

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 4, 2010

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

Announcements

Madeleine Cohen, Comparative Literature, Head Steward in the UAW 2865, said they were still in contract negotiations, which started in the spring. One issue they haven't reached agreement on was wage increases. There will be a membership meeting

Viola Tang, ASUC Academic Affairs Vice President, said the office has grants available for travel, events on campus, community projects, and for arts and performances. Also, there will be a town hall on the Academic Senate and the ASUC was working to establish an Operational Excellence committee for students.

Waleed Abed, Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator, said the Lower Sproul architects, Moore Ruble Yudell, will come to campus to speak with students about the project. This was the programming phase. Of interest to grads would be the meeting about shared resources, where the transit center and practice and performance space, e.g., will be discussed.

Robin Greving said the Student Technology Council works under the campus CIO and advises on matters of technology and funds student-led technology initiatives. In addition, the Student Technology Council was hiring.

Claudia Covello, Executive Director, University Health Services, said they're working to make processes less bureaucratic and more customer friendly. Their phones were very busy and online scheduling is available. Check-ins will be by self-service, like at the airport. Regarding the GSHIP, they're looking at pulling together the health insurance plans of all UC grads. The benefits, as well as the cost, would be higher. They're also looking at pooling all students on all ten campuses.

Jeff Deutsch, Cal Student Store Director, said the Store was really the students' Store. It reports to the ASUC and the GA through the SOB. Store revenue, at least \$1.75 million, goes to the ASUC and the GA. The Store does its best to keep costs down as much as possible and works closely with the Academic Senate's Affordability Committee as well as the State's Affordability Committee. As for digital books, nobody really has a pricing model figured out. The Store sold maybe 1% of the readers in the market and was adamant about copyright protection. Also, green books, with recycled paper, cost more than blue books. It's been a difficult process, but they they'll have a recycled blue book by the next academic year.

The ASUC Academic Affairs Office was seeking grads to volunteer a session to help undergrads with grad school applications.

Ms. Hsueh said reimbursements submitted after December 6 wouldn't be paid until the end of January. Also, there was a food drive for the Alameda County Food Bank.

Faculty Mentor Award nominations will be coming out and the GA will hold a Coffee Hour.

Resolution Referral

The following bills were referred to committee:

1011a, Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities

1011b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee

1011c, Directed Action In Support of a Study of Lower Sproul Program and Funding Options which Enhance the UC Berkeley Student Experience

REPORTS

Student Services Fee

Every student pays the Student Services Fee, about \$450 a semester. It used to be called the Registration Fee. It adds up to \$30 million. With budget cuts, the campus has redirected its use, and students want to express priority as to what was funded. A new Regental policy mandates that Chancellors accept recommendations of Student Fee Advisory Committees on each campus. This committee at Berkeley is the Committee on Student Fees, comprised of about 12 students. It's independent from the GA and the ASUC, and student government, without success, has tried to reform the CSF and make it more representative. Openings are paid positions and are advertised, and the CSF itself chooses new members.

Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

The GA last year created a non-profit, 501(c) 3, the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. The GA will put in commercial revenue, which is less restricted than student fee money, and like an endowment, receive interest back. The Foundation's Board is composed of five GA Officers, a GA alum, and a Delegate. All Delegates are members of the Foundation.

A non-profit allows the GA to accept donations and protects funds from the Chancellor's policy of collecting short-term interest on units' funds.

The GA has about \$100,000 in student fee reserves and about \$370,000 in commercial reserves.

Projects Reports

Elizabeth De La Torre showed pictures of Project events, including a GMORR event; Bridging the Gap; surviving orals; a Sex and Dessert Workshop; and the GSC Beer Fest. The Women of Color Conference

Report on Operational Excellence

Operational Excellence is a large restructuring initiative of the campus, and included student services. After GA pushing, students can now become members of initiative teams. It's a big time commitment. The Student Operational Excellence Committee, comprised of student government officers, will meet bimonthly and will nominate a student OE Communications Coordinator. Delegates volunteered to serve on the OE/ASUC committee.

Ms. Ng called for Delegates to serve on the OE/ASUC committee.

