

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 3, 2011

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order at 5:32 p.m.

Announcements

Nadesan Permaul, ASUC Auxiliary Director

The campus wants to restructure the ASUC Auxiliary, but students on the Store Operations Board met and decided not to make any changes at this time, although they were open to ideas on restructuring. Also, the Pub lease runs out that month and the Auxiliary is negotiating for current management to remain until June 30, when they'll probably go out to RFP. At the request of student leadership, well drinks would be added to the RFP, along with wine and beer. A survey on Lower Sproul will go out to all 35,000 students and 16,000 faculty and staff. Regarding the campus soft drink agreement, they're moving forward with negotiations with either Coca-Cola or Pepsi.

Upcoming GA Events

The Business Office is doing a survey.

The Empowering Women of Color Conference will be on February 19 in Pauley Ballroom, with a reception at the Multicultural Center. Keynote speakers are Angela Davis, Ericka Huggins, and Dylcia Pagán, with Goapele to perform. The Conference is free for Berkeley students.

Worker-community outreach has a grad student survey.

There are plans to have one big Student Health Insurance Plan that would include grads and undergrads. Proposed changes to the plan were outlined.

The Union, UAW Local 2865, will have an important election for its Joint Council, the Union's highest decision-making body.

Former GA President, Josh Daniels, who was elected to the Berkeley School Board, will have a community engagement forum on February 19.

Delegate Responsibilities

A GA orientation was held.

Resolution Referral

Resolutions were referred to committee. They would revise Funding Committee procedures; amend the By-laws to implement the Structure Workgroup's recommendations; consider the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation; and consider a campus energy efficiency target.

GA ELECTIONS

Mollie Epstein, Health Services and Policy Analysis, was elected Budget Committee Chair. Apple Williams was elected Funding Officer. Jamie Apgar, Music, was elected GA Grad Council rep.

Resolutions

The GA unanimously approved, as amended, Resolution, 1012a, Directed Action In Support of the Berkeley Student Cooperative's Efforts to Expand Co-operative Housing for Graduate Students. The bill asks the President to write a letter to the Berkeley Student Cooperative in support of expanding cooperative housing for grads.

The GA passed, 1102b, as amended, To Amend the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement.

The GA considered 1102c, On Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and Executive Board Meetings, Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for the Spring 2011 Semester. With money to come from the Contingency Fund and budget savings, the GA approved: \$3,300 for GA and E-Board spring 2011 food expenses; \$2,000 for incentives for the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey; \$2,400 for travel to UCSA and SAGE lobbying events; \$1,600 to fund an OE student liaison. The GA voted down funding \$1,700 for the January retreat.

The GA unanimously approved 1102d, On Directed Action to Ensure that the University of California, Berkeley Is In Compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, Otherwise Referred to As the "Clery Act."

Announcements (cont'd)

From the External VP, a grad student Bill of Rights survey was circulating; a hearing and forum on UC Village redevelopment were scheduled; applications were being accepted for Student Regent.

Report from the Structure Review Workgroup

A report from the Workgroup was distributed. Proposals include: a new position, VP for Assembly Affairs; removing the Communications Chair and Committee; reducing the size of the E-Board, to be comprised of Vice Presidents and the President; making officer positions of the Funding and Sustainability Chairs; removing the International Student Affairs Committee and creating an Advocacy Agenda. The Workgroup anticipates that changes will result in reduced time at meetings; lower the rate of turnover among officers; and help recruit, retain, and orient Delegates. The proposal could be voted on next month.

Report on the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

The GA started a separate, non-profit 501(c) 3, the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation, in order to raise funds for Berkeley grads. Last year the GA authorized \$280,000 to establish an endowment with the UC Berkeley Foundation. The BGSF is separate from the GA. Delegates would be members of the non-profit and its Board would be elected GA Officers. From GA Commercial Activity Reserves, \$350,000 would be invested in the BGSF. This money has been in the bank for eight years and was earning very

little. This would also protect GA money. The GA has worked on this with its lawyer. The GA voted to meet in closed session to discuss this with its lawyer. Back in regular session, Mr. Daal announced a meeting of the members of the BGSF.

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Tiffany Ng at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nadesan Permaul, ASUC Auxiliary Director

Mr. Permaul said the Store Operations Board met on Tuesday night and authorized moving forward with the 2011-12 budget based on the current structure of the Auxiliary. There are politics associated with that. The students met independently of the full Board to ascertain whether or not the students wanted to take affirmative steps to restructure the Auxiliary, or to dismantle it, as has been suggested by the campus. The students came back with the idea that they didn't want to make any changes to Auxiliary structure at this time, but were open to ideas on restructuring. But they want to take their time and assess any ideas before making any rash or hasty decisions.

Mr. Permaul said that Operational Excellence has been moving on, and in the coming week, he, Mr. Daal, and Noah Stern, the President of the ASUC, will meet with Anne DeLuca, the Registrar, who is the Chair of the Student Affairs OE Committee. There are some suggestions for the campus to restructure all of Student Affairs, and the ASUC could be relocated from Business and Administrative Services to Student Affairs. Both student Presidents have their own opinions about that. The meeting with Ms. DeLuca was to meet in advance of the campus making any pre-emptive administrative decisions without consulting student leadership; and there are politics to this as well.

Mr. Permaul said the Pub lease runs out on February 11. The Auxiliary is negotiating for the Pub to remain under current management until June 30, at which time they'll probably go out to RFP. The current Pub managers have gone through a decade without an Alcohol Beverage Control violation. In the previous decade, before his time, three separate Pub operators had such violations. At the request of student leadership, an RFP for well drinks would be added to wine and beer. And they'd look at setting aside

at least one night a week for graduate students. If people have opinions or thoughts about this, he'd be grateful to hear from members of the GA.

Announcements -- ASUC Auxiliary Director (cont'd)
Review of Robert's Rules of Order
Upcoming GA Events

- 4 -

Mr. Permaul said that next week the Lower Sproul planning process will distribute a survey to all 35,000 students and 16,000 faculty and staff. He would ask Delegates to please encourage their colleagues to respond. Lower Sproul hasn't been an attractive environment for graduate students, and the survey is one of many points of input to find out what amenities and types of services, particularly associated with food and lounge space, that students, grads in particular, would like. There will be gifts for people who respond, including iPods, a Southwest Airlines gift certificate, and parking permits.

For the beverage alliance, the campus soft drink agreement, Mr. Permaul said they're moving forward with negotiations with either Coca-Cola or Pepsi. The Coca-Cola contract can be extended for two years, by mutual agreement. The alliance also had an excellent presentation from Pepsi Cola, which made a strong case for going out to an RFP. Mr. Daal and Mr. Stern will be deep in the decision-making process for this. The GA gets \$50,000 from that agreement. He said Ms. Hsueh would distribute the written report he made to the ASUC Senate. He called for any questions.

Mr. Ellison asked where they could get updates about the recommendations of the campus concerning the ASUC Auxiliary. Mr. Permaul said he could send out information through the GA; and they could get information from Mr. Daal as well. He'd defer to GA leadership as to how they would like to communicate.

Robert's Rules of Order Review

A short skit was presented to review Robert's Rules of Order. Ms. Ng said she would like to thank the participants. (Applause)

Upcoming GA Events

Ms. Hsueh introduced herself and said she was the Business Office Manager. The Business Office was doing a survey, and if people complete it and turn it in, they'd get a Wonka chocolate bar. That also applied to doing the survey online. Getting a candy bar involved taking responsibility to tell people in their departments about the GA and to ask them to complete the survey. She noted that the candy bars were donated.

Kim McNair introduced herself and said she was the Women of Color Project Coordinator. The Empowering Women of Color Conference was coming up on Saturday, February 19, all day, 9:30 to 5:30, in Pauley Ballroom, after which they'll have a reception at the Multicultural Center. Their keynote speakers are Angela Davis, Ericka Huggins, and Dylcia Pagán, with a performance by Goapele. The Conference is free for Berkeley students. She passed out fliers, and more were available at Anthony Hall.

