

SPECIAL GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

September 30, 2010

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This Special Meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Philippe Daal at 5:11 p.m. in the Tan Oak Room, Student Union.

Introduction to the GA

The Delegate Assembly is the main legislative or decision-making body. The Executive Board is elected by the Assembly to deal with the day-to-day work of the GA between GA meetings. There are seven Projects that were part of the GA, with seven Project Coordinators. The GA's Business Office carries out the administrative duties of the GA.

Susan Hsueh is the Business Manager, one of only two career, ASUC Auxiliary staff at the GA. Everybody else was a student. The ASUC Auxiliary manages the day-to-day business operations of the GA.

The Business Office is the management and accounting operation of the GA. Each student pays \$27.50 a semester for student fees, one-third of which goes towards financial aid. The GA gets about \$417,000 from this. Outside administration, the money is divided in thirds, to student groups, Executive Officers, and Projects.

The GA also receives \$50,000 from the Coca-Cola contract. In addition, the Grad Division has promised to fund the GA \$10,000.

Lindsay Cast helps the GA organize meetings and does support work for the Executive Board.

Elizabeth De La Torre is the Project Coordinator Liaison, overseeing the projects. Projects include the Graduate Women's Project; the Women of Color Initiative, which puts on the Empowering Women of Color Conference; the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project (GMORR); the Graduate Support Services Project (GSSP); the Graduate Minority Student Project (GMSP); and "The Berkeley Graduate." The Grad Social Club holds big events each semester.

As for Executive Officers, the GA President, Mr. Marchand, has many roles and chairs GA meetings, and is the main spokesperson of the GA. The External Affairs VP, Mr. Ortega, works with UCOP, has lobby visits to Washington and Sacramento, and works on legislation. The Campus Affairs VP position is vacant and was being filed by Ms. Love. It meets with administrators and appoints people to campus-wide committees, where positions were still open. The Project Coordinator Liaison, Ms. De La Torre, works with the Exec Board and Project Coordinators.

Other positions include the Rules Chair, Ms. Ng, which works on GA rules and analyzes Resolutions; the Budget Chair, Mr. Nicholas, which works on the upcoming budget; the Funding Chair, Ms. Whelan, which works on applications students submit for funding; and Communications Chair, Mr. Froehle, which works on the Web site, published information, making announcements, and possibly a newsletter. Other

Chairs include the Environmental Sustainability Chair, Mr. Zachritz, and the International Student Affairs Committee Chair, Mr. Mujumdar. Officers and Chairs have associated committees. Four GA members are reps on the Grad Council, a Grad Division body, which deals with reviews and policy issues pertaining to grads. Officers and Grad Council reps sit on the Exec Board.

Announcements

Ms. Pannu said that Law School Delegates would like to acknowledge that last week's meeting had a rough tone and would apologize for their role in that. They want to work collaboratively.

Ms. McCoy spoke on the October 7 Day of Action. There's concern for their education.

Ms. Ng went over some of the meeting rules the GA follows, and typical motions made on the floor. The GA will hold elections on October 7 for President, Campus Affairs VP, and a Grad Council rep.

Mr. Abed, Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator, facilitates and coordinates communication among major stakeholders on the Lower Sproul project. Mr. Daal is the GA's main person working on this.

Resolution Referral

The following Resolutions were referred to committee:

1009d, To Establish Funding Committee Procedures

1009e, Action Agenda Item to Adopt a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target.

Presentation on Fall Funding Allocations

Ms. Whelan, Funding Committee Chair, presented slides that were shown at the May GA meeting, showing the changes made to funding policy recommended by the Funding Ad Hoc Committee.

The GA has four types of funding: the Travel Grant; other Grants; Graduate Meetings, Events, and Resources (GMER); and Contingency. Grads pay \$27 in student fees a semester, and the GA gets two-thirds of that.

In the past, people would request more than the GA had, and the Funding Committee would take a percent off the top from all of them. Also, groups were constrained in the timeframe they could use the funding, resulting in left over funds at the end of the semester. A previous category, "Group Resources," things to just run a group, was underused.

The idea of "super groups" was initiated. Departments were grouped thematically, each group representing about 10% of the grad population. This is so small departments weren't penalized. Now, each group is guaranteed that it will get back what students pay in student fees.

This year's Contingency Fund is much larger than last year, with the idea that this system would see a lot of funding appeals.

In August, there were 64 applications for GMER funding, totaling \$32,000. Only \$21,996 was available. A universal cut would have awarded 83% of what was requested.

Business is 15% of the school; Humanities, 16%; Law, 10%; Public Policy, 10%; Biological Science, 9%; Mathematics, 11%; Engineering, 9%; Physical Science, 8%; Education, 4%; Professional Schools, 8%.

In the August applications, Law requested 34% of the total; Public Policy, 19%; Engineering, 16%; Biological Science, 12%; Math, 7%. Some groups, in Education and the Humanities, requested less than the amount of student fees their students paid.

Some groups were fully funded: Professional Schools, Education, Physical Science, Humanities, Mathematics, Biological Science, Engineering, and Public Policy. Law got 53%, which is 22% of the total given in Round 1.

93% of GMER funding is for food at meetings.

Round 2 for GMER only, would fully fund Education, Physical Science, Humanities, professional schools, and Math. Biological Science would get 81%; Law, 63%; Public Policy, 53%; and Engineering, 43%. Under universal cuts, everyone would have gotten 73%.

Appointments

The GA approved the appointment of Munira Lokhandawala, a grad student in Film and Media Studies, to the campus Police Review Board.

Resolution 1009c

The GA considered 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations, dealing with funding policy. The bill was amended on the floor and was tabled.

Appointments Ratification

When the GA held elections, nobody was nominated for Project Liaison Coordinator position. Since the position is busy during the summer, the Executive Board appointed Ms. De La Torre, and a vote was needed to elect all Officers. Ms. De La Torre said her goal was to publicize the Projects. The GA elected Ms. De La Torre as Project Coordinator Liaison.

One person on the Lower Sproul Fee Committee is jointly appointed by the ASUC and the GA. The nominee, Waleed Abed, is an undergraduate who works for the GA. The GA elected Waleed Abed to the Lower Sproul Fee Committee.

Approval of Executive Board Summer Decisions

The GA considered Resolutions to approve decisions made by the Exec Board over the summer.

The GA considered Resolution 1009a, On By-law Amendment to Allow Changes of Delegate Assembly Meeting Dates. The By-laws set a fixed date for GA meetings, with no mechanism for moving the date. The Resolution was amended and approved, and would allow the Assembly to change meeting dates with a three-fourths vote.

The GA considered Resolution, 1009b, On Budget Amendment to Allocate 2009-10 Graduate Assembly Surplus. The GA has a surplus of \$37,000 and also received an unrestricted grant of \$10,000 from the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. The Resolution allocates \$47K, with most of the money going to group funding and reserves, as well as to staff and projects. The GA approved the Resolution.

Questions on May-August 2010 GA Report

No questions were raised.

Resolution 1009c On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations

The Resolution was taken from the table. The GA amended it by removing clause 4), which would have created work groups. The version of 1009c under consideration had been substituted by the author, and the Assembly approved the substitute amendment.

The question was divided, to vote on clauses of the Resolved Clause separately. The GA approved clauses 5) and 1), which call for the Rules Committee to develop a proposal on funding policies and to reaffirm that funding procedures require a two-thirds vote of the Assembly.

A motion to extend speaking time failed by hand-vote.

1009c will be considered at the next meeting, beginning with clause 2).

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This Special Meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Philippe Marchand at 5:11 p.m. in the Tan Oak Room, MLK Student Union.

INTRODUCTION TO THE GA

Mr. Marchand introduced himself and said he was the interim GA President. He'd introduce different components of the GA. The Delegate Assembly is the main legislative or decision-making body. The Executive Board is elected by the Delegate Assembly to deal with the day-to-day work of the GA between Delegate Assembly meetings. Projects were another important part of the GA, with seven Project Coordinator positions that have been created over the years, some of which actually pre-date the GA itself. Project Coordinators are hired to work on organizing events, either for specific constituencies

groups of the graduate student population or for the general population. And finally, the GA has an administrative office, the Business Office. This is where both full-time and student Work Study staff carry out the administrative duties of the GA.

Susan Hsueh, Business Manager, introduced herself. Only two career staff work for the GA. Everybody else was a student. The Business Office has a different structure. The Associated Students of UC, the ASUC, was established 124 years ago. In the 1960s a group of graduate students decided that since many issues in the ASUC pertained to undergraduate students, it was important to have a graduate student body. So in 1967, the GA was formed.

When people talk about the ASUC, they're talking about undergrads. But the GA is under the same umbrella as the ASUC. In 1998 the ASUC had a \$6 million deficit and an agreement was reached with the UC Office of the President, and the ASUC Auxiliary was created to manage the ASUC's daily operations. Ms. Hsueh said she is an ASUC Auxiliary employee and has worked for UC Berkeley for 28 years. Five years ago she applied for the job of Business Office Manager and started that position.