Contingency Funding Report

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Contingency Funding Report, awarding \$700 for October and November.

There is an opening for a Graduate Council representative from the GA. It has 10 to 12 professors and three student reps, and discusses almost anything that affects graduates.

With no objection, the GA approved Eva Hagberg as Chair of the Mission Statement Work Group.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution, 1009d, as amended by substitution and on the floor, was approved by voice-vote, Resolution to Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide. It sets out funding procedures and policies, and organizes groups into supergroups.

Resolution 1010a, as amended on the floor, was approved unanimously by voice-vote, Resolution to Amend the GA Budget to Restore External Affairs Funding for Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE). It corrects a mistake in the budget and creates a line item in the EAVP budget for SAGE travel expenses, \$4,000, funded from savings. SAGE is a coalition, Student Advocates for Graduate Education. It advocates for grads on the federal level and is Chaired by Mr. Ortega.

Resolution 1010b, as amended on the floor, was approved by unanimous voice-vote, To Create a GA Structure Review Workgroup. It establishes a workgroup to analyze GA structure, including division of power and workload, and make recommendations to the GA by the February GA meeting. Mr. Marchand was elected Chair of the Workgroup and Delegates volunteered to serve on it.

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Tiffany Ng at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Ng said she will continue to chair the meetings. Mr. Daal, GA President,

along with several other members of the GA, were at the SAGE Conference (Student Advocates for Graduate Education). A Resolution about SAGE, 1010a, will come up that evening. Philippe Marchand is the Internal Coordinator of the GA and will assist the Chair in running the meeting that evening.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madeleine Cohen, UAW 2865

Ms. Ng said the first announcement was from the UAW. Madeleine Cohen introduced herself and said she's a grad there, in Comparative Literature, and is Head Steward in the UAW 2865, which represents academic student employees in the entire UC System. These are mainly graduate student instructors as well as readers and tutors.

Most people there were hopefully aware that the Union was in contract negotiations at that time and has been negotiating since the spring. An agreement was supposed to have been reached at the end of September, but negotiations were stalled for the last month on a few key, outstanding issues. One was not reaching an agreement on wage increases for academic student employees. They're also trying to get an increase in childcare subsidies for student employees who are parents. And they're trying to get better language for employment notification when GSIs are notified about courses they're supposed to teach. In the last few sessions, UC has not brought any proposal to the table, so things have been stalled.

Ms. Cohen said she would like to invite all of them, as department representatives, to come to the membership meeting on Friday at 5 p.m. at the Union office. They're working very hard to have more productive, effective, and functioning communications with their members at Berkeley and what was happening with the Union. So they're trying to develop departmental communications. They want to use existing grad student associations that Delegates were a part of and use their roles as department representatives and help students know what was going on and to offer them ways to get involved. Obviously the Union was only able to make a strong contract for employees when members were involved and engaged with what was going on. So she would ask Delegates or someone from their department to please join them on Friday.

Ms. Cohen said the next day of bargaining is November 9. And to will determine what happens from there. If UC still doesn't make any movement, the union will start to talk about filing an unfair labor practice strike, which could materialize at the end of the semester. The Union wants to have conversations on what that would mean and why it would be necessary. Along with the UCSA and the whole coalition of Unions, UAW members will go to Regents meetings that week to make statements and make vocal their idea for a fair contract, and to be in support of the other Unions there.

Ms. Cohen said she would pass around a list. If Delegates or someone in their department wasn't getting updates from the Berkeley unit of the UAW and would like to be involved, she would ask them to please put their names down and the Union could keep them updated about plans. She wanted to thank them.

Viola Tang, ASUC Academic Affairs Vice President

Ms. Ng asked if there was someone from the ASUC to give an update. Viola Tang introduced herself and said she was the Academic Affairs Vice President of the ASUC. Last year she was an ASUC representative to the GA.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

Ms. Tang said there were some things happening in her department that she wanted to bring to the attention of grads, since there were opportunities for grad students. They have grants available for students to apply for funding for travel to conferences, for events held on campus that are academically related, or even just community projects. They also support public service projects. Also, they just started a new grant, the Arts and Creativity Fund, to support any creative endeavors or events that showcase the arts or media. People can apply for up to \$250 for each application, per grant. They could find out more information at aavp.berkeley.edu. Applications were due on November 19. If people were interested in this semester, they should be sure to apply.