Mr. Niederhut said that for worker-community outreach, he sent out a survey to graduate students through the listserve. He would ask Delegates to remind people in their departments to do the survey. They have about 140 respondents and would like more. The survey was really short.

Upcoming GA Events (cont'd) Delegate Responsibilities

- 5 -

Ms. Navab said she had an update on the Student Health Insurance Plan. UC campuses have been taking bids from different insurance providers to create a UC insurance plan. Last year they made a GSHIP for grads and this year they planned to have one big plan with grads and undergrads. In the next week or two they'll figure out which group will get the bid and what the terms will be. The Berkeley campus can give feedback as to whether to opt into the Systemwide plan or stick to its own insurance plan. There were major differences. If they get care off the Berkeley campus, they're currently 80% covered, and in the new plan, it would be 90%. The maximum for physical therapy maximum would go from \$1,500 to \$5,000; prescriptions max out now at \$7,000, and that would go to \$10,000. There was also a slight difference in what students would pay for medications. Mental health, dental, and eye insurance wouldn't really change, and international travel doesn't really change. The other big thing is that there was a dependent plan. It's different from the student plan, but dependents could buy in. If people have any questions or if there's something they care a lot about and what reps to ask for, Ms. Navab said they could send an e-mail to Mr. Ortega, who sits on this committee.

Charley Eaton introduced himself and said he's a second-year grad student in Sociology. He's very active in their Union, UAW Local 2865. The Union has 12,000 members and has an annual budget of \$2 million to advocate for members. Any graduate student can join whether or not they're a GSI or other position covered by the Union contract. An important election was coming up. They have 80 positions on their Joint Council, the Union's highest decision-making body. Of those 80 positions, only 28 are filled, and an election was coming up, on the 15th and 16th. Finally, a graduate student in his department, who was eligible for the election, was being kept off the ballot, along with others, because of confusing rules on nominations. There is a petition asking to have these candidates put on the ballot so grads could vote for people who will represent them rather than that decision being made by the elections committee. Time for his announcement was short, and if people had questions he'd be glad to answer them one-on-one.

Mr. Daal said he just received an announcement from the previous GA President, Josh Daniels, who was recently elected to the Berkeley School Board. Mr. Daniels is having a community engagement forum on Saturday, February 19, noon to 3 p.m., at the Berkeley Technology Academy. He wants to strengthen lines of communication with community members.

Delegate Responsibilities

Ms. Williams said some of them there were new Delegates, so they thought they'd orient people. Delegates are ambassadors for their departments, both coming and going. The GA really relies on Delegates to bring things to the table and to bring things back to their departments. The primary thing was to be an effective liaison. If Delegates couldn't attend a GA meeting, it would be great if they could send an Alternate, and to have the Alternate review the GA minutes so they knew what was going on. The GA has a number of internal committees as well as external committees. Everybody should be on at least one committee, which was mandatory. Also, committees were different from workgroups, which weren't

actually committees. If people had any questions, Ms. Williams said they could talk to her, Mr. Marchand, or Stephanie. And if people have an issue they would like to see addressed, she'd be happy to take it on.

Approval of the Agenda and Minutes
Resolution Referral
GA Elections

- 6 -

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Mr. Rabkin moved to fast track three Resolutions, 1102b, c, and d. Ms. Ng said their By-laws allow for a Resolution to be introduced and voted on at the same meeting, bypassing the committee referral process, with a three-fourths vote.

Mr. Rabkin said he would also like to discuss the Resolutions immediately after elections rather than after reports, so they don't discuss the bills during the last 15 minutes.

The motion to fast track the Resolutions was seconded. THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK RESOLUTIONS 1102b, c, AND d PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The motion to move discussion and votes of the Resolutions immediately after elections, and to extend the time for the bills from 15 minutes to 30 minutes was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Seeing no other amendments, Ms. Ng said that with no objection, the agenda was approved. WITH NO OBJECTION, THE AGENDA WAS APPROVED, AS AMENDED.

Ms. Ng said that the November 4 and December 2 Delegate Assembly minutes were posted online. She called for any amendments to those minutes. Seeing none, she said the minutes were approved. THE MINUTES TO THE NOVEMBER 4 AND DECEMBER 2, 2010 GA MEETINGS WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

1102a, To Revise Funding Committee Procedures, to the Funding and Rules Committees

1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations, to all committees

1102f, Budget Amendment and Direct Action Regarding the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation, to the Budget and Rules Committees

1102g, Action Agenda Item to Implement a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target, to the Campus Affairs, Sustainability, and Rules Committees

GA ELECTIONS

Mr. Rabkin suggested making all nominations at once, since some people might want to run for multiple offices. Ms. Ng said she would do that.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 7 -

Ms. Ng said the first position was Budget Officer. The person chairs the Budget Committee, whose duties were to formulate policies for the allocation of GA funds; prepares the GA budget; monitors implementation of the budget; reports regularly to the Assembly and the Executive Board on the status of the budget; meets regularly with the ASUC Auxiliary/Finance Officer; summarizes relevant information and documents to the E-Board; attends all E-Board meetings; and serves as one of five directors for the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. There's a stipend of \$500 a semester.

The Funding Committee Chair organizes the Funding Committee meetings; reviews student group applications and finalizes applications; presents allocations for Assembly approval; ensures that the Committee is fiscally responsible; meets with the Business Director and Funding Advisor; and attends E-Board meetings. The stipend is \$500 a semester.

Ms. Ng said the Graduate Council is a policy-making body for campus graduate academic affairs. It recently reviewed the affect of Operational Excellence on graduate academics and research; enabled the submission of electronic dissertations; it reviews normative time to degrees for various programs; and presents graduate perspectives on controversial implementations of the Dean's normative time fellowship. Grad Council reps also attend E-Board meetings.

Ms. Navab asked if Delegates had to give up their seats to be an Officer. Ms. Ng said Officers couldn't be Delegates, but Grad Council reps could retain their Delegate position. She said the Rules Committee could talk about that more.

Ms. Ng called for nominations for Budget Officer. Mr. Ellison nominated Ms. Williams. Ms. Williams said she would accept unless anybody else was interest. Mr. Rabkin nominated Ms. Epstein.

Ms. Ng called for nominations for Funding Committee Chair. Mr. Mikulin nominated Mr. Klein, who respectfully declined. Mr. Marchand nominated Camille. Ms. Ng said Camille wasn't present and couldn't accept the nomination. Mr. Klein nominated Mr. Rabkin, who respectfully declined. Ms. Williams nominated herself. Mr. Rabkin asked if she was also a Grad Council rep. Ms. Williams said she was, and said she was asked to run.

Ms. Ng called for nominations for Grad Council representatives. Mr. Ortega nominated Mr. Apgar.

Mr. Klein asked if there would be another opening for a Grad Council rep if Ms. Williams was elected Funding Chair. Ms. Ng said that was correct. Ms. Williams said there's an Alternate GA rep, so there was only one vacancy. Mr. Klein said the GA should elect two Grad Council reps that evening. Ms. Ng said elections had to be announced in advance, and although it depended on how the By-laws were read. In her opinion, an election has not been announced.

Ms. Ng called for any other nominations for Grad Council rep. Mr. Marchand nominated Mr. Sheen, who respectfully declined.

Seeing no other nominations, Ms. Ng called for the candidates to give a one-minute speech.

Ms. Williams said she was only running for this in case nobody else was interested. Ms. Epstein said one responsibility of the Budget Committee Chair was to provide oversight and give statements to the GA regularly. She called for any questions.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 8 -

Mr. Ellison asked about her experience in terms of running a budget committee. Ms. Epstein said she was a program manager for a number of grants and ran those budgets.