Ms. Hsueh said that people who work at the front desk are hired by the ASUC Auxiliary. Other staff, such as the GA President, and other positions within the GA, are paid with stipends paid by the ASUC Auxiliary.

Ms. Hsueh said the Business Office is the management and accounting operation of the Graduate Assembly. When they think about money, it involves the Business Office. She's hired as a fiscal agent. Her responsibility is to make sure the GA doesn't spend more money than it has. She works very closely with GA elected officers and with Project Coordinators. Anybody who attended a funding workshop know that each student pays a fee, \$27.50 a semester, and that's earmarked for student fees, for the ASUC. But one-third of all student fees goes to pay for financial aid. So every year, each grad pays about \$38 to the GA, and there are 10,000-plus graduate and professional students.

The GA has about \$417,000 to \$420,000 from this. They put one-third back to student groups to apply for funding. For such things as travel grants, people could go to the GA Web site and look at their funding programs. And then a third of GA income goes back to the projects. Each Project Coordinator has a set amount of programs and knows how much they could spend for their fliers, e.g. She didn't know how many people at the meeting attended the Graduate Social Club's Back to School Night, \$5 for all-you-could-drink beer and eat pizza. The GA subsidized that, and subsidizes all the projects.

Ms. Hsueh said the last third of the GA's budget pays for the Project Coordinators, the Exec Board, salaries, stipends to Chairs, \$500, for which they're asked to do a lot.

In addition to student fees, the GA receives \$50,000 from a Coca-Cola contract. It was written ten years ago and expires in the spring of 2011. The GA and the ASUC were negotiating a new beverage contract. Some people have said they don't want to do anything with Coke, and that was for the GA to decide. She wouldn't get into that. Whatever money the GA doesn't spend, she puts aside. As those who were there last year remember, the GA was able to put aside \$100,000 into the campus' endowment, the Berkeley Foundation. That will start to pay interest that the GA could tap into and put back into the GA budget.

Ms. Hsueh said the GA receives student fees. Since enrollment was growing, the GA will hopefully continue to receive around \$420,000 each year, not counting the \$50,000 from Coke. Whether that continues was up to the students.

Introduction to the GA (cont'd)

- 6 -

Ms. Hsueh said the GA Exec Board, with Delegate approval, was able to put \$322,000 aside, from commercial revenue.

Ms. Hsueh said the GA also receives some funding from the Graduate Division, which has always been very generous. The Grad Division, for the year to come, has promised \$10,000.

Mr. Marchand said the GA's organizational chart was shown on the screen. The Business Office is part of the ASUC Auxiliary and works closely with the Executive Board and would Projects. Ms. Hsueh is the Manager. The GA also should have another full-time position, a Funding Advisor, a career staff position. It was currently occupied by a student while they search for a full-time staffperson.

Students in charge of the front desk and in charge of reimbursements and finance processes were also part of the Business Office. Finally, Mr. Marchand said he would introduce Executive Assistant, Lindsay Cast, who helps the GA organize meetings and who does a lot of support work for the Executive Board.

Mr. Marchand said he would ask Elizabeth De La Torre to talk about the seven projects that were part of the Graduate Assembly. Ms. De La Torre introduced herself and said she was a second-year Law student. She wasn't a Delegate last year, but went to an event put on by one of the projects, the Graduate Women's Project. She really liked it so she kept going to Projects' events. And then she found out the position of Project Liaison was open. The position oversees all the projects and makes sure that people attend events, that they're well planned, that budgets were being met, etc. The GA has seven projects that she'll go through.

The Graduate Women's Project meets the special needs of women. Since women weren't allowed in higher education for a long time, they still have some special needs in terms of relationship, negotiations, and the space they have. Events this Project puts on are for women, but everyone was invited. It put on things like a study hall, which was usually held on Saturdays. Once a month there was a space for people to do homework. It's really quiet with food throughout the day, as well as tea, snacks, and little breaks for meditation and yoga.

Kimberly McNair said she'd talk about the Women of Color Initiative. A group of undergraduate and graduate women got together 26 years ago to hold a really big conference, the Empowering Women of Color Conference. It happens once a year. People come from all over the United States. As an undergraduate in Southern California, she attended one of those Conferences. It will happen this year on February 19, and everybody was invited, and these events were not exclusive. This year, Angela Davis and Erika Huggins will be the speakers.

The Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project (GMORR) tries to recruit undergraduate students into the graduate level of education. The Graduate Support Services Project (GSSP) had a student orientation for grads with 500 people there, to introduce people to the campus and let them know about things people should know as a resident of Berkeley. The Graduate Minority Student Project (GMSP) deals with retention. Minority students of color were really underrepresented at the graduate level, and they want to keep the ones who are here. So the GMSP has events and information to try and help minority students of color. It held a Graduate Minority Student Orientation that was really success-

ful, with 90 graduates attending. “The Berkeley Graduate” is a blog online, operated by Lucy Diekman, who will be at the next meeting. It has articles on things like where to get good barbecue.

Introduction to the GA (cont'd)

- 7 -

For the Grad Social Club, Ashley Russell said that if people want to join their committee, they'd love to have them. They have a couple of really big events each semester and need help. It wasn't too much of a commitment.

Mr. Marchand said that most of the Executive Officers were present, and he'd ask them to please make a short presentation about their offices.

Mr. Marchand said the GA President of the GA has a lot of roles, very few of which were explicit in the By-laws. The President is the Chair of the Delegate Assembly meeting, although that can be delegated. The President is the main spokesperson, and the GA or the Exec Board can direct the President to write a letter or take a stance on behalf of the GA. The President is also ultimately responsible for making sure there's good communication at the GA internally, with the Delegates, and with the general student population. This person also goes to meetings with various administrators.

Alberto Ortega introduced himself said a lot of what the External Affairs VP and Committee does comes from individual and GA initiatives. The position is reactive and proactive in terms of what they take on. He thought the External Affairs Committee does a lot of great stuff. They work with the OP at the UC System. They typically go to Washington, D.C. once a year, and to Sacramento a couple of times a year, and talk to legislators. People could get involved in any capacity that any of them were interested in. People make policy statements and show up at meetings. Some of the things they're looking at include the Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan; a graduate student Bill of Rights; trying to restore the tax exempt status of fellowships and scholarships; immigration reform, specifically F-1 and H-1 visas; loan forgiveness; having the State provide enough budgetary support to the University; getting more student representation on committees at the City level, such as with AC Transit and public safety. External Affairs was really broad and encompassed anything that went beyond UC Berkeley. If there's anything that affects people or that the Office and Committee should consider, he would ask them to let him know, even if they don't want to be involved.

Mr. Marchand said the Campus Affairs Vice President Rekia Jibrin had to leave the GA for personal and family reasons. They'll elect a new VP next week. Until then, Danielle Love, the CAVP Chief-of-Staff, will be the acting CAVP. Ms. Love introduced herself and said the position was concerned with things happening on the campus. The CAVP meets with administrators to make sure their graduate student experience was amazing. There's also a Campus Affairs Committee people were invited to serve on. Another responsibility of the position was to appoint people to campus-wide committees. There are openings on the Graduate Council Advisory Committee on GSI Affairs, a fee referendum committee, the Health Fee Advisory Board, the Life Safety Fee Committee, the Durant Hall Program Committee, the East Asian Library and Studies Center Committee, Energy Biosciences Institute, the Helios Building Program Committee; the Li Ka Shing Program Committee; and the Dean of Students Advisory Council. If any of these sounded interesting, there was more information on the GA Web site.

Mr. Marchand said people already met Ms. De La Torre, the Project Liaison. The position is a member of the Executive Board and helps with internal communications between the Exec Board and the Project Coordinators.

Tiffany Ng introduced herself and said she was the Chair of the Rules Committee. Its purpose is to conduct an annual review of the By-laws and Charter. The Charter was seriously out of date. They analyze

Introduction to the GA (cont'd)

- 8 -

virtually all of the Resolutions in advance of GA discussion and keep an eye out for any discrepancies between the By-laws and current practices of the GA. The Committee was surprisingly interesting. The documents they deal with are online, and people were encouraged to read them. People could e-mail her at rules@ga.berkeley.edu.

Mr. Marchand said there's a list outside of GA committees. Everyone who turned in their feedback form by Monday got their first choice of committee. All committees except for Funding still have vacancies. During the break, people could check their names for their committees or sign up for one.

Michael Nicholas introduced himself and said he was the Budget Committee Chair. The Committee basically makes the budget for next year, which occurs in the spring. They'll look at how this year's budget was used and handle any amendments that are necessary. They work with Ms. Hsueh on the projected budget in relation to their actual monies, and then create a budget.

Mary Whelan introduced herself and said she was the Funding Committee Chair. They look over all the applications from students and in the case of grants, decide whether the application warrants receiving \$1,500, or for Graduate Meetings, Events, and Resources, making sure nothing that looked shady was being requested and that the request was in the best interests of the graduate community. This Committee is a great way to get exposed to everything happening on campus as far as what the GA actually funds. It was pretty fun and it was really important to have a lot of perspectives. They have lively debates.