Ms. Tang said they are also organizing a town hall on the Academic Senate and have invited Ms. Love, the graduate student representative on the Academic Senate committee, to participate. There were issues happening with the Administration and on campus that students should be aware of. It will happen in the week of November 22. She'll send a message out to Mr. Daal so grads could know about this.

Ms. Tang said the ASUC was working to establish an Operational Excellence committee for students so they know how to gauge OE for student services and other areas that have relevance. Another Senator will be coming later to speak to the GA about that. Finally, Ms. Tang said she has standing meetings with different administrators, including EVCP Breslauer and various Vice Chancellors. As an undergrad, she really saw a very direct correlation between the welfare of graduate students and the advocacy that needed to be done by undergraduates. The GSI contract, for instance, really affects undergrad education and the sections undergrads have. So if grads have issues that they think undergrads should be aware of and think are important, people could contact her about them. She wanted to thank them.

Mr. Marchand said GA Officers, such as the President and the CAVP, meet with a number of campus administrators. One thing he hoped to do as Internal Coordinator was to better transmit information to Delegates about the issues they discuss at these meetings with administrators, and what has been learned. They'll try to be more transparent about this.

Waleed Abed, Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator

Ms. Ng said the next announcement was on Lower Sproul. Waleed Abed introduced himself and said he was the Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator. He works directly with the campus and with the architects that have been hired by the Lower Sproul project. He put a schedule outside for the final round of interviews with the architects they've hired, Moore Ruble Yudell, which will be coming to Berkeley to speak with students.

Mr. Abed said they're in the programming phase, which meant that the architects will attempt to transact what Lower Sproul will look like from the vision that students have. Obviously, they'd love graduate student input. There's an initial overview on Wednesday, the 17th, and then on Thursday the 18th, and Friday morning, there will be some interviews that the architects requested to have with specific student groups. A wrap-up session will occur after that. If they look at this and see that one of the student groups they represent fell into one of the categories, he would ask them to please attend so that they could represent them.

Mr. Abed said he would anticipate that grads will be most interested in the Thursday meeting about shared resources, from 6:00 to 7 p.m. This was where the architects will discuss the transit center. Mr.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

Abed said he knew that a lot of grads commute. The facilities that work well for student parents will also be discussed. He thought a lot of their constituents will be interested in this meeting. In addition, they're looking into graduate student music groups or performance groups, might be interested in practice and performance space meeting. They're looking to build maybe a black-box theatre, or something like that.

Mr. Abed asked Delegates to look at the schedule. If anything pertained to them or their student groups, he would ask them to please show up or send someone from their group. Mr. Abed said his e-mail was on the flier, in case anybody had any questions.

Robin Greving, Student Technology Council

Ms. Ng said the next announcement was about the Student Technology Council from Robin Greving. Mr. Greving introduced himself and said he was a member of the Student Technology Council. They are a group of students, undergraduate and graduates, who work under the campus Chief Information Officer, Shel Waggener. They're charged with advising him on matters of technology, improving the technology situation on campus. They seek to improve the technology experience for every student on campus. The Council talks directly to Mr. Waggener and the Administration in order to provide a student perspective behind what the Administration was doing with technology.

Mr. Greving said that one main goal of the Council was to provide funding for student-led technology initiatives. They have around \$10,000 that could be allocated to students to fund their own projects related to technology. In addition, they're also working with Operational Excellence and IT, seeking to provide a sort of casual student perspective on what OE IT is doing and the measures being proposed. The Council has ex officio members not only from the ASUC, but also from the Graduate Assembly. Ben is their ex officio. In addition to that, the Student Technology Council was hiring.

Dorie introduced herself and said she was a current member of the STC. Applications were being accepted until November 7 and could be found on their Web site, stc.berkeley.edu. Any graduate student can apply. The position pays \$15 an hour. Applications are due November 7 and interviews should take place that following week. As part of the STC, they sit on committees and advise the CIO and get involved in all of the current projects they're working on. Mr. Marchand asked what the time commitment was. Dorie said it was five to eight hours a week.