Mr. Daal asked about her department and her year. Ms. Epstein said she's a first-year in Health Services and Policy Analysis. Seeing no other questions, Ms. Ng asked her to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. **MOLLIE EPSTEIN WAS ELECTED BUDGET COMMITTEE CHAIR.** Back in regular session, Ms. Ng she would like to congratulate Ms. Epstein. (Applause)

Ms. Ng asked Ms. Williams to make a statement for Funding Officer. Ms. Williams said she has a background as a professional bookkeeper for 15 years and was well versed on how to fund different projects. She look forward to contributing in whatever way was most meaningful to the GA. Ms. Ng called for any questions.

Ms. Murrell asked why she would rather have this position than be on the Grad Council. Ms. Williams said she didn't, and loved the Grad Council. But they only had so much energy and resources in the GA, and she was willing to shuffle her energies around.

Ms. Ng asked Ms. Williams to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. **APPLE WILLIAMS WAS ELECTED FUNDING OFFICER.** Back in regular session, Ms. Ng said she would like to congratulate her. (Applause)

Ms. Ng said the next position they'd vote was for Grad Council rep. She asked Mr. Apgar to make a statement.

Mr. Apgar said he successfully had a seminar moved so he'd be free to run for the position and attend Grad Council meetings. He's a first-year Ph.D. in the Music Department and was interested in what the Grad Council was doing.

A Delegate asked if he was previously nominated for this position and declined. Mr. Apgar said that was correct, and declined because at the time he'd been planning to take the seminar that met at a conflicting time.

Ms. Navab asked how he'd reach out for grad student feedback. Mr. Apgar said he'd try to talk to people at Delegate meetings about what their departments were doing and what they were concerned about, and would talk to people in general.

Mr. Marchand said there was another vacant position on the Grad Council, and in case anyone was interested in running, he moved to reopen nominations. The motion died for lack of a second. Ms. Ng said they'd have another election next month.

Seeing no other questions, Ms. Ng asked Mr. Apgar to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. JAMIE APGAR WAS ELECTED GA GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE. Back in regular session, Ms. Ng said she would like to congratulate him. (Applause)

RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

Resolution 1012a, On Directed Action In Support of the Berkeley Student Co-operative's Efforts - 9 -
To Expand Co-operative Housing for Graduate Students

The following Resolution, 1012a, was authored by Clara Haskell Botstein:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE BERKELEY STUDENT COOPERATIVE'S EFFORTS TO EXPAND CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

WHEREAS, there is strong demand among UC Berkeley graduate students for affordable housing in Berkeley. A February 2010 Graduate Assembly student satisfaction survey found that 32% of respondents had difficulty finding appropriate, affordable housing; and

WHEREAS, co-operative housing is appealing to graduate students because it provides an opportunity to meet fellow students from a variety of departments and form a community. It also provides a relatively inexpensive way to live near campus; and

WHEREAS, co-operative housing at Berkeley currently targets undergraduate students, with only two of the 17 BSC houses and one of the three apartment complexes, dedicated to graduate student housing;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President is directed to write a letter on behalf of the Graduate Assembly to the Berkeley Student Cooperative expressing the Graduate Assembly's support for GSC efforts to expand cooperative housing for graduate students.

Ms. Haskell-Botstein said the GA met with the Co-op earlier that year. The Co-op was very interested in building more graduate student co-op housing, but haven't had a lot of contact with grads. Most Co-op members are undergrads. One building the Co-op owns could supply a little over 100 units, on Dwight, for potential grad student housing. And there were other options. The Co-op wanted to see if this was of interest to grads. The Resolution was just to show support and to state that the GA would like to move forward with investigating the demand among graduate students, and potentially moving forward.

Mr. Marchand said two or three of the co-ops are for grads, and have about 90 residents. He applied to be in the Co-op when he got there and it took a few semesters on the wait list to get in. It's really preferable to have co-operative housing reserved for grads.

Ms. Haskell Botstein said that it's really helpful in that there's an automatic community, there are people from across departments, and it's affordable. She was on the wait list as well, and Berkeley was very expensive.

A Delegate said she said she lives in a grad co-op. She loved it and it's been a great experience. And they have excellent meals almost every night.

A Delegate asked about costs. Ms. Haskell Botstein said that rent was about \$800 a month, and included food and utilities. The building the Co-op had in mind has 120 units. But if there's a lot of demand, that was something they could talk about.

Resolution 1012a, On Directed Action In Support of the Berkeley Student Co-operative's Efforts - 9 -
To Expand Co-operative Housing for Graduate Students (cont'd)
Resolution 1102b, To Amend the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement

Mr. Froehle moved to approve the amendments out of committee. In the first Resolved Clause, "GSC" should be deleted and replaced with "BSC," to read, "Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly President... write a letter... expressing... support for BSC efforts...."

The acronym "BSC" would be added to the title.

A Further Resolved Clause would be added, to read:

"Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly President is directed to request the support of Graduate Dean Andrew Szeri on this issue."

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

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1012a, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE BERKELEY STUDENT COOPERATIVE'S (BSC) EFFORTS TO EXPAND CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS.

The following Resolution, 1102b, was authored by Eva Hagberg, on behalf of the Mission Statement Workgroup:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MISSION STATEMENT

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is the primary governing body of all graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, the primary mission of the Graduate Assembly is to promote a vibrant student life, promote inclusiveness, activism, community service, educational improvement, and professional development; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is also the main advocacy body for all graduate and professional students at the campus, local, State, and national levels; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly accomplishes its mission by advocating on behalf of students, distributing funding to student groups, and managing a variety of student projects; and

WHEREAS, a succinct Mission Statement is an important part of how any organization portrays itself to its members and to the outside world, and is the first information that people see about an organization; and

WHEREAS, the current Graduate Assembly Mission Statement reads:

Resolution 1102b, To Amend the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement (cont'd)

- 11 -

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MISSION STATEMENT (cont'd)

The Graduate Assembly's vision is to engage and empower graduate students to work together for academic, political, and social change -- both inside and outside the UC Berkeley community. As a graduate student government, we are actively engaged in pinpointing graduate student needs, providing resources, and advocating for graduate students through campus and community activism.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly adopts the following as its revised Mission Statement, disseminates a copy to all of its constituent members, and places it on their Web site:

The mission of the Graduate Assembly is to improve the lives of University of California, Berkeley graduate students and to foster a vibrant, inclusive graduate student community.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the following description be appended to the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement:

The Graduate Assembly is the official democratic governing body of the graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley. The fundamental principles of the Graduate Assembly are the promotion of a vibrant student social life, inclusiveness, progressive activism, community service, educational improvement, and professional development. In service to these principles the Graduate Assembly advocates for students, funds student groups on campus, and directly manages a variety of projects.

A Delegate said the workgroup was formed because of concerns about the GA's current mission statement. The workgroup was interdisciplinary and the Resolution was what they came up with after long debate.

A Delegate moved to approve the recommendations from the Rules Committee, to strike "progressive" from the mission statement and to correct a typo.

The amendment would have the Mission Statement read as follows:

“The Graduate Assembly is the official democratic governing body of the graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley. The fundamental principles of the Graduate Assembly are the promotion of a vibrant student social life, inclusiveness, activism....”

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

Ms. Navab asked why there were two separate portions to the Mission Statement. Mr. Klein said the Mission Statement should be concise and easy to read, and the following language was a description of the GA, not necessarily its mission. The Mission Statement was just the one sentence in the Resolved Clause. The Further Resolved Clause describes what the GA is.

Ms. Love said there's a lot of literature about mission statements, and how they should be very brief, and should fit on a T-shirt.