Mr. Marchand said they have a new position, since the Technology Chair was renamed the Communications Chair. Brad Froehle introduced himself and said he was the Communications Committee Chair. The Committee was starting this year. Its scope has been increased with the name change. He envisioned tackling issues relating to how they communicate internally, their Web site, information that's published, making announcements, and as a whole, making communications more effective. One possibility was to send out a newsletter once a month or once a semester, or redesigning the logo or freshening up brochures. He really needed folks from the technology side and from the visual arts/graphic design side, as well as writers.

Mr. Marchand said two Committee Chairs were absent, the Environmental Sustainability Chair, Jordan Zachritz, and the International Student Affairs Committee Chair, Dhawal Mujumdar. Projects these Committee take on are determined by the interest of people who sit on them. The ES Committee got a grant two years ago, e.g., to design a new recycling bin that was more ergonomic. They now have a design and will mass produce them.

Mr. Marchand said that besides Committee chairs, there are three Graduate Council representative who are members of the Executive Board, and one alternate who replaces any rep if they can't make a meeting of the Grad Council or the Exec Board. Samveg Saxena introduced himself and said the Grad Council deals with many of the academic affairs that affect people in individual programs. They do departmental

and graduate group reviews and work on policy, such as making it possible to hand in electronic dissertations, which was just approved by the Grad Council last year. There's one open position.

Mr. Marchand said that concludes the overview of people working in the GA. They would take a break at that time. This meeting was recessed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements

- 9 -

Back in session, with Tiffany Ng chairing the meeting, she called for any announcements.

Ms. Pannu said she was from the Law School. She and others from the Law School just wanted to take this time to acknowledge that last week's meeting was really crazy and that the tone was really rough. She thought it was a particularly disempowering and difficult experience for people who had not been exposed to that method of Robert's Rules. The Law delegation just wanted to say that to the extent they furthered that, they sincerely apologize and they really hope that they're able to work and speak together. Lawyers have a really bad habit of caring about process as well as substance, and sometimes process more than substance. And that was kind of what people saw. They'll try to tone that down a little bit and try to make sure that the Delegate Assembly was a comfortable place for everybody to participate and that they don't make that harder for people. For new Delegates in particular, the Law delegation was very sorry that last week was their first introduction to the Graduate Assembly. They hope it was an isolated event that won't happen again. They really do want to work collaboratively with everyone, and they just wanted to take this time to support that vision, of a collective body that worked together.

Ms. Ng said that Mickey McCoy would speak about the October 7 Day of Action. Ms. McCoy introduced herself and said she was a Delegate from the History of Art Department. The main point of the Day of Action was that the student movement has a message, that they're not ready to go back to business as usual. There's concern for their education. She'll send an e-mail to Delegates about ways to get involved for GSIs and all graduate students. If people are interested in forwarding the e-mail to their respective departments, that would be appreciated.

Ms. Ng said she just wanted to go over a little rules refresher, especially for new Delegates. There were a couple of motions people should keep in mind. Tabling postpones consideration of a main motion until somebody moves to take the item from the table. Moving the previous question means ending debate and moving to a vote. Something could also be referred to committee, which is useful for contentious debates and if the GA didn't arrive at a solution in two hours. People can amend some aspect of a motion or resolution as long as it remains within the scope of the topic. People can call for the orders of the day if the GA has gone over time. If people have a question they could call for a point of information, and can call for a point of information about Robert's Rules if they don't know how to make a motion they want to make. This will be the last time he does it, but Mr. Daal has volunteered to be their Robert's Rules consultant, and people could contact him at Gchat. She wanted to thank him for that.

Ms. Ng said she'd clarify a couple of motions that were probably misunderstood a little bit at the previous meeting. A point of order is used to point out that some aspect of a motion doesn't comply with the rules. The person raising the point explains what they thought was being violated and the chair makes a ruling. The chair's decision can be appealed. A point of personal privilege relates to comfort, such as wanting to open a window, or relates to charges against the official character of a member. So if someone insults someone's mother, a point of personal privilege could be raised, which the chair will, again, rule on.

Since the last Delegates meeting was a little extraordinary, Ms. Ng said they thought they'd specify speaker priority. People may speak once on a motion and then had to yield to others who haven't spoken. However, asking a question, making a suggestion, or making an unrelated motion didn't count for speaking on a question. This just allows everybody to be heard at least once.

Ms. Ng said she also wanted to point out the "info" signs that were available. Delegates were urged to put one up on a bulletin board in their department and to post underneath it all the little fliers and things they get at GA meetings.

Announcements (cont'd)
Approval of the Agenda
Resolution Referral

- 10 -

Finally, Ms. Ng said she just had a reminder that the GA will hold elections on October 7 for President, Campus Affairs Vice President, and Grad Council rep. People can nominate themselves or nominate others.

Ms. Ng said the GA will consider a nominee to the Police Review Board. PRB rules require a two-thirds vote of the GA to confirm the nomination. When the nominee arrives, unless there was an objection, they'll table what they were doing in order to take a vote. Mr. Rabkin asked if this was the City PRB or the campus PRB. Ms. Pannu said it was the campus PRB.

Ms. Ng said they would next hear from Waleed Abed. Mr. Abed introduced himself and said he was a fourth-year undergrad. He is the Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator. He was appointed by the GA as well as the ASUC to work on the Lower Sproul project. His job was to facilitate and coordinate communication among the major stakeholders on the Lower Sproul project. That includes campus administration and graduate and undergraduate students, represented by the GA and the ASUC. His job was to work with all three parties on everything relative to Lower Sproul. Recently, he's also been added to a few of the major committees relative to the project, mainly the Program Committee, which was the highest decision making unit for the project, and a few other committees below that, which serve as advisory committees.

Mr. Marchand said that Mr. Daal is the Lower Sproul designate and the main person working on the Lower Sproul project for the GA. He'll make a presentation at the next Delegates meeting and take questions at that time.

Ms. Ng said that later on in the agenda the GA will vote to confirm Mr. Abed's appointment.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Ng called for a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Rabkin said that they first needed to approve the minutes. Mr. Marchand said the recorder needed more than two weeks to prepare the minutes, and he provided the GA with a summary of the decisions made at their last meeting, although those weren't the official minutes. They'll approve the minutes from this meeting next week, and the minutes from this week at a later time.

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

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Ms. Ng said that normally, Resolutions are referred to committees without any substantial discussion, with the initial debate taking place in small groups. This was the time to make any motion to fast track a Resolution, or to refer them to other committees besides the ones listed. Seeing no objections, Resolutions were referred.

Resolution Referral (cont'd)
Presentation on Fall Funding Allocations by Ms. Whelan

- 11 -

Ms. Ng referred the following bills to committee:

1009d, To Establish Funding Committee Procedures, to the Budget, Funding, and Rules Committees

1009e, Action Agenda Item to Adopt a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target, to the Campus Affairs, Environmental Sustainability, and Rules Committees

PRESENTATION ON FALL FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

Ms. Ng said they have a PowerPoint presentation from Mary Whelan on this.

Mary Whelan introduced herself and said she was the Chair of the Funding Committee. She'll present the same slides that were presented at the May GA meeting, showing the results of the Funding Ad Hoc Committee that was convened last year. At the May meeting, she and the previous Funding Committee Chair, Asad Tahir, presented these to the Assembly.

People should have a hand out, with pie charts. There are four types of funding the GA gives out. The Travel Grant is something any graduate student can apply for, \$300 to present research, e.g., or attend a conference. The Funding Committee doesn't deal with that directly. Grants and Graduate Meetings, Events, and Resources (GMER) are two other things people can apply for. The fourth category of funding was Contingency, money that was set aside to deal with appeals and emergency allocations, if something timely comes up outside the normal funding process.

Ms. Whelan said that most of this money comes from student fees. Grads pay about \$27 in student fees a semester, and two-thirds of that comes to the GA. It's supposed to be put back to the students so they could enjoy quality student programming. This was the foundation of the argument that the GA should distribute funding on the basis of the percentage of student population served.

Initially what had been happening was that people would apply for grants and Meetings, Events, and Resources, and the requested amount would be more than the GA had. So the Funding Committee would simply take a percentage off the top from all of them. It was understood that doing that wasn't the most equitable situation because certain departments would be represented by more than one group and get the same amount of money as a student group that represented, e.g., all of the astronomers.

Ms. Whelan said the GA also had a decreasing budget, and their budget this year was less than last year. Another concern was the fact that student groups were constrained in the timeframe with which they could use the funding they were awarded. That resulted in a bunch of funds that were left over at the end of the semester because groups could only use the funding in a two-month timeframe. If a group didn't get its act together within that timeframe, the time couldn't be extended. So the Funding Committee wanted to extend the period of time in which people could use the funds they were allotted.

Under the old structure, if a group was awarded money at the beginning of the summer, they had until October 9 to spend it. And there were similar time constraints for other rounds. In the revised method, groups can apply once a semester and had until December 3 to use that money. This was meant to allow

Presentation on Fall Funding Allocations by Ms. Whelan (cont'd)

- 12 -

student groups more time to get their acts together and to actually produce the programming they wanted.

