly to be held within seven (7) days of the time of the presentation of petition. See section 6.2 of the Graduate Assembly Charter.
- 3.3 Public Meetings Requirement. All meetings of the Delegate Assembly shall be open to the public. However, two-thirds (2/3) of the Delegates present and voting can

RESOLUTION ON SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY BY-LAWS FROM THE 2010-2011 RULES COMMITTEE'S ANNUAL REVIEW (cont'd)

require, on the grounds that a closed meeting is necessary for the proper functioning of the Delegate Assembly, a member-only meeting that shall be closed to the public. See section 6.5 of the Graduate Assembly Charter.

- 3.5 Quorum. A quorum of the Delegate Assembly for the purpose of doing business shall be the fraction of existing voting members that is twenty-five percent (25%) plus one (1) voting member. See section 6.4 of the Graduate Assembly Charter.
- 4.10 Public Notes Requirement. At each Committee and Workgroup meeting, notes shall be taken on or the meeting audio recorded. The notes or the audio recording shall be archived and made available to the public.
- 4.11 Quorum. Quorum shall be the fraction of existing voting members that is fifty percent (50%), rounded down to the nearest whole number, plus one (1) member. The number of members attending each Committee meeting must be included in the Committee's monthly report to the Delegate Assembly.
- 4.15. 1.2 Authority to Act. The Executive Board may act on behalf of and not as the Delegate Assembly on matters of immediate concern when the Delegate Assembly is not in session. Matters of immediate concern are those matters on which the Delegate Assembly would normally take action but which require urgent attention, and those matters for which the financial or legal circumstances have changed significantly since the last Delegate Assembly session. Urgent is defined as requiring action to prevent or respond to legal or physical harm to the Graduate Assembly or its assets. Minutes of the meeting in which the decision to act is made must be recorded and include a roll call of the vote. The Executive Board must make a good faith effort to post these minutes on the Graduate Assembly Web site as soon as possible.
- 5.5.1 Selection Workgroup. A Selection Workgroup of not less than three (3) persons shall be designated by the Executive Board from among the Delegates, Officers, Graduate Council Representatives and Alternate, chairs, Project Coordinators, and Graduate Assembly stipend-staff. Each selection committee shall have at least one (1) Officer, who shall chair the Workgroup, and at least one (1) Project Coordinator, and shall not have more than ~~one-half~~ *fifty percent* (→) (50%) of its membership composed of Graduate Assembly stipend-staff.

Ms. Pymer said that when the By-laws refer to the Charter and the Charter and the By-laws say the same thing, she has the By-law language refer to the Charter. Also, she updated the GA's mission such that it reflected what the GA voted on recently.

Ms. Pymer said she believed the only controversial element was 4.1.1, quorums for committee meetings. The amendment would set quorum as the fraction of existing voting members that was 50%, rounded down to the nearest whole number, plus one member. There was discussion about this in the Rules

Committee. If people wanted to remove it from the bill, that was okay. But she thought the change would make it easier for committees to meet.

Ms. Navab moved to amend to remove the proposed additional language, "rounded down to the nearest whole number," and would rather have more people having a say, rather than fewer. The motion would be to change "rounded down" to "rounded up." The motion to amend was seconded by Mr. Froehle. People had an issue with doing that. This was being really explicit.

Mr. Kehoe said the amendment increases the number needed for quorum, as was discussed earlier. Robert's Rules of Order rounds down. It's a simple majority, so there's more people than half. It was 50%-plus-one, rounded down. If there are five people in a committee, the proposed change would have a quorum of four members, out of five. Following Robert's Rules of Order in this case made sense. So he would suggest a "no" vote on the amendment.

Ms. Pannu said the confusion was what to do with the fractional person. Rounding down to the nearest whole number might confuse people, so she asked if this could be clarified. So people would vote down Ms. Navab's amendment and then have the amendment to use the procedure followed by Robert's Rules.

The question was called and debate closed on Ms. Navab's amendment. The motion to approve Ms. Navab's amendment, to round up rather than round down, failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Pymer said they added a line that talks about Executive Board power over the summer. They wanted to make it a little more firm and report to the Delegates. But they didn't know how that would work logistically, so the wording was for the Board to make a good faith effort to put the minutes of meetings they hold over the summer on the GA Web site as soon as possible. The summer would be a trial period to see how quickly that could be done. If it's logistically possible, they'd put a two-week limit or a one-week limit on that in the By-laws.

A Delegate asked if Delegates would be notified that E-Board minutes were available. Ms. Pymer said the language didn't include that, and Delegates would be responsible for checking.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1105c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY BY-LAWS FROM THE 2010-2011 RULES COMMITTEE'S ANNUAL REVIEW.

Mr. Yost call for a quorum. He asked Ms. Ng what 25% of Delegates was. Ms. Ng said there were 101 Delegates, so quorum would be 26. Ms. Ng asked Delegates to raise their voting cards. Ms. Ng said there were 21 Delegates present, which did not constitute a quorum.

Ms. Pannu asked what they'd do with 1102f. Mr. Ellsworth said they'd consider it at the next meeting.

Ms. Ng said that all remain business would be tabled until the Delegates meeting. That includes 1102f, Budget Amendment and Directed Action regarding the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation; 1105a,

Directed Action Regarding the SOB Charter Revision; and 1105d, Regarding Job Posting for New Project Coordinators.

Ms. Pymmer asked how much could be tackled by the Executive Board over the summer. Ms. Ng said the Executive Board could deal with 1105d.

Mr. Kehoe asked what the repercussions on not voting on these until September. Mr. Daal said it would just involve interest they'd lose and having to educate the new Delegates about the issues.

This meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

APPENDIX 1

Amended Version of Resolution 1104c
On Directed Action to Implement Online Funding Applications

1104c, as amended:

Resolution on Directed Action to Implement Online Funding Applications

Whereas, the 2010-2011 student group funding application process requires the submission of one original and two copies of each funding application, an unnecessary use of paper; and

Whereas, the funding application must be submitted in person to Anthony Hall, placing an unnecessary burden on student groups; and

Whereas, mechanisms exist for securely collecting funding applications electronically via e-mail or Web form; and

Whereas, the identity of the individual submitting the funding application could be verified using CalNet Authentication; and

Whereas, electronic funding applications would be easier to review in advance of funding committee meetings since they could be easily electronically disseminated; and

Whereas, the 2011-2012 Funding Guide is due for Delegate approval in April, before an online funding application system can be decided upon and implemented; and

Whereas, for a transition period of at least a semester and at most a year it would be feasible and prudent to accept both paper and electronic funding applications;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Funding Chair and Communications Chair jointly investigate and implement online funding applications for the 2011-2012 school year.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Funding Chair may amend the 2011-2012 Funding Guide, with approval from the Executive Board, to reflect any additional policies necessary to implement an online funding application process, subject to the following restrictions:

1. Paper applications must still be allowed, and the process for paper applications must remain unchanged.
2. The process for online applications must be substantively the same as for paper applications.
3. Specific language must be added indicating that no preference will be given to electronic or paper applications in the funding approval process.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Funding Committee shall, at the end of the application process for the Fall 2011 semester, tabulate the number of electronic and paper applications received and recommend to the Delegate Assembly any changes or further adoption of the online funding application process.