Resolution 1102b, To Amend the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement (cont'd) - 12 -
Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings,
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for the Spring 2011 Semester

Mr. Marchand moved to amend the Further Resolved clause, the description, to delete “democratic” and replace it with “representative,” and to delete “governing,” to read as follows: “The Graduate Assembly is the official representative body....” He thought that was more accurate, since Delegates represent department and not all of them were elected; and they don't really govern graduate students. The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1102b, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MISSION STATEMENT. Ms. Ng she would like to thank the Mission Statement Workgroup for all its work.

The following Resolution, 1102c, was authored by Miguel Daal, Danielle Love, Alberto Ortega, Tiffany Ng and Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND DELEGATE ASSEMBLY AND EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS, CAMPUS AFFAIRS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS INITIATIVES FOR THE SPRING 2011 SEMESTER

WHEREAS, due the addition of a special Assembly meeting on September 30th and the participation of a record number of Delegates, the President's Meeting and Meals budget -- which funds the food served at Delegate Assembly and Executive Board meetings -- has been almost exhausted; and

WHEREAS, the projected meals cost for four Assembly meetings (\$600/meeting) and six Executive Board meetings (\$150/meeting) is \$3,300; and

WHEREAS, the Annual Graduate Assembly Executive Board Winter Retreat from January 15-17 was not considered in this year's budget and cost \$1,700; and

WHEREAS, in the spring 2010 the Graduate Assembly approved \$2,000 towards prize incentives for the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey that resulted in a 22% participation rate to the survey; and

WHEREAS, the current External Affairs budget would allow for four Graduate Assembly representatives to attend the UCSA Student Lobbying Conference (SLC) in Sacramento and four representatives to attend the SAGE Day on the Hill in Washington, DC, while an additional \$2,400 would allow six representatives to attend each event; and

WHEREAS, the GA and ASUC have been discussing the creation of an Operational Excellence (OE) Liaison position to relay information between the Operational Excellence Coordinating Committee and student governments, and support to the Student Operational Excellence Committee (SOEC); and

Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings, - 13 -
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for Spring '11 Semester (cont'd)

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND DELEGATE ASSEMBLY AND EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS, CAMPUS AFFAIRS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS INITIATIVES FOR THE SPRING 2011 SEMESTER (cont'd)

WHEREAS, while campus funds have been sought to fund the OE Liaison, depending on the outcome of those requests the GA could be required to pay up to \$1,600 towards this position; and

WHEREAS, no money was drawn from the General Contingency budget line of \$15,000 in the fall, and an additional \$2,000 surplus is projected for the ASUC Elections budget line;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a transfer of \$11,000 be made from the General Contingency (\$9,000) and ASUC Elections (\$2,000) budget lines to the following budget lines:

- (1) \$3,300 to the President Meeting and Meals budget to fund spring 2011 food expenses for the Delegate Assembly and the Executive Board.
- (2) \$1,700 to the President Programs and Events budget to fund the January retreat;
- (3) \$2,000 to the CAVP Programs and Events budget to fund incentives for a new Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey;
- (4) \$2,400 to the EAVP Travel budget to increase GA representation at the UCSA and SAGE lobbying events;
- (5) \$1,600 to the President Staff budget to fund the Operational Excellence Liaison position, if needed.

Mr. Marchand said the Resolution would transfer \$11,000, \$9,000 of which would come from the GA's general contingency fund, part of that year's budget, \$15,000 they set aside. They also have a \$2,000

surplus from a lower cost they had for ASUC elections. Out of this, \$3,300 would fund Assembly and Executive Board food expenses for that spring. They've had a record number of Delegates, usually 70 at meetings, an increase of 30-40% over past years. Also, \$1,700 will be used for an E-Board meeting that was actually an all-staff meeting, \$5-600, and a two-day weekend retreat for members of the E-Board and staff, \$950, mostly for renting the accommodations.

Regarding the EAVP Travel budget, Mr. Ortega said that the Budget Officer last year thought it would be good to make sure that Delegates supported work done by the External Affairs office, since in previous years the office wasn't as engaged with the GA, and people didn't want to over-allocate funds to something that wasn't very involved. A large extent of the expenses go towards lobbying in DC and Sacramento.

Mr. Daal said the proposal for \$1,600 would be for a temporary position, a grad student liaison with the Operational Excellence decision-making group, to articulate the needs and interests of grads. Grads are particularly connected to OE, such as through research and travel. OE is a very complicated endeavor, and he'd describe it as having exceeded his bandwidth and his capability to track it and relay the information back to the GA. This position would fill that gap. The ASUC Senate had GA support in a

Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings, - 14 -
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for Spring '11 Semester (cont'd)

proposal to create a liaison between students and OE leadership, which has been summarily denied. Mr. Daal said the OE liaison would be his designate and the GA's liaison to OE.

As for the proposal for survey incentives, Mr. Daal said they wouldn't necessarily use all of the allocated funds. Last year they used about \$2,000 for incentives and got a 22% response rate. Mr. Ortega said there was another big survey, without incentives, that got a quarter of that response rate, 500 responses versus over 2,000.

Ms. Navab asked what would happen if the GA doesn't approve the money for the retreat. Mr. Daal said he would reluctantly use the President's discretionary funds. That fund is \$10,000 and isn't replenished every year. It allows the GA to do things between GA meetings. Last year there almost wasn't a boat cruise because a down payment was needed in the middle of the month.

Mr. Rabkin said he was astounded that the Executive Board went to Sonoma for two days, and decided they needed another event that cost \$600. That was way over the amount spent per student for any other student group. And student groups couldn't use the money the way the E-Board did, for wine tasting and a party.

Mr. Apgar said he appreciated what Mr. Rabkin was saying, but couldn't imagine that absolutely nothing was accomplished that wouldn't benefit the GA. Retreats were supposed to be fun. And the on-campus meeting was a whole day.

A Delegate moved to divide the five parts of the Resolution. Mr. Rabkin asked to do the retreat items last, and have the order be (1), (3), (4), (5), (2). The motion to divide passed by voice-vote.

Ms. Ng called for debate on allocation Clause (1), \$3,300 to the President Meeting and Meals budget.

Mr. Klein said that the amount was \$600 for each of four Delegate meetings, and \$150 for Executive Board meetings. He asked how much that was per person. Mr. Marchand said he believed they order food for 80 people for Delegate meetings, at about \$7.50 per person. The E-Board was 15-20 people, and the amount was over \$10 per person. But there are economies of scale. Mr. Klein asked if they wouldn't have food next month if they vote this down. Mr. Marchand said that wouldn't be automatic.

Ms. Berkeley said it was a well-known stereotype that grads respond to free food. Removing food would not be wise.

Ms. Navab said she thought they could order something cheaper to cut costs. She also took issue with funding the E-Board \$150 a meeting for food when they get paid to hold their offices.

Mr. Sheen said the Rules Committee had some concern about spending more than double what was budgeted last semester. He was also confused about what the President's discretionary fund was. If this part of the Resolution fails, he asked if discretionary funds would be used for food. Mr. Daal said he wouldn't want to do that. A vote against the proposal would be a statement that the GA didn't want food at meetings.

Ms. Williams said the administrative things that people do at the GA was an effort, and food motivated people to show up. This wasn't a sit-and-be-served community and people had to participate. The GA

Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings, - 15 -
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for Spring '11 Semester (cont'd)

forecasts its budget before they know anything and they had to allow wiggle room. This was a small portion of their overall budget.

A Delegate asked if being paid wasn't incentive. Ms. Williams said that not everybody who goes to E-Board meetings was paid.

Ms. Navab said she would like to amend the amount of \$600 per Delegate meeting for food.

Ms. Murrell asked why they'd begrudge the E-Board \$7 for meals. This wasn't a salary. Ms. Navab said this wasn't begrudging. Some student groups that were much larger than 15-20 people got \$100 for the entire semester. They're stingy with student groups but would fund meals when people get stipends. Not everybody does get a stipend, but the bulk of people on the E-Board get a lot more than \$500 a semester.