Under the old structure, there was a category, "Group Resources," which was for things needed to just run a group. This category was underused, and it seemed like it just made things a little more confusing. In the new structure, resources funding was included with Meetings and Events. They also made the Contingency Fund larger, so if a group wanted to suddenly respond to something, they could apply to get GA money out of round.

Mr. Whelan said that nothing has changed with the Travel Grant. It's a lottery, \$300 for conferences.

There are four general categories of merit that the GA considers for grants: to foster student activism; to foster community service or reaching out to the community; educational improvement and making the educational experience at Berkeley better; and improving campus diversity. These limits have not changed, and people could still get a maximum of \$1,500 per student group per semester. However, the change that came with this was to either fully fund grants or to not fund them at all. If they did a global cut across all grants, that meant projects would be produced that were slightly less exciting than the event people were applying for. If they only gave half the money, maybe the group, e.g., wouldn't get a speaker, or wouldn't have as many speakers. The idea for grants was to either go full bore or not at all. And grants would be given to the most meritorious applications.

Ms. Whelan said that Meetings, Events, and Resources is the category that has caused the most confusion and contention. People used to be able to apply for \$1,000, which was ridiculous, because the GA didn't have enough money to give that amount to everybody. So the Funding Committee dropped the cap down by half in the hope that they'd have enough money for everybody and they wouldn't have to do any cuts at all. They hoped dropping the cap would solve the problem.

Ms. Whelan said they decided on the idea of "super groups" in case they needed to apply budget cuts to student group funding. They grouped departments and determined the departments that were associated with the funding application and with whatever GA Delegate was specified as the contact. They grouped departments into thematic groups, each representing about 10% of the student population. As to why the Funding Committee went through this, it's because if they divided the funding by population, then Folklore, e.g., with three grads, would get \$14. So the Funding Committee created super groups so small departments weren't penalized for being small. And while it wasn't always correct, they assumed that groups in the same thematic group would probably attend each other's events. So people in math might go to an event put on by statisticians. That was the basis of doing things this way. Ms. Whelan said she'd concede it wasn't always correct, but for the most part, it's okay. This change meant that each super group

was guaranteed the amount of money that that group of departments paid in student fees that year. So students were guaranteed to get their money back if they were in a super group and applied for some money.

Ms. Whelan said the Contingency Fund was much larger this year than it was last year. The idea was that with this system, a lot of people will appeal. If someone has a really awesome idea for a project that didn't fall under any category, or there's an emergency, such as earthquake relief, it was good to have a mechanism to provide the resources of the GA to put something forward. So there wasn't a limit. But she couldn't imagine someone coming up with resources that cost more than \$1,500. There was a limit, after all, as to how many posters could be printed. But within reason, the Funding Committee looks at things, decides if something is reasonable, and then gives a recommendation to Delegates to approve or disapprove.

Presentation on Fall Funding Allocations by Ms. Whelan (cont'd)

- 13 -

A Delegate asked why the budget has decreased if fees haven't changed. Mr. Marchand said that in previous years, they budgeted for more expenses than they had in revenues. They decided that it was not sustainable to continue that. The budget was reduced overall and every department of the GA got a percentage cut. And they still have an excess of expenses over income in the projected budget. The GA put in an additional \$10,000 to Funding and they also received \$10,000 from the Graduate Division. Funding wasn't cut as much as other parts of the GA and is bigger than they budgeted for Funding last year. But the cap was \$1,000, and the usual cut to requests was about 50%.

Ms. Whelan said the Funding Guide wasn't ready by the last meeting last year and the Executive Board approved it on July 15th. The first funding workshops started on July 20.

As for the funding process, they got a whole bunch of applications. They have to project how many applications they'll get in the fall, the spring, in August, and in October. Before he left the GA in June, Mr. Tuchman, the Funding Advisor, made a guess for them. They got a whole bunch of applications on August 2 and decided on the breakdown for the year. For GMER, Fall Round 1 was \$21,996; for Round 2, \$14,664; Spring Round 1, \$14,664; and Round 2, \$9,776.

The 64 applications that came in for GMER on August 2 asked for \$32,000. The Funding Committee could only give out \$21,996. These applications weren't based on merit at all, so the Funding Committee basically went through them, made sure they weren't asking for anything crazy, anything that the GA couldn't fund, and checked whether the group followed directions and if the requests were reasonable. That was pretty much all they do. And then they do the initial allocations. They initially allocate as much money as a group requests and then would just take a percentage cut off of everybody. Now, because they have super groups, they didn't do that and did something different. If they had done a universal cut, people would have gotten 83% of what they asked for, awarding much less than previously. The Funding Committee considered what population was served for each application and then did the super group thing.

Ms. Whelan said she would go over the super groups. Business was 15% of the school, although Business groups never apply, as far as she knew. Humanities included a bunch of departments associated with each other. The Funding Committee wasn't sure how to divide them in another way. Humanities represents 16% of the school; Law is 10%; Public Policy, 10%; Biological Science, 9%; Mathematics, 11%; Engineering, 9%; Physical Science, 8%; Education, 4%; Professional Schools, 8%.

Ms. Whelan said the super groups represent all the student population.

As for what individual groups in the super groups requested, Law requested 34% of the total pot; Public Policy, 19%; Engineering, 16%; Biological Science, 12%; Math, 7%. Groups highlighted in blue asked for less than the amount of student fees that they paid in to begin with. That included Education, 2%, and Humanities, 4%. Those groups will be fully funded, because they're guaranteed to get back the amount those students paid in student fees.

As for the amount allocated, in the end, they take the excess from groups that didn't ask for their full amount and redistribute that based on population to the other super groups. Some people get fully funded, including Professional Schools, Education, Physical Science, Humanities, Mathematics, Biological Science, Engineering, and Public Policy. Public Policy got 22% and was fully funded; Law got 22% and got 53% of what those groups asked for.

Presentation on Fall Funding Allocations by Ms. Whelan (cont'd)

- 14 -

Ms. Whelan said GMER funding was primarily used for catering. She wanted to emphasize this point. It isn't Grants funding and isn't merit based. Ninety-three percent of this money is used for food at meetings.

Ms. Whelan said that for GMER only, in Round 1, for super groups, all were given what they asked for except for Law, which was given 53%. Despite the fact that this universal cut for Law was very large, Law still received 22% of the total funds given out for that Round.

One idea floating around was to give groups the amount of money they would have gotten under a universal cut, 83%, and taking \$2,786 out of the Contingency Fund to give to Law. That would bump Law up and change the total, with Law getting 31% of the total amount of amount of money the GA had to disburse, and would get 84% of the amount Law asked for.

If they look at Round 2, for GMER only, if this is approved, Education, Physical Science, Humanities, professional schools, and Math all get fully funded. Biological Science gets funded at 81%; Law at 63%; Public Policy, 53%; and Engineering, 43%. As they could see, the system wasn't set up to screw one group. But at the same time, people are asking for more money than the GA has. The argument is that universal cuts were not the most equitable, and the new system might be more equitable. Under universal cuts, everyone would have gotten 73%. That would mean that the two applications from the Education School would get 73% of their request, even though they represent a much larger group of people than another super group that asked for more money.

Mr. Rabkin asked which individual was responsible for dividing groups into super groups. Ms. Whelan said it was a collaborative process. It has been pointed out that if someone really wanted to game the system, if someone in Engineering knew someone in Dramatics, they could just get a hookup and get fully funded. If people had any suggestions as to how to better divide the super groups, that would be great. But any system could be gamed.

Mr. Rabkin asked if there was a place online where people could see each super group. Humanities had Social Sciences and the Humanities. Ms. Whelan said there are 40 departments in Humanities. They could post the composition of the super groups on the Web site.

A Delegate asked where interdepartmental student groups fell. Ms. Whelan said that if two departments are listed, e.g., she'd take half the amount of money requested and pretend they applied in one super group and then the other half would be run as if it was applied for in the other super group.

A Delegate said it was mentioned that some things were recommended by the Ad Hoc Funding Committee, which she'd assume was different from the regular Funding Committee. She asked how many Delegates were on the Funding Ad Hoc Committee. Ms. Whelan said it was disbanded once its recommendations were submitted. Mr. Kline said that as he recalled, it was himself, Mr. Tahir, one other Funding Committee member, and one non-Funding Committee Delegate. It was whoever showed up. Everybody was welcomed and they encouraged input from groups. Ms. Whelan said a report was given to the GA at the April meeting, and then a presentation was given to the GA in May.

A Delegate suggested asking for an accounting of people's majors in an organization to prevent any gaming of the system.

Presentation on Fall Funding Allocations by Ms. Whelan (cont'd)

- 15 -

Appointments

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations

Mr. Rabkin asked if student groups could challenge what super group they were in, and asked if the Funding Committee could decide on that. Mr. Whelan said that was possible, and it has representatives from all over campus. Mr. Rabkin said this could be discussed, and this wasn't a decision that was set in place. Ms. Whelan it wasn't. It was wishy-washy to begin with, and wasn't hard science.