Claudia Covello, Executive Director, University Health Services

Claudia Covello introduced herself and said she was the Executive Director from the Tang Center. She's been asked to give the GA a brief update of anything that was new and different at the Tang Center, and to make sure Delegates were informed about the GSHIP initiative at the Office of the President.

If people were new to the Tang Center, Ms. Covello said they distributed a hand out that gives an overview of its health services. It's the medical, mental health, and health promotion services for all Berkeley students. The brochure had a lot of good information. It was developed by students to answer the number one question people ask, which was how to get started and get access.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

As for what's new and different with the Tang Center, Ms. Covello said they've been working on some technology initiatives to make their processes a little less bureaucratic and a little more customer friendly. As some of them may know or have personal experience with, the Tang Center has a very busy phone call volume. So when people call to make an appointment, it could take a little bit of effort to get in. The volume was very, very high. They've been working very hard to put online scheduling in place. It allows people to go to the Web site, hit a button, and make online appointments for medical needs, travel and immunization, and health education. People can pick what provider they're interested in. There's a section for people to "Meet the Staff," and they can pick the provider they're interested in, go into their schedule, and select an appointment. Every night, at the end of the day, the Tang Center opens up 35 new appointments for the next day. So if people go in and don't see something close by, the trick was to go in around 8 p.m., or so, and a whole bunch of new appointments will be available at that time.

Ms. Covello said the other initiative they're working on is the Self-Service Kiosk, a self-service check-in, such as when people do at the airport when they check themselves in for a flight. People can check in for their medical or counseling appointment at stations in the lobby. They hope to open these up in the next month. This will shorten lines at the Tang Center. People will walk into the lobby, check-in immediately, fill out the administrative forms quickly on the kiosk, and be directed to their appointment. They'll be located right next to the Information Center. If people don't have a Gold Card, they don't get tracked in, and when they go to the clinic, they'd have to go back downstairs. So this will improve efficiency and convenience, and will hopefully improve lines and shorten waits at the Tang Center. That's important for lots of reasons. One was that Tang was really busy at that time. She didn't know what's been going on, but Tang was trending at a much higher utilization than was typical for the fall, in both their medical clinics and their counseling centers. So students were actively using Tang, and it's very busy. She hoped everyone was taking care of themselves. She called for any questions.

Regarding the GSHIP, Ms. Covello said she would assume that most of them have heard about the Systemwide OP's initiative last year to pull together the health insurance plans of all graduate students on all ten campuses. A tremendous amount of work and analysis was done. About 16,000 graduate students are in the pool. It's an attractive plan, with a higher level of benefits than the current plan than they have at Berkeley or at some other campuses. But it's also higher priced.

The decision makers for when and if Berkeley joins in the Systemwide plan, called "UCSHIP," are George Breslauer and Andrew Szeri, not her. The decision to opt out last year was based on two factors. Berkeley's plan, GSHIP is already a pooled plan, with 22,000 Berkeley students, a combination of undergrads and grads. If they had pulled the graduate students out separately, that would have had a major negative impact on the premiums undergraduates paid, because of the much smaller pool. And the OP's plan was also higher priced. Given all the fee hikes and the concern and sensitivities around fees, it was decided that Berkeley would not opt in the first year, although they were very open to opting in for future years.

Another work group was initiated that fall, and they're analyzing pulling in everybody, all undergraduates and the graduates, on all ten campuses, and how that would spread the risk, help with the pricing of the plan, and whether they could keep strong benefits. The decision about whether or not Berkeley will enroll grads and undergrads in UCSHIP will be made in February of 2011. She called for any questions or comments.

Mr. Mikulin asked what the semester premium would be under UCSHIP for graduate students. Ms. Covello said the analysis was happening as they speak, and she'll probably know in a month. When they

Announcements (cont'd)

- 8 -

looked at this last year, the price had jumped up by about 18%. But now they'll look at it with more people in the pool.