Ms. Navab moved to remove the portion of the budget amendment that went towards E-Board meetings. Her amendment would be \$900 off of that \$1,500. The motion was seconded.

A Delegate asked how many meetings have occurred already, and how many E-Board meetings have occurred. Ms. Ng said one has occurred. He asked how much of this has already been spent. Mr. Marchand said it was definitely \$600, and beyond that, he wasn't sure.

Ms. Ng said the motion was to amend clause (1), to reduce \$3,300 to \$2,400, with the money only for Delegate Assembly meetings. The amendment would have (1) read: "\$2,400... to fund food expenses for the Delegate Assembly."

The motion to approve the amendment failed by hand-vote 21-28.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE CLAUSE (1) OF THE RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng said they would next consider Clause (3), \$2,000 to the CAVP Programs and Events budget for the grad student satisfaction survey. The question was called and debate closed. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CLAUSE (3) OF THE RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng said they would next consider Clause (4), \$2,400 to the EAVP Travel budget.

Mr. Mikulin asked why they need larger delegations at these events rather than the four they usually send. Mr. Ortega said they've been sending six people to each event. Last year they sent seven people to DC. There's a lot to gain by having a delegation. They get a lot of information on how other student governments operate and about their interactions with their administrations. They meet with people in Congress, and had 40 meetings. The delegation is usually half E-Board members and half External Affairs Committee members.

The question was called and debate closed. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CLAUSE (4) OF THE RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings, - 16 -
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for Spring '11 Semester (cont'd)

Ms. Ng said they would next consider Clause (5), \$1,600 to the President Staff budget for an OE Liaison position.

Ms. Murrell asked how they arrived at the figure and how much time the position would entail. Mr. Daal said he was proposing 8 hours a week, for 13 weeks, at \$15 an hour.

A Delegate said other funds were being sought, and asked what would happen if that funding came through. Mr. Daal said the money the GA funded would go back to the Contingency Fund. The Delegate asked if Mr. Daal will appoint this person. Mr. Daal said that was correct.

Ms. Williams said the GA really needed someone to be a student liaison. From the perspective of the Grad Council, OE people come in and just run the proceedings, don't solicit feedback, and don't care what grad students have to say. This was especially true for procurement. The GA really needed to have somebody on top of this.

Mr. Sheen said he understood the President's discretionary funds wasn't part of the GA budget and that Delegates had no control over it. He asked if the Liaison position was appropriate for those funds and asked what the plans were for the \$10,000 in discretionary funds. Mr. Daal said the money was there to absorb any unexpected budgetary impacts. Mr. Sheen asked if Delegates put that money into the fund. Mr. Daal they didn't. He goes to administrators and asks for money. Mr. Sheen asked if there were any strings on that. Mr. Daal said there are restrictions because it's State money.

Mr. Rabkin asked how discretionary the discretionary funds were, and if he could buy a cruise to Hawaii. Mr. Daal said he didn't think so. Mr. Rabkin asked who would stop him. Ms. Hsueh said she would. The Business Office tells Officers and Delegates who can to raise money, such as from faculty. Mr. Daal

raised this money and it had no strings attached. It came from the campus two years ago and they've just kept carrying it forward.

Mr. Rabkin asked what would stop Mr. Daal from spending it as he wanted. Ms. Hsueh said it could only be spent on behalf of the GA. Mr. Daal said it's for the benefit of graduate students.

The question was called and debate closed. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CLAUSE (5) OF THE RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng said they would next consider clause (2), \$1,700 to the President Programs and Events budget, to fund the January retreat.

A Delegate asked if there were any options to pay for this other than the Contingency Fund or the discretionary fund. Mr. Klein said an application could be made to the Funding Committee. Ms. Williams said she was the only member of the Budget Committee present, and the answer was there weren't.

A Delegate asked if this wasn't budgeted for, or if it went over budget. Mr. Daal said he'd consider this to be a mistake he made. The GA has been losing money for a long time, budgeting more money to spend than they bring in. For the past several years they've been decreasing their budget. The last round of budget cuts removed a lot of padding. That was one element. Secondly, they historically do not budget for the retreat. It's an unbudgeted expense because of padding the GA had previously. Also, he wasn't

Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings, - 17 -
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for Spring '11 Semester (cont'd)

present at the first retreat they had. They usually have one in the summer and one in the early spring. He's been told there were some issues with relationship among the Executive Board, Projects, and the Business Office relationships. At the December E-Board meeting they decided they'd try to remedy that and build relationships by having an away retreat. They usually have retreats in 440 Stephens. They didn't model the costs as they should have.

A Delegate said he thought most people felt there should be consequences. They didn't have many options other than having the money come from the Contingency Fund or from the discretionary fund. The Contingency Fund is used for important things, as they did last year, and it didn't seem appropriate to shift this burden on to this Fund.

Mr. Marchand said this kind of happened at the last minute. They decided to compromise between an overnight, social retreat as opposed to a day-long meeting. For the future, he would suggest that for any meals, whether for meetings of Delegates, the E-Board, or for any others, that they use the same limit they have for student groups, which was \$7 per person.

A Delegate said this question should have come to the GA two months ago if people knew there wasn't money for the retreat. He asked why they were being asked to fund the retreat retroactively. Mr. Daal said they didn't detect the problem until it was too late, because it wasn't in the budget. Had it been in the budget, they would have seen how much of a cap they had.

Ms. Navab said that from information she's gathered, eight people went to the overnight retreat, and roughly \$952 to \$1,100 was spent. That was over \$100 per person. And student groups were being told the GA wouldn't give them enough funding to do multiple events throughout the school year. There are

ways to do retreats less costly. It looked really bad. The Budget Committee was supposed to watch out for this, but members of the Budget Committee helped plan the retreat. And that made it confusing why people didn't see this situation. Given that this was a screw-up on the E-Board's part for not asking for money in advance, she thought this should come out of the President's discretionary fund, which would still have \$8,000 remaining.

Mr. Rabkin said he mentioned this retreat to some of his grad students and they were furious and felt this was one step short of embezzlement. People aren't supposed to spend organization money on themselves without any checks. This was way beyond a screw-up. His grad students will write to everyone they could saying the GA exists to take student group funds and spend it on its executives. He hasn't heard one word of contrition, and people don't seem to get it that this was inexcusable.

Mr. Sheen said he didn't think the E-Board made a conscious decision to have a retreat knowing there was no line item for that, and then realizing that too late. The Rules Committee's position was that nobody heard that this wasn't budgeted for.

A Delegate said that as a leader of a student group, any group that had a retreat for \$1,700 and asked the GA to pay for it would get laughed out of the room. She thought the money should come from the discretionary fund.

Ms. Williams said that everybody kicked in some cash for their own food and entertainment. It wasn't a party in the woods. They had two retreats because this institution was in a state of organizational crisis.

Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings, - 18 -
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for Spring '11 Semester (cont'd)

And it wasn't an oversight in that the previous Budget Chair omitted this line item. It was a mistake by someone. Mistakes happen and the GA had to deal with them.

A Delegate asked where the money came from. Ms. Hsueh said the GA has two retreats and they put together \$1,000 for both, in 440 Stephens. Mr. Marchand said that was for 30 people.

Ms. Berkeley said people had to weigh whether taking this money from the discretionary fund would do more harm than good. It would reduce the fund nearly 20%, which could be bad for GA functioning. She thought a more appropriate avenue for people's frustrations for this having happened was to create rules to prevent this from happening in the future.

A Delegate said that Mr. Daal mentioned that the President's discretionary fund was for unexpected budgetary consequences, and this was unexpected, with the E-Board realizing money for the retreat wasn't in the budget. That puts a bad light on the GA.