Ms. Navab said it was explained what Law would have gotten if it was funded 83%. She asked if they knew the projections for Round 2, and asked what they would have gotten with universal cuts. Ms. Whelan said it was 73%. Mr. Marchand said the reason there was Contingency in Round 1 was because there were already funds promised in Round 1. But for Round 2, nothing was promised. So that option didn't require money from Contingency.

Ms. Whelan said that unless the GA instructed her to do otherwise, this was what she was going to do for Round 2, because this is the system that was recommended to her, after much debate.

APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Ng said they would hear from Munira Lokhandawala. Ms. Lokhandawala introduced herself and said she was a grad student in Film and Media Studies and was running to be appointed from the Police Review Board. She came to the meeting to introduced herself and answer any questions. She's been involved in student activism for the last three years and was an active rank-and-file member of the UAW. She was really excited about working with the GA and representing graduate students on the Police Review Board.

Mr. Marchand said he's been to a meeting of the PRB. It's composed of representatives from different constituencies, including grads and undergrads, the community, a retired police officer, a faculty member, and a former judge. Among other tasks, if somebody makes a complaint with the UCPD and aren't satis-

fied with the result, they could appeal to this independent Board, which reports to the Chancellor. The Campus Affairs VP has recommended appointing Ms. Lokhandawala to the PRB.

Ms. Ng called for any questions. Seeing no questions, Ms. Ng said they would have a discussion off the record and come to a vote. A discussion was held off the record and a vote occurred.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MUNIRA LOKHANDAWALA AS THE GA REPRESENTATIVE ON THE POLICE REVIEW BOARD PASSED BY HAND-VOTE. Ms. Ng said she would like to congratulate her.

Resolution 1009c

The following Resolution, 1009c, as amended by the author, was authored by Danny Kramer:

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 16 -

RESOLUTION ON ASSEMBLY REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE AUTHORIZATION, EVALUATION OF FUNDING OUTCOMES, AND COMMITMENT TO STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

WHEREAS, funding procedures are an issue of significant concern to the Delegate Assembly that impacts all graduate student organizations and departments; and

WHEREAS, Graduate Assembly ("GA") By-laws 4.13, 4.14.4, and 6.4.1.5 recognize this significance through their combined requirement that funding procedures must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly; and

WHEREAS, there is stark disagreement between departments over whether the Funding Committee or Executive Board had -- or had been delegated -- the authority to adopt and enact new funding procedures in advance of the September 16, 2010, Delegate Assembly Meeting; and

WHEREAS, as the Executive Board considers itself to have enacted a funding guide, there is further disagreement and misunderstanding over whether the summer enactment constitutes in effect the creation of a new funding procedure; and

WHEREAS, the new funding procedures enacted by the Funding Committee included, in part, the establishment of a "Super group" categorization structure and the imposition of \$500-per-group caps for funding granted through the Group Meetings, Events and Resources (GMERF) Fund; and

WHEREAS, disagreement over the authority to enact these changes, along with a misunderstanding about the application of these new funding procedures, led to unforeseen funding consequences for organizations and departments; and

WHEREAS, a sudden change in GMER funding procedures resulted in drastic funding cuts of 52% to 60% for student organizations housed within a single department (Law), resulting in substantial hardship and the inability to sustain basic programs; and

WHEREAS, this transition in funding seems, intended to improve the equitable distribution of student group funding, has instead inspired frustration across department, indicating the necessity of further conversation and potential alternatives; and

WHEREAS, it is unfair to penalize groups whose expectations and applications relied on either the "new" (super group) or "old" (global cut) funding systems remaining in force in Rounds 1 and 2 for fall 2010;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that:

1. The Graduate Assembly re-affirms the principles set forth in GA By-law 6.4.1.5 that all funding procedures must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly, *and such approval authority does not extend to the Executive Board when the Delegate Assembly is not in session.*
2. Preserving a \$500-per-group funding cap for fall 2010, the Delegate Assembly directs the Funding Committee to:

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 17 -

RESOLUTION ON ASSEMBLY REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE AUTHORIZATION, EVALUATION OF FUNDING OUTCOMES, AND COMMITMENT TO STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS (cont'd)

- a. Maintain that no student group receives less than their reported allocation in the Round 1 and Round 2 GMER Funding reports for fall 2010 under the super group system;
- b. Ensure student groups that would have received greater funding under the global cut system will be "topped up" to no more than they would have received under the old (global cut) system (a 34.6% reduction), assuming Round 1 and Round 2 funds are commingled and that groups may only apply once in fall 2010 for GMER funding. These "top up" funds will be allocated from Contingency, or from another fund if deemed appropriate by the Funding Committee (with Delegate Assembly approval).

This clause (clause 2) *only* applies to GMER funding and does not apply to Grants.

3. The funding system -- enacted on July 15, 2010, by the Executive Board and in force for Round 1 and 2 in fall 2010 -- is hereby disapproved and repealed for all future funding rounds, effective with Round 3 (GMER, Grants, Contingency). This provision may be overridden by the proper introduction and approval of funding procedures with a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly.
4. Consistent with Section 4 of the GA by-laws, and continuing the valuable efforts of the Spring 2010 Ad-Hoc Funding Procedures Committee, the Delegate Assembly hereby creates the Workgroup on Funding Procedures.

Workgroup Purpose & Mandate. The Workgroup will analyze, craft, and propose

comprehensive funding procedures with the goal that these new procedures be enacted and approved by the Delegate Assembly no later than its December 2010 meeting, or prior to distribution of funding information for Round 3.

Workgroup Membership. This Workgroup will strive to ensure its membership represents a diversity of disciplines (and departments). No department may have more than two (2) members, and no department may constitute a majority of the Workgroup. The total membership of the Workgroup may not exceed fourteen (14) delegates and must have at least three (3) delegates.

Sunset Provision. The Workgroup shall be dissolved on December 31, 2010 unless otherwise directed by the Delegate Assembly.

5. The Delegate Assembly directs the Rules Committee to develop a concrete proposal to (1) clarify “funding procedures” and the “Funding Guide”; (2) define and clarify the relationship between the GA By-laws, the funding procedures, and the Funding Guide, and (3) if necessary, amend the By-laws accordingly.

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 18 -

Mr. Sheen introduced himself and said he was a Delegate from the Law School. For people who were there at the last meeting, this item was probably really confusing and a little crazy. Since then they've had a series of informal conversations among individuals and among groups, pretty much all sorts of people who have been involved in this proposal, to talk about the problem and what they could do to fix it or move forward.

Mr. Sheen said they came to the conclusion that there were just some things they just weren't going to be able to agree upon. What they wanted to do with the amended Resolution was to lay out how to get where they want to be.

A couple of principles come into this. In the summer the Executive Board approved a funding guide. The first point of contention was whether the funding guide was procedures that should have been passed by the Delegate Assembly. That issue was now resolved. But people have disagreements with it. A Whereas Clause acknowledges the haziness involved and the misunderstanding between a funding guide or funding procedures.

Mr. Sheen said there was also a question as to who had the authority to do what. The Resolution acknowledges that there's contention on that as well, and leaving it at that. They also described what the funding system looks like.

Mr. Sheen said he thought the problem stems from seeing the results of what happened. A number of groups were finding out for the first time that the results of this new funding system were not what they expected, and they want to look further into how to fix things.

Mr. Sheen said the Resolved Clause has five clauses. It states that funding procedures must be approved by a two-thirds vote. Secondly, for groups that didn't receive 100% of what they requested last year, the Resolution would top them up to what they would have received under the global cut system, and not

what they requested. It was calculated to be a 34.6% reduction. They calculate that it's close to \$1,700 from the Contingency Fund to compensate those groups. The third Resolved Clause would disapprove the funding system enacted by the Exec Board in the summer. That would leave the GA in limbo for procedures going forward. That led to the fourth clause, which creates a work group or process, where more people could participate. The last clause is a directive to the Rules Committee to clarify the difference between the funding guide and funding procedures.

Mr. Marchand said the GA should first vote on whether to approve the amended version.

A Delegate moved to amend the Resolution to remove the section in italics from the first point. The motion was seconded. The amendment would have 1) read as follows:

“1. The Graduate Assembly re-affirms the principles set forth in GA By-law 6.4.1.5 that all funding procedures must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly. ~~and such approval authority does not extend to the Executive Board when the Delegate Assembly is not in session.~~”

A Delegate said she didn't understand why, if the Executive Board could meet when the Assembly wasn't in session, why the GA has a Delegate Assembly at all, and why they didn't just have an Exec Board to decide things.

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 19 -

Ms. Ng said she would respond to that as Rules Chair. There is a By-law that states that the Executive Board can act in times of urgency with the Delegate Assembly's powers. However, that wasn't normally exercised.

A Delegate said that during the summer she was there, but she didn't know how many of them were there in total. A lot of people go home. So in order to hear everyone's opinion was partially why the Exec Board has that power. When this clause was written, it was expected that the E-Board would be reasonable; and she thought they have been.

Mr. Ortega said that all decisions the Exec Board makes had to be approved by the Delegates. It wasn't as if every decision of the E-Board was the final say. It was all subject to being approved, amended, or rescinded by the Delegates.

Mr. Ortega said he had a question for the person offering the amendment. A Delegate said he was from Law. He asked why there was a desire to acquiesce this power from the GA over to the Exec Board without showing as to why this qualified as an emergency. He understood there would be a working committee.

Mr. Apgar said this wasn't about giving up power to the E-Board, because the Delegate Assembly has the authority to review all E-Board decisions, as stated in the By-laws. It was so that when the Assembly wasn't in session, the E-Board could take action that it needed to take. In this case that had to do with funding procedures, and there was some immediate concern that the E-Board should enact what was needed. Once the GA was back in session, then the GA could review the action. But it would be silly to have a situation where something needed to happen and they had to wait three months for a Delegate Assembly meeting to act.

A Delegate said the GA's power to review decisions made by the E-Board doesn't exist if the E-Board proceeds with the decision, the GA hasn't had a chance to review the decision, and events have already taken place.

Ms. Hagar asked if the part in italics in 1) was not in the By-laws. Ms. Ng said that was correct. Perhaps it was more an interpretation of the By-laws.

Ms. Hsueh said that due to a lot of student demand in the past, the GA always has the first round application deadline in August, in anticipation of student groups that want to have an orientation, welcome events, etc. In order to proceed they need to have a funding guide in order to accept applications and process them. If people decide not to have a funding round in August, then everything can resume and they'd have the first funding round in September, after the Delegates meeting. Then there would be no questions about this.

A Delegate said she thought that only Delegates were allowed to talk on the floor. Ms. Ng asked if she was making an objection. The Delegate said she just wanted to clarify what happened. Ms. Ng said informally, they generally tend to allow staff to speak at Delegate Assembly meetings. If someone objects, the GA could also entertain a motion to allow them to speak for the rest of the meeting. The Delegate asked if Executive Officers were allowed to speak as well. Ms. Ng said they're allowed to speak on the floor, but they can't make motions or vote.

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 20 -

Mr. Kline said the text in italics in clause 1) contradicts a section of the By-laws even if it remains, even if the amendment is amended and they approve the Resolution. The Resolution has no authority over the By-laws, and the By-laws supersede the Resolution. If the GA wanted to have this go into effect, the proper thing to do would be to amend the By-laws. He thought the wording should be struck from the amendment because the language was pointless.

Ms. Navab said she understood it was pointless, but thought it echoed at the sentiments of the Delegates, rather than making a By-law change. If people read the Resolution carefully, it doesn't talk about funding guidelines or rounds, and just mentions funding procedures. She understood the E-Board approves a funding round, during the summer. That has happened for years and it was pretty normal. She wasn't questioning the Board's right to approve that funding round, but she was questioning the Board's authority to approve funding procedures. And that's what the italicized wording in 1) refers to. If they read the GA's By-laws, 4.1.3, which was not what the Resolution refers to, it states that for procedures, each committee can make any procedures to fulfill its duties. The E-Board can approve it, except for funding, because funding rules had to go to the Delegates. So it was clearly laid out that Delegates were supposed to do amend the By-laws, and not the E-Board. It didn't seem justified to her that there was an immediate condition to change procedures. Changing an actual round was fine, but changing the procedures by which the GA allocates funding wasn't fine. The E-Board should have done what was done in the past, and if they didn't like it, then the Board should have proceeded to change it after Round 2. If the Assembly wanted to change funding procedures, it was the GA's right to do so. But the By-laws specifically say the Executive Board can't do it.

Mr. Rabkin said that on behalf of the Rules Committee, regardless of what happens with this Resolution, the Committee's first order of business was to work with the By-laws.

A Delegate said that this was talking about procedures, not funding rounds.

Mr. Froehle said that since people could agree that this was a disagreement with the GA's By-laws, he thought it would be best to strike the text. They do enough silly things, such as passing Resolutions they know were slightly contradictory to their other documents, and then in a year or two, they look back and get very confused about what the thinking was. If they know the proposed wording was in disagreement with the By-laws, the GA should simply remove it and move on.

Mr. Apgar said that in response to a point made previously, about funding procedures, the Resolution states that the Executive Board can approve procedures, except for funding. Mr. Apgar said that if that was the responsibility of the Delegate Assembly, then if the E-Board acts as the Delegate Assembly, which it would if it followed other By-laws, then things would fall in line, since the Funding Committee was acting in place of the Delegate Assembly, or until the Delegate Assembly was formed.

Ms. Navab said part of the By-law that states that only for immediate cause to take action could the Exec Board make these changes.

A Delegate said it wasn't clear that the Resolved Clause contradicts the By-laws. It was up to interpretation.

Mr. Daal asked if the GA has a funding procedure. Mr. Kline said there's no difference between funding procedures and the funding report. Mr. Marchand said he wrote a document giving his analysis on

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 21 -
Appointments Ratification

funding procedures, the funding guide, and funding reports. He did that after going through the By-laws with Lindsay Cast. There are conflicts between the funding procedures and the funding guide. There are funding procedures, but they don't talk about "super groups" or "global cuts." He would say getting the funding guide approved over the summer was very pressing and timely. They had to allocate funding and needed procedures. The funding guide is normally approved by the Exec Board over the summer.

A Delegate moved to call the question. The motion to end debate on the amendment was seconded and passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT, STRIKING LANGUAGE FROM 1) OF THE RESOLVED CLAUSE, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

A Delegate moved to amend the Resolution by striking language about creating a work group. Such a group was created last year. Just because the Law School didn't like the results didn't mean they should create a new work group. The motion would remove clause 4) of the Resolved Clause. The motion to amend was seconded.

A motion to extend speaking time by 15 minutes was made and seconded and failed by hand-vote.

Mr. Apgar moved to table the Resolution. The motion was seconded.

THE MOTION TO TABLE 1009c, AS AMENDED, RESOLUTION ON ASSEMBLY REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE AUTHORIZATION, EVALUATION OF FUNDING OUTCOMES, AND COMMITMENT TO STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

APPOINTMENTS RATIFICATION

Ms. Ng said that Mr. Marchand would explain the positions of Project Coordinator Liaison and Lower Sproul Fee Committee. Mr. Marchand said the Project Coordinator Liaison is an Officer position within the GA. Last year, when they had an election for GA positions, nobody was elected for this position, so it remained vacant. Because this position has quite a lot of work to do in the summer, the Exec Board, acting on behalf of the Assembly, appointed Elizabeth De La Torre, who did a presentation earlier about the position. A vote was needed to elect all Officers.

Ms. De La Torre said she really liked what Projects do and how they deal with the graduate community. Her goal was to publicize them more so more grads know about them. She ran as for the position in April and somebody else won. That person had to leave, so luckily, Ms. De La Torre was contacted again. She couldn't attend the GA's May meeting for an election, but got appointed. She call for any questions.

Mr. Froehle noted that the vote in May was very close.

A Delegate asked if she was running unopposed. Mr. Marchand said that since they had to make an interim liaison, the Exec Board was proposing to confirm that appointment. If the Assembly wanted to have an election, they could vote down the appointment, after which anybody could run for the position.

Appointments Ratification (cont'd)

- 22 -

Approval of Exec Board Summer Decisions -- Resolution 1009a, On By-law Amendment to Allow Changes of Delegate Assembly Meeting Dates

A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE ELIZABETH DE LA TORRE AS PROJECT COORDINATOR LIAISON PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng said she would like to congratulate her. (Applause)

Ms. Ng start the next appointment was to the Lower Sproul Committee. Mr. Marchand said there are three Lower Sproul committees. The main one was the Program Committee. The Project-Related Work Group feeds recommendations to the Program Committee and the Committee on the Student Fee. Committee appointments are made by the GA President or the Campus Affairs VP. There was an exception because on the Lower Sproul Fee Committee, there are two grads, himself and a Law student who was the only grad to apply when applicants were recruited last spring. The ASUC also appoints two reps. There's one person jointly appointed by the ASUC and the GA, Waleed Abed. Mr. Abed is an undergraduate and works for the GA. The GA thinks he's a good choice. He'll be involved in all aspects of Lower Sproul. Since the Senate approved him, they just need the GA to also approve him as the At-large member of the Lower Sproul Student Fee Committee.

A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE WALEED ABED TO THE LOWER SPROUL STUDENT FEE COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE BOARD SUMMER DECISIONS

The following Resolution, Resolution 1009a, was authored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO ALLOW CHANGES OF DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MEETING DATES

WHEREAS, the current GA By-laws set a fixed date for Delegate Assembly meetings, with no mechanism to move a meeting to a different date; and

WHEREAS, changing the date of Delegate Assembly meetings could be desirable, for example when the fixed date falls on a holiday;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that section 3.1. of the GA By-laws be amended as follow (addition in italics):

3.1. Regular Meetings. The Delegate Assembly shall have regular meetings on the second Thursday of September and the first Thursday of October, November, December, February, March, April, and May. Any regular meeting may be rescheduled by a vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Delegate Assembly.