Mr. Apgar said that in the future, they could have people on retreats that go over budget pay for the extra amount out of pocket. He had a hard time believing that members of the E-Board intended to take advantage of GA funds. He felt it was punishing them afterwards to say they wouldn't use GA funds for this GA-related activity.

A Delegate asked if this would make it harder to fundraise the next round of presidential discretionary funds, and how else this might impact them. Mr. Daal said it might make it harder. Ms. Hsueh said that there is a budget line item for staff retreats for all campus units. And people try to get away from the

campus, and even invite speakers. At these retreats, campus units try to have bond building and build relationships. This was done throughout the campus, so from an administrative point of view, she didn't see any problem with it.

A Delegate said a letter could be written acknowledging this mistake and saying it wouldn't happen in the future. He didn't think they should take the money from the discretionary fund.

Mr. Marchand said at the most, 13 people signed up for the overnight retreat, out of possibly 30. And not all who signed up actually went. He supported the on-campus retreat because not many could go on the overnight retreat.

Mr. Niederhut said the suggestion to have people pay for this out of pocket would set a dangerous precedent. If he was told he'd be paying out of pocket if the External Affairs Committee ran over budget, he wouldn't sit on that Committee. And he thought that calling this "embezzlement" was nonsense.

Mr. Daal said that if this proposal wasn't approved, the money would have to come out of the President's discretionary funds. He would suggest that if the GA doesn't approve this, that perhaps they consider moving that money from some other discretionary account, so if a decision had to be made in between the time Delegates meet, the GA would have a cushion available. For example, putting it in the Projects contingency.

Ms. Murrell said she didn't think it would matter to student groups if this was paid for out of discretionary funds or the regular budget. She didn't believe people willfully did this. Only 12 people wanted to go,

Resolution 1102c, Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and E-Board Meetings, - 19 -
Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for Spring '11 Semester (cont'd)
Resolution 1102d, Resolution to Endorse UCB Compliance with the Clery Act

and she wouldn't want to go to a two- or three-day retreat. She didn't think it was a fair accusation to say that people were lining their pockets. She thought the GA was wasting a lot of time on this.

A speaker said that taking money for this out of the Contingency Fund would affect groups because that's what student groups apply for, not the President's discretionary funds.

Ms. Ng said that time for discussion had expired.

The motion to approve Clause (2) of the Resolved Clause, \$1,700 to President's Programs and Events budget for the January retreat, failed by hand-vote 15-32.

RESOLUTION 1102C PASSED, OMITTING CLAUSE (2), RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND DELEGATE ASSEMBLY AND EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS, CAMPUS AFFAIRS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS INITIATIVES FOR THE SPRING 2011 SEMESTER.

A Delegate moved to table all reports until the next meeting. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Navab said she understood people want to leave, but the Structural Review Workgroup proposed a huge By-law change for the GA's next meeting. It's nine pages long, and it would be great to give the GA

a short update on what it was before committees consider it. The amendment would totally change the Executive Board.

Mr. Macklin moved to table all reports except for the Structural Workgroup report. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Daal said there's a report about the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation that was part of a fairly substantial Resolution. It was scheduled for 15 minutes, but he could introduce it in less time. He thought it would be a good idea to have an overview of it.

Mr. Ellison moved to reduce the Structural Workgroup report by five minutes. The motion was seconded. Ms. Ng said they could amend the agenda with a two-thirds vote. Mr. Ortega said he would like two minutes to make an announcement. The motion to hear these two reports and table the rest passed by voice-vote.

The following Resolution, 1102d, was authored by Alberto M. Ortega Hinojosa:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ENSURE THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE JEANNE CLERY DISCLOSURE OF CAMPUS SECURITY POLICY AND CAMPUS CRIME STATISTICS ACT, OTHERWISE REFERRED TO AS THE "CLERY ACT"

Resolution 1102d, Resolution to Endorse UCB Compliance with the Clery Act (cont'd)

- 20 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ENSURE THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE JEANNE CLERY DISCLOSURE OF CAMPUS SECURITY POLICY AND CAMPUS CRIME STATISTICS ACT, OTHERWISE REFERRED TO AS THE "CLERY ACT" (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Clery Act is a federal statute (20 U.S.C. § 1092 (f)) wherein institutional compliance is monitored by the United States Department of Education; and

WHEREAS, all US universities and colleges receiving federal financial aid dollars are required to report campus security policies and campus crime statistics; and

WHEREAS, campuses need to have clear guidelines and reporting structures on who should report campus crime statistics to the designated campus security authority, including: campus medical facilities, women's centers, and other departments and officials who either supervise students or respond to crime victims; and

WHEREAS, a 2002 study sponsored by the US Department of Justice reported that 63%¹ of institutions did not fully comply with the Clery Act; and

WHEREAS, the current legislation does not require institutions to report all crimes including assault²; and

WHEREAS, crimes involving sexual misconduct may be classified as an assault rather than a sex offense and are therefore not captured in the reported list of criminal offenses; and

WHEREAS, institutions are encouraged to provide “accurate and prompt reporting of all crimes to the campus police and the appropriate law enforcement agencies”; and

WHEREAS, the University of California, Berkeley is a public university supported by taxpayers and receives federal financial aid money, and is thus required to follow the Clery Act; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly at the University of California, Berkeley is a member of Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE); and

WHEREAS, SAGE members unanimously passed a resolution on the Clery Act directing SAGE to (1) urge Congress and the Administration to pass legislation to (a) specifically clarify which campus officials and offices are required to report campus crime statistics, (b) to further empower the US Department of Education to monitor and fine those institutions not in compliance, and (c) that all criminal offenses including simple assault should be classified and reported in the spirit of law; and (2) work with the Department of Education to strengthen existing regulations and to enact rules that are in line with the spirit of the Clery Act; and

WHEREAS, the resolution directed its members to (1) present SAGE’s Clery Act resolution to their delegations and (2) work with their respective campus administrative leaders to ensure full compliance with the reporting intent of the Clery Act;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the President and Vice Presidents of the Graduate Assembly will present this Resolution to the Chancellor and other relevant officials of the University of

Resolution 1102d, Resolution to Endorse UCB Compliance with the Clery Act (cont'd)
Announcements (cont'd)

- 21 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ENSURE THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE JEANNE CLERY DISCLOSURE OF CAMPUS SECURITY POLICY AND CAMPUS CRIME STATISTICS ACT, OTHERWISE REFERRED TO AS THE “CLERY ACT” (cont'd)

California, Berkeley and work with them to ensure full compliance with the reporting intent of the Clery Act at the University of California, Berkeley.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice President will present a similar Resolution to the University of California Student Association (UCSA) directing the UCSA to work with the UC Office of the President to ensure University of California compliance with the reporting intent of the Clery Act at the University of California System.

¹ Karjane, H.M., Fisher, B.S., & Cullen, F.T. (2002) Campus sexual assault: How America’s institutions of higher education respond. U.S Department of Justice. Document #196676.

² Required criminal offenses in the Clery report include: murder, sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, manslaughter, arson, alcohol or drug violations and hate crimes.

Mr. Ortega said this originated from a colleague at the University of Minnesota, from an issue of crime reporting and a friend whose crime wasn't reported properly through the university police mechanism. The Clery Act, federal legislation, requires all universities that receive federal funding to have due process and report statistics, and to deal with crime in a certain way. SAGE, a national group the GA belongs to, passed a similar resolution, and asked all campus delegations to pass similar legislation, to make sure campuses were in compliance with this Act. The Resolution directs the E-Board to ensure that these provisions are followed at Berkeley.

Mr. Froehle asked why they need to decide on this that evening. Mr. Ortega said they'll be busy in the next few meetings and might not have time to debate this.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1012d PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ENSURE THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE JEANNE CLERY DISCLOSURE OF CAMPUS SECURITY POLICY AND CAMPUS CRIME STATISTICS ACT, OTHERWISE REFERRED TO AS THE "CLERY ACT."