Mr. Marchand said there's a clause in the By-laws stating exactly when Delegate Assembly meetings will occur. That date, the second Thursday of September, fell on a Jewish holiday, Rosh Hashanah. So the

Approval of E. Board Summer Decisions -- Resolution 1009a, On By-law Amendment to Allow - 23 -
Changes of Delegate Assembly Meeting Dates (cont'd)

Exec Board thought they'd move the meeting a week, so as not to have that conflict and to have more time to recruit new Delegates. Unfortunately, the By-laws are so fixed that there's no mechanism to change the date. Some people might fear the Exec Board, acting as the Assembly, might make a By-law change for very evil purposes. But all he wanted to do was to move one meeting one week. In the past this has been done by just disregarding this By-law. It was kind of ridiculous, having this problem in their By-laws, and that's what the Exec Board had to do that to legally move the meeting one week. He just wanted to be clear that his intention wasn't to use the Exec Board to trample the By-laws.

Mr. Rabkin moved to amend. In the interests of consistency and phrasing, he would like to amend "a vote of two-thirds" to "a two-thirds vote," to call it the same thing everywhere in the By-laws. The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Froehle moved to change the requirement from two-thirds to three-fourths. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rabkin said they really need the Exec Board to have the power over the summer to change this. He wanted the minutes to acknowledge that they're all aware of the fact that this was a power the Exec Board might exercise without the Assembly.

A Delegate asked why the change to three-fourths was being proposed. Mr. Froehle said that for consistency they should have meetings at common times, and to move meeting dates should be a very special circumstance. He thought it called for a three-fourths vote.

A Delegate asked if there are other instances of a three-fourths vote. Mr. Rabkin said there are. Mr. Marchand said a motion to fast track a Resolution requires a three-fourths vote.

A motion to call the question and end debate on Mr. Froehle's amendment was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT CALLING FOR A THREE-FOURTHS VOTE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

As amended, 3.1 would read as follows:

3.1. Regular Meetings. The Delegate Assembly shall have regular meetings on the second Thursday of September and the first Thursday of October, November, December, February, March, April, and May. Any regular meeting may be rescheduled by a three-fourths (3/4) of the Delegate Assembly.

Ms. Navab said she wasn't comfortable that the Exec Board could change the By-laws. She wasn't saying people should vote against the bill. It already happened, but it should be acknowledged that this was not a power the E-Board usually uses. The Rules Committee talked about this and will look at the By-laws that allow these powers of the E-Board and talk about what the implications might be in the future.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1009A, AS AMENDED BY THE AUTHOR AND ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO ALLOW CHANGES OF DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MEETING DATES.

Approval of Exec Board Summer Decisions -- Resolution 1009b, On Budget Amendment to Allocate 2009-10 GA Surplus - 24 -

The following Resolution, 1009b, was authored by Philippe Marchand and Miguel Daal:

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ALLOCATE 2009-10 GRADUATE ASSEMBLY SURPLUS

WHEREAS, the GA has a surplus of \$37,000 for the fiscal year 2009-10, and also received an unrestricted grant of \$10,000 from the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; and

WHEREAS, this sum was carried over to the current fiscal year (2010-11) and can be allocated either to this year's operating expenses or to our long-term reserve this

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the sum of \$47,000 be allocated between the 201--2011 budget and the GA reserves as follows:

\$7,000 to create a new stipend staff line item in the President's budget;

\$1,000 to add to the stipend staff line item in the External Affairs VP budget;

\$2,500 to go towards the Graduate Women's Project Resource Guide;

\$6,500 to go to contingency for all projects;

\$10,000 to go to student group funding;

\$20,000 to go to the GA's restricted reserve fund invested with the UC Berkeley Foundation.

Mr. Marchand said that he called for this motion because this is a transition between two years. It was before the new Budget Chair worked on the budget. This distribution was proposed in June. People have a copy of the GA budget in the Delegate Guide. Rather than having a deficit, as their past budget predicted, they ended up with a surplus. In June they assumed that from last year they'd have a surplus of \$37,000. In addition, they got a grant of \$10,000 from the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. That resulted in a net carryforward of \$47,000 through the end of the year. They could put all that into their surplus, but they thought it would make sense to apportion the money and put much of it back into the budget.

If they look at the GA's budget and take away the administrative costs, there's really a three-thirds separation: about a third to Executive Offices and Delegates, a third to Projects and Events, and a third to student group funding. The Resolution stays within that principle, with \$20,000 going to long-term reserves.

Of the \$7,000, \$3,000 would create a new stipend staff line item. They've been on a stipend basis since last year. The position reviews GA memos and documents for quality of writing. While this person assists the entire Exec Board and wasn't associated with any Officer, the stipend was placed in the President's budget, the staff stipend line. Also, \$4,000 would go to pay for Lower Sproul, which was actually planned for Waleed Abed's salary. Mr. Abed is funded by three sources, the ASUC Auxiliary and the Lower Sproul project as well as the GA. Because they might actually spend \$1,000 of the \$4,000, that would leave \$3,000 in the President's stipend. Mr. Marchand said he would advise leaving that way. He was only Interim President, and there will be an election for president in a week. He thought the GA should leave some flexibility for the new president to use this money in a way they felt was good for support staff for the GA.

Approval of Exec Board Summer Decisions -- Resolution 1009b, On Budget Amendment to Allocate 2009-10 GA Surplus - 25 -

Mr. Marchand said the Resolution also adds \$1,000 to the stipend staff line item. Mr. Ortega already planned to hire three positions, Legislative Directors for State Affairs, for Federal Affairs, and a Chief-of-Staff. Eventually the Cabinet decided to change it to City Affairs, State Affairs, and Federal Affairs. Because of that, they needed to have an adjustment of \$7,000 total stipend rather than \$6,000.

To the projects, \$2,500 would go to the Graduate Women's Project to publish the GWP Resource Guide. That only happens once every two years. It was previously funded by a grant from the Grad Division. They didn't get that grant this year. Finally, the ASUC Auxiliary, which operates the MLK Student Union, has its own financial problems and is increasing the cost of booking rooms that GA projects use. To recover that, they added \$6,500 to Projects' contingency fund. That was relatively small compared to the total budget, but is a buffer. In addition, they added \$10,000 to student group funding, bringing that amount to \$133,000. Finally, they put \$20,000 in their long-term student fee reserves. The GA has three reserves: long-term student fee reserves that would total \$120,000; \$225,000 in commercial reserves the GA has saved over the years; and \$104,000 in a liquid reserve. He called for any questions.

Mr. Marchand said the Exec Board made a decision on behalf of the GA, as this needed to be operational over the summer. If they didn't allocate this money right away, different parts of the GA, such as Funding, wouldn't have been able to plan ahead. If this money was taken away, that would mean they'd take

out money from Funding, and it would have had less in the spring than they thought it would have. The GA will continue to review these changes.

Ms. Pannu asked why the GA was paying the Lower Sproul rep \$4,000, a pretty high amount compared to other stipends. Also, she asked about the ASUC Auxiliary charging students, who own the building, more money to use their own rooms. Third, they've already started to spend this money. Third, they've already started to spend this money. The amended budget. She was just trying to understand what the GA was doing if the money has already been budgeted.

Mr. Marchand said as for Lower Sproul, it's not really a stipend. The position is paid by the hour, like the GA pays undergrad employees. Mr. Abed works between 15-20 hours a week, about 75% on Lower Sproul and the rest on GA communications. The total stipend will be close to \$9,000, split between the GA, the ASUC Auxiliary, and the Lower Sproul project. But because Mr. Abed works with funding, it might cost the GA less than \$1,000, since they're getting funding from Work Study. This needed Exec Board approval, which approves all stipends. He would recommend leaving this money there, as there are other staff who could use this, and it would give some leeway to the next president.

As for booking rooms in MLK, the small rooms in the Student Union, such as the one they were meeting in that evening, doesn't cost students anything to rent, unless there was a set-up was required. Everything except Pauley was at no cost to students. Pauley Ballroom costs money to rent and for equipment. He thought there was a lot of debate in the Auxiliary and the SOB about student groups paying to use student facilities. But the issue was the Auxiliary currently having expenses around \$100,000 over revenues. The whole budget was about \$3.8 million. This was a very serious issue. He's on the SOB so he could relay anything to them. If this doesn't get spent, it gets carried into next year.

Finally, as for the last question, on funding, they added \$10,000 to student group funding, making it \$133K rather than \$123K. They're currently not even spending that much. They're spending the first \$123K, but over the whole year, they plan to spend the whole budget.

Approval of Exec Board Summer Decisions -- Resolution 1009b, On Budget Amendment to Allocate 2009-10 GA Surplus - 26 -

Questions on May-August 2010 GA Report
Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd)

Ms. Ng said they were running out of time on this agenda item. A motion to extend time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate asked if some of the money in this budget may have been spent. If the budget was voted down, she asked where they would take the money from. Mr. Marchand said the money has been spent in the sense that it's been budgeted, but it hasn't been spent in the sense of cutting checks. If the GA decides to cut this, they'd have to pay Mr. Abed from someplace else, such as Contingency, since it involves a contract. But it has not been spent. Anything that didn't involve contracts and employment could be repealed if the GA didn't approve the budget.

The Delegate asked if they could refer this to committee and have a new budget. Mr. Marchand said they could propose amendments to the budget, which could happen at any time.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1009b, RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ALLOCATE 2009-10 GRADUATE ASSEMBLY SURPLUS PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

Questions on May-August 2010 GA Report

Ms. Ng called for any questions, and seeing none, said they would move on.

Ms. Pannu moved to take 1009c from the table, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations. The motion was seconded.

THE MOTION TO TAKE RESOLUTION 1009c FROM THE TABLE PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

Mr. Froehle called the question on the farthest down amendment, which would strike entirely clause 4. The motion to call the question passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO AMEND 1009c, BY DELETING CLAUSE 4), CREATING WORK GROUPS, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

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

Ms. Ng said they would vote on approving the amendment by substitution of 1009c. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION OF 1009c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 27 -

Mr. Rabkin moved to divide the bill into clauses. In addition, he would like to consider the last clause first, since it was the only one that didn't seem controversial. He was asking have the order of voting on the clauses to be 5), 1), 2), 3). The motion to divide passed by voice-vote.

Ms. Ng said they were under consideration of clause 5), as an independent motion. A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CLAUSE 5) OF 1009c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng called for discussion on clause 1). She noted that the italicized wording was deleted. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CLAUSE 1), AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng called for discussion on Clause 2).

Mr. Rabkin said this clause would substantially constrain the GA in funding.

Ms. Pannu said they have a table of projected figures. It feels like the funding will come to about \$2,700. It's premised on different assumptions that would fund people at \$8,373. Because Round 1 comes from the same global pot of money, what they did was to calculate how much people would have gotten funded on a global cut for that whole pot, only looking at people who were not funded at 100%. The financial issue behind this was about \$40, to \$20, to \$7, with some groups receiving more. These were not hard numbers because some of these groups applied incorrectly. This was more to illustrate to the Funding Committee what it might look like. That's why they didn't put it in there. It's premised on the idea that everyone would have gotten about 61% of what they asked for in the entire Fall Semester. So if a group got funded above 61%, they'd keep their money. And if a group was cut and got funded below that, like Law was, 52%, or Engineering, 43%, or Policy, 51%, that's what the balance was. Law was not cut below 61% in Round 2, for Law groups that didn't apply the first time. It was only for Round 1.

Ms. Navab said they were hearing lots of sources and numbers and asked if the Budget or Funding Chairs could comment on the numbers. Mr. Marchand said that what Ms. Whelan showed in her table during her presentation that if there was a global cut, it would have been 83%. As such, in Round 1, Law got 83% and other groups got 100%, and it would have cost \$1,700. There was a similar process for Round 2. However, this was not exact. The Resolution says that if a group would have gotten more under the global cut, they would get up to that, but no more; but at least at 34.6% cut. Essentially, instead of getting 83% in Round 1 if there was a global cut, but instead of getting 52% in the current system, Law would get 65.4%.

Ms. Pannu said that she changed the number in response to the graph of Round 2 decisions. The number went down and it wasn't just Law, but applied to everyone who was cut.

Mr. Marchand said that Law would get 62% instead of 52%, and Engineering would get 62% instead of 43%. However, they would still need an amendment to move the Law School up from 34.6%.

Ms. Pannu said the total was about \$2,571. Ms. Navab said she asked the Budget and Funding Chairs how much this would actually cost. Ms. Ng asked if the Budget Chair could please respond. Mr. Nicholas said that he didn't make the current budget, which was made last year. Once he allocates something in the budget, it goes to Ms. Whelan and the Funding Committee to decide on the allocation. Mr. Nicholas said he could only give them this figure, that they have \$133,000 for the entire year.

Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd) - 28 -

Ms. Navab said the Resolution says that the additional \$2,500, or \$1,700 would come from the Contingency Fund, not out of the line item for student group funding. Mr. Kline said it would come out of the Contingency Fund, under the Funding Committee.

A Delegate said that essentially, they would be shuffling money around. They would just have to apply to contingency for things that weren't being shuffled, as long as it wasn't food. Essentially, they're taking money out of Contingency and putting it into direct funding for student groups. The groups in Law and everyone else denied in Round 1, and potentially for Round 2, as long as it wasn't for food, could apply for Contingency funding. That was how the system was designed to work that the GA has adopted. They could get the funding that way without shuffling the money around. If they're the only one asking for this money, from what the Funding Chair told them earlier, they would definitely get it. As long as the request wasn't for food, and was for programming, as they were told at the last meeting, they would get it and would be fully funded. Everyone would be happy because small colleges would get their funding and large colleges that were very active would get their funding too.

A motion to extend speaking time failed by hand-vote.

Ms. Ng said that debate on 1009c, beginning with clause 2), has been postponed until the next meeting.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

This meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

The following Resolution, 1009c, as amended by substitution and on the floor, was authored by Danny Kramer, Resolution on Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations. The Resolution was postponed, as amended. Clause 5) was approved and Clause 1) was approved as amended. Clauses 2) and 3) are yet to be considered voted upon.

Resolution on Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations

Whereas, funding procedures are an issue of significant concern to the Delegate Assembly that impacts all graduate student organizations and departments; and

Whereas, Graduate Assembly ("GA") By-laws 4.13, 4.14.4, and 6.4.1.5 recognize this significance through their combined requirement that funding procedures must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly; and

Whereas, there is stark disagreement between departments over whether the Funding Committee or Executive Board had -- or had been delegated -- the authority to adopt and enact new funding procedures in advance of the September 16, 2010, Delegate Assembly Meeting; and

Whereas, as the Executive Board considers itself to have enacted a funding guide, there is further disagreement and misunderstanding over whether the summer enactment constitutes in effect the creation of a new funding procedure; and

Whereas, the new funding procedures enacted by the Funding Committee included, in part, the establishment of a "Super group" categorization structure and the imposition of \$500-per-group caps for funding granted through the Group Meetings, Events and Resources (GMERF) Fund; and

Whereas, disagreement over the authority to enact these changes, along with a misunderstanding about the application of these new funding procedures, led to unforeseen funding consequences for organizations and departments; and

Whereas, a sudden change in GMER funding procedures resulted in drastic funding cuts of 52% to 60% for student organizations housed within a single department (Law), resulting in substantial hardship and the inability to sustain basic programs; and

Whereas, this transition in funding seems, intended to improve the equitable distribution of student group funding, has instead inspired frustration across department, indicating the necessity of further conversation and potential alternatives; and

Whereas, it is unfair to penalize groups whose expectations and applications relied on either the "new" (super group) or "old" (global cut) funding systems remaining in force in Rounds 1 and 2 for fall 2010;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that:

1. The Graduate Assembly re-affirms the principles set forth in GA By-law 6.4.1.5 that all

funding procedures must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly.

Amended Resolutions (cont'd)

- ii -

Resolution on Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations (cont'd)

2. Preserving a \$500-per-group funding cap for fall 2010, the Delegate Assembly directs the Funding Committee to:
 - a. Maintain that no student group receives less than their reported allocation in the Round 1 and Round 2 GMER Funding reports for fall 2010 under the super group system;
 - b. Ensure student groups that would have received greater funding under the global cut system will be "topped up" to no more than they would have received under the old (global cut) system (a 34.6% reduction), assuming Round 1 and Round 2 funds are commingled and that groups may only apply once in fall 2010 for GMER funding. These "top up" funds will be allocated from Contingency, or from another fund if deemed appropriate by the Funding Committee (with Delegate Assembly approval).

This clause (clause 2) only applies to GMER funding and does not apply to Grants.

3. The funding system -- enacted on July 15, 2010, by the Executive Board and in force for Round 1 and 2 in fall 2010 -- is hereby disapproved and repealed for all future funding rounds, effective with Round 3 (GMER, Grants, Contingency). This provision may be overridden by the proper introduction and approval of funding procedures with a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly.
4. The Delegate Assembly directs the Rules Committee to develop a concrete proposal to (1) clarify "funding procedures" and the "Funding Guide"; (2) define and clarify the relationship between the GA By-laws, the funding procedures, and the Funding Guide, and (3) if necessary, amend the By-laws accordingly.

The following Resolution, as amended, 1009a, was approved by the Assembly and was authored by Philippe Marchand:

Resolution on By-law Amendment to Allow Changes of Delegate Assembly Meeting Dates

Whereas, the current GA By-laws set a fixed date for Delegate Assembly meetings, with no mechanism to move a meeting to a different date; and

Whereas, changing the date of Delegate Assembly meetings could be desirable, for example when the fixed date falls on a holiday;

Therefore Be It Resolved that section 3.1. of the GA By-laws be amended as follow (addition in italics):

3.1. Regular Meetings. The Delegate Assembly shall have regular meetings on the second Thursday of September and the first Thursday of October, November, December, February,

March, April, and May. Any regular meeting may be rescheduled by a three-fourths (3/4) of the Delegate Assembly.