ANNOUNCEMENTS (cont'd)

Mr. Ortega said that for the grad student Bill of Rights survey, they're trying to build a document that delineates all rights of grad students. He would ask Delegates to please fill out the survey and would ask them to please send the survey out to their departments and friends. He'll present some results via e-mail.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 22 -

Report from the Structure Review Workgroup

Mr. Ortega said that UC Village is getting redeveloped, and there will be a hearing about that on February 23. If people were interested in being a part of this they should let him know. Also, a forum will be held, tentatively on March 9, to discuss Telegraph and downtown redevelopment. In attendance will be members of the City, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Mayor's office. Finally, if people were interested, they could apply to be Student Regent, which is a two-year commitment. It fully funds tuition or remission as a stipend. People spend from 20-30 hours a week on it. Meetings with all the Regents occur every other month. The application was due February 17.

Report from the Structure Review Workgroup

Mr. Niederhut said he and Ms. Love would give a quick overview of the work of the structure Review Workgroup. People in the Workgroup will make every attempt to visit all committee meetings to talk about a proposal for a major change to their By-laws. To get feedback from people associated with the GA, they talked to a variety of sources, including anonymous and non-anonymous respondents. They asked about responsibilities, how they differed from what grads were told they would be, opinions about positions in the GA, and their opinions about how things work. They also talked to former Officers, Delegates, and people who weren't members of the GA.

Ms. Love said she'd talk about the Executive Board. A lot of offices reported being overloaded, particularly the President. The E-Board noted overlapping responsibilities and a lack of coordination among Board members. The size of the E-Board was identified as problematic. E-Board meetings hardly had enough time to give updates to one another, let alone plan future actions. That led to an absence of a powerful guiding vision or a clear set of goals for the GA. They also heard of a lack of communication between projects and the E-Board. There is effectively a two-tiered E-Board, with four main officers doing most of the work and having most of the responsibilities and a second tier acting more as an advisory council. There's a lack of accountability and an absence of clear lines of communication. And the Funding and Communications Officers were especially overworked.

Mr. Niederhut said they identified three major problems with the Delegate Assembly. There's a serious issue with the GA's visibility. A lot of grads don't know what the GA does or why they exist. That creates problems with saying they're a representative body of grads. There isn't a single Delegate from Business, e.g. Also, in recruiting Delegates to the GA, the first couple of months at the Delegate Assembly could be really confusing, especially at large meetings. So they identified a need for a greater orientation process. As it currently stood, he believed that the consensus among a lot of new Delegates was that they felt sort of voiceless and that they'd like to participate more actively at meetings, but didn't really know how to go about doing that.

A third problem that the Workgroup has observed, which people who have been to GA meetings that past semester have seen themselves, is a breakdown in parliamentary procedure, especially when discussing funding resolutions. This could be very frustrating for new Delegates, because it looks like the Assembly was getting nowhere and that people were just bad-mouthing each other.

Ms. Love said they started to set some goals, which include improving communications throughout the GA and increasing their presence on campus, to make sure they actually represent grad students and not

Report from the Structure Review Workgroup (cont'd)

- 23 -

just a subset of grads. They also wanted to simplify the Executive Board and have a structure that increases accountability and that makes all E-Board actions clear and transparent. They wanted to unify their messaging and actions. The GA has a lot of potential to be a really powerful force that they're just not harnessing. And most importantly, they want to improve the GA experience for all.

Mr. Niederhut said the Workgroup solicited feedback from members of the Assembly. They also looked at the organization of graduate assemblies of several other institutions that were about the GA's size. They also met with a professor on campus, Todd LaPorte, who specializes in organizational structure.

Mr. Niederhut said the screen showed the current structure of the GA. They currently have the Delegate Assembly at the top of the hierarchy, directing a two-tiered E-Board that has 13 members, with 8 voting members and 5 non-voting. The E-Board was intended to be the body that executed policy created by the Assembly. But due to its size, it has become, in practice, more of an advisory body to the President and to VP positions. But the lines of communication and responsibility weren't as clear as the diagram might suggest. The Workgroup has heard from Delegates and from the Projects that they don't feel there's a real clear line communications between these two groups. That's something that needed to be addressed.

Ms. Love said that in order to address that, the Workgroup has proposed some changes, which were detailed in the report that Delegates received. They want to create a new Vice President position, VP for

Assembly Affairs. The position would be responsible for the recruitment and retention of Delegates and would chair Delegate meetings and oversee communications and IT. The proposal would remove the Communications Chair and Committee.

Another proposal would reduce the size of the E-Board, to be comprised of the Vice Presidents and the President. That would result in clearer lines of communication. Ms. Love said they think Project Coordinators should report to the Campus Affairs VP. This would bring all opportunities for advocacy under one umbrella rather than having them split up and having a lack of coordination.

Ms. Love said the Workgroup also wanted to change the Funding and Sustainability Chairs so to instead, be Officers. This was to be consistent. They're already elected. The proposal would also recommend the removal of the International Student Affairs Committee and would create an Advocacy Agenda.

Ms. Love said the screen showed the proposed structure and was included in the packet.

Mr. Niederhut said the Workgroup anticipates that enacting these changes will lead to reduced time at meetings, which was actually the number one complaint, that people were spending ten hours a week at meetings and nothing was getting done. This would lead to greater coordination among officers and a clearer and more even distribution of responsibilities.

The Workgroup believes these changes will lower the rate of turnover among officers, which was currently a large problem, since they'd have the time to do the things they need to get done. The greater coordination among Officers, with only a four-member E-Board, will result, they believe, in a GA with a stronger purpose. It would also provide a more legitimate face to external entities because they wouldn't be hearing different things from different Officers.

The creation of the Assembly Affairs VP, in particular, will help with the problem of recruiting and retaining Delegates. The person could go to departments that weren't represented and could provide personal orientations.

Report from the Structure Review Workgroup (cont'd)
Report on the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

- 24 -

One other change would be for the Assembly Affairs VP to chair meetings, leaving the Rules Committee Chair to act as parliamentarian during debates and to act impartially.

Mr. Niederhut said there are about nine pages of changes, most of which deal with grammar and consistency, along with some major things. The Advocacy Agenda would create action items and give the GA a unified purpose. Ms. Love said the Advocacy Agenda would be generated from Delegates.

Mr. Niederhut said there would be clearer limits on the powers of the E-Board. Right now there's ambiguity of when it's allowed to act in place of the Assembly. The Rules Chair would be emphasized for preserving internal consistency of policy. The Funding Officer position would be redefined; and hopefully people will stick around for more than one semester if it wasn't so treacherous. People in the Workgroup would like to come to people's meetings to talk about this, and they'll also talk about this with the GA more next month.

Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank everybody who has worked on this, especially Delegates. This was referred to all committees and they welcome feedback in any form. A large By-law amendment was necessary to make everything consistent. People could e-mail him at internal@ga.berkeley.edu.

Report on the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

Mr. Daal said Resolution 1102f is in continuation of an activity that the GA started last year which was to create a separate, non-profit 501(c)3, the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. The purpose of the Foundation was to raise funds and create resources for Berkeley graduate students. The impetus for the Foundation was because the GA budget was becoming increasingly constrained. Their income has remained fixed for about five years and they continue to encounter greater draws of funding. They receive more and more requests for funding from student groups and their basic operations increase in cost because of inflation.

Mr. Daal said that last year the GA authorized \$280,000 to establish an endowment with the UC Berkeley Foundation, which raises funds for the campus. That amount established two endowments. The GA has \$120,000 with the Foundation, and it pays out once a year, in August, about 5%. The next thing the GA did last year was to ratify Resolution 0909c, which was to create the Berkeley Grad Student Foundation. They got approval from the California Secretary of State and are pursuing 501(c)3 status with the IRS. Once they receive that, they'd like to create an endowment for the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation.

The BGSF is separate from the GA. It's an external tool to raise funding for grads. The members of the corporation are GA Delegates and the Board of Directors is comprised of some elected GA Officers, including the President, the Rules Committee Chair, and the Vice President. The Resolution calls for the allocation of \$350,000 from the GA's Commercial Activity Reserves, money that's been in the bank for about eight years, building up to that amount. It would authorize the investment of that money with this new Foundation. The check on the use of that money would be the creation of a contract between the GA and the Foundation, essentially a gift agreement that would direct where the monies would be spent. It follows the model the GA has already executed with the UC Berkeley Foundation. There's a gift agreement that obligates them to give the GA 5% from appreciation each year. Mr. Daal said the Resolution

Report on the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation (cont'd)

- 25 -

authorizes the \$350,000 and also directs the President to finalize and execute a gift agreement between the organizations.

Mr. Ortega said this also protects GA money from being taken by anybody else. The GA was part of the ASUC, and if the ASUC went into bankruptcy, money in this Foundation couldn't be taken. Mr. Daal said that was a way it limits liability.

Ms. Navab asked if they've gone through this with the ASUC lawyer. Mr. Daal said Mr. Brock was present and could answer that. Mr. Brock said they have.

Ms. Hsueh said the GA receives \$50,000 in commercial revenue, from the Coca-Cola contract.

Mr. Daal said they're currently earning four-tenths of a percent on this money, and they think they could do better than that.

A Delegate asked about the mechanism by which Delegates have control over the Foundation. Mr. Daal said Delegates can call for a meeting of corporation members and can override any decision of the Board

of Directors. Members have ultimate control. The gift agreement was also a mechanism of control over how the money could be used.

A Delegate asked who votes on the Charter and By-laws for the 501(c)3. Mr. Daal said Delegates approved the By-laws, which occurred last year.

A Delegate asked if the Board will provide updates at GA meetings. Mr. Daal said it would. They could institutionalize that by adding that to the By-laws.

A Delegate asked if Delegates have continuing approval power over By-laws. Mr. Daal said they did, but only at their meetings. The Delegate asked if without that, members of the Foundation could change By-laws without Delegates approval. Mr. Daal said that was correct. Mr. Brock said he would like to address that point, but he thought it would be appropriate to go into executive session.

Ms. Navab moved to meet in executive session. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. Mr. Daal called for any objection to having staff as a part of executive session. Ms. Navab said they're members of the Auxiliary. This meeting entered into closed session.

Back in regular session, Mr. Daal said he would like to announce that he would like to have a meeting of the members of the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation at the next GA meeting, or the meeting after that.

Ms. Ng asked Delegate to please turn in their feedback forms.

This meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

Amended Resolutions -- 1009d, 1102b

- i -

The following Resolution, 1009d, was amended at the GA meeting to read as follows:

Resolution on Directed Action In Support of the Berkeley Student Cooperative's (BSC) Efforts To Expand Co-Operative Housing for Graduate Students

Whereas, there is strong demand among UC Berkeley graduate students for affordable housing in Berkeley. A February 2010 Graduate Assembly student satisfaction survey found that 32% of respondents had difficulty finding appropriate, affordable housing; and

Whereas, co-operative housing is appealing to graduate students because it provides an opportunity to meet fellow students from a variety of departments and form a community. It also provides a relatively inexpensive way to live near campus; and

Whereas, co-operative housing at Berkeley currently targets undergraduate students, with only two of the 17 BSC houses and one of the three apartment complexes, dedicated to graduate student housing;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly President is directed to write a letter on behalf of the Graduate Assembly to the Berkeley Student Cooperative expressing the Graduate Assembly's support for BSC efforts to expand cooperative housing for graduate students.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly President is directed to request the support of Graduate Dean Andrew Szeri on this issue."

The following Resolution 1102b was amended at the GA meeting to read as follows:

Resolution to Amend the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly is the primary governing body of all graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley; and

Whereas, the primary mission of the Graduate Assembly is to promote a vibrant student life, promote inclusiveness, activism, community service, educational improvement, and professional development; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly is also the main advocacy body for all graduate and professional students at the campus, local, State, and national levels; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly accomplishes its mission by advocating on behalf of students, distributing funding to student groups, and managing a variety of student projects; and

Whereas, a succinct Mission Statement is an important part of how any organization portrays itself to its members and to the outside world, and is the first information that people see about an organization; and

Whereas, the current Graduate Assembly Mission Statement reads:

Amended Resolutions -- 1002b, 1102c

- ii -

Resolution to Amend the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement (cont'd)

The Graduate Assembly's vision is to engage and empower graduate students to work together for academic, political, and social change -- both inside and outside the UC Berkeley community. As a graduate student government, we are actively engaged in pinpointing graduate student needs, providing resources, and advocating for graduate students through campus and community activism.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly adopts the following as its revised Mission Statement, disseminates a copy to all of its constituent members, and places it on their Web site:

The mission of the Graduate Assembly is to improve the lives of University of California, Berkeley graduate students and to foster a vibrant, inclusive graduate student community.

Be It Further Resolved, that the following description be appended to the Graduate Assembly Mission Statement:

The Graduate Assembly is the official representative body of the graduate and professional students at the University of California, Berkeley. The fundamental principles of the Graduate Assembly are the promotion of a vibrant student social life, inclusiveness, activism, community service, educational improvement, and professional development. In service to these principles the Graduate Assembly advocates for students, funds student groups on campus, and directly manages a variety of projects.

The following Resolution, 1102c, was amended at the GA meeting to read as follows:

Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and Executive Board Meetings, Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for the Spring 2011 Semester

Whereas, due the addition of a special Assembly meeting on September 30th and the participation of a record number of Delegates, the President's Meeting and Meals budget -- which funds the food served at Delegate Assembly and Executive Board meetings -- has been almost exhausted; and

Whereas, the projected meals cost for four Assembly meetings (\$600/meeting) and six Executive Board meetings (\$150/meeting) is \$3,300; and

Whereas, the Annual Graduate Assembly Executive Board Winter Retreat from January 15-17 was not considered in this year's budget and cost \$1,700; and

Whereas, in the spring 2010 the Graduate Assembly approved \$2,000 towards prize incentives for the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey that resulted in a 22% participation rate to the survey; and

Whereas, the current External Affairs budget would allow for four Graduate Assembly representatives to attend the UCSA Student Lobbying Conference (SLC) in Sacramento and four representatives to attend the SAGE Day on the Hill in Washington, DC, while an additional \$2,400 would allow six representatives to attend each event; and

Amended Resolutions -- 1102c

- iii -

Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Delegate Assembly and Executive Board Meetings, Campus Affairs and External Affairs Initiatives for the Spring 2011 Semester (cont'd)

Whereas, the GA and ASUC have been discussing the creation of an Operational Excellence (OE) Liaison position to relay information between the Operational Excellence Coordinating Committee and student governments, and support to the Student Operational Excellence Committee (SOEC); and

Whereas, while campus funds have been sought to fund the OE Liaison, depending on the outcome of those requests the GA could be required to pay up to \$1,600 towards this position; and

Whereas, no money was drawn from the General Contingency budget line of \$15,000 in the fall, and an additional \$2,000 surplus is projected for the ASUC Elections budget line;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that a transfer of \$11,000 be made from the General Contingency (\$9,000) and ASUC Elections (\$2,000) budget lines to the following budget lines:

- (1) \$3,300 to the President Meeting and Meals budget to fund spring 2011 food expenses for the Delegate Assembly and the Executive Board.
- (2) \$2,000 to the CAVP Programs and Events budget to fund incentives for a new Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey;
- (3) \$2,400 to the EAVP Travel budget to increase GA representation at the UCSA and SAGE lobbying events;
- (4) \$1,600 to the President Staff budget to fund the Operational Excellence Liaison position, if needed.