A Delegate asked if the new price would be roughly \$1,100 or \$1,200, versus the \$1,000 they currently pay. Ms. Covello said it would be \$1-200 more. The Delegate asked what the tangible benefits would be for the increased premium. Ms. Covello said the two most tangible benefits would be reimbursement of outpatient services. They're currently reimbursed at 80%, and with UCSHIP they'd be reimbursed at 90%. Pharmaceuticals have a cap on them. The Berkeley plan has a cap of \$7,500 which is an increase, and was new this year, and in UCSHIP it's \$10,000 a year. Those are two of the biggest changes.

Mr. Froehle asked if there were any plans to roll back the fees that were introduced last year for primary care. Ms. Covello said there were no plans to roll back fees for primary care. The Tang Center had budget cuts and those fees were direct response to that. Funding was redirected out of the Tang Center for other priorities. They would have had to close clinics. Unless a miracle happens and they're re-funded, which she'd love, those fees will continue.

Ms. Navab asked if there was a way to give input to the decision makers. Ms. Covello said there absolutely was. Mr. Marchand could help with that. There are at least five students on the work group.

Mr. Marchand said the Campus Affairs VP, Ms. Love, is responsible for being the link between the GA and its representatives on campus committees. If people want to bring a point to the students on the work group, they could go to the CAVP. There are also two questions on the feedback form about health services. He'll inform the Tang Center of the results. Ms. Covello said she would also make herself available. Her e-mail is on the campus directory, ccovello@uhs.berkeley.edu. If people also wanted to give direct student input, they could do that as well.

Ms. Berkeley asked what happened to the dental plan that summer. She had a bad experience with the SHIP, as did one of her roommates did. She asked if there was a way to convey that difficulty or to fix it. Ms. Covello said there was. The campus shifted carriers from MetLife over to Delta Dental, which is what all of the UCs staff use, and which is the dental carrier for UCSHIP. So the direction is that Delta Dental will be everyone's carrier. She asked if there was an experience through that network. Ms. Berkeley said her dentist had trouble transitioning to Delta because they weren't very co-operative, and there wasn't proper notification of the shift. Her roommate had an appointment after the shift and wasn't notified of it, and her dentist was no longer in the plan. It wasn't a very positive change. Ms. Covello said she was sorry Ms. Berkeley had that experience. The first six months of transitioning to a new carrier are often difficult, and the dentist mentioned should complain to Delta. Ms. Covello said she could bring that feedback to her channels as well. Ms. Berkeley said they had been working with them for a while and they were very disappointed they couldn't make it work with their insurance company. That would be a good complaint to raise. Ms. Covello said she would carry that forward.

A Delegate asked if there was any way to switch from Blue Cross UCSHIP. Ms. Covello said the five campuses they're in are currently with Anthem Blue Cross. When they also pull the undergrads, they're required to do an RFP and send out a request for proposals to the community. To be competitive again, the plan will have to work really hard to keep them in it, which actually will work in everybody's favor. She thought they had a strong match. Ms. Ng said she would like to thank Ms. Covello very much.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 9 -

Jeff Deutsch, Cal Student Store Director

Ms. Ng said they'd hear from Jeff Deutsch, of the Cal Student Store.

Jeff Deutsch introduced himself and said he wanted to give a brief background on the Store and then have an open forum. There were two things he wanted to talk about the Store. First of all, he really wanted to punctuate the point that the Store was really the students' Store, and he wanted as much involvement and engagement with students as possible. Saying it was "their Store" wasn't just a tagline and wasn't just marketing, but really was the case. The Store reports to the ASUC and the GA through the SOB. From Store revenue, at least \$1.75 million goes to the ASUC, and the ASUC and the GA have figured out a revenue-sharing plan. The Store is the largest revenue source for student programs on campus; and the more students were invested, the more the Store could give them money back.

Mr. Deutsch said the other thing he wanted to talk about was textbook affordability. The Store has done quite a bit with students, the Administration, and with professors, to increase and broaden options for students, as well as to do their best to keep costs down as much as possible. The Store works very closely with the Academic Senate's Affordability Committee as well as the State of California's Affordability Committee to implement recommendations. And they even go a bit above and beyond, and try to reach out and help not just the Store try and keep costs down, but even Ned's, the competitor across the street. The Cal Student Store was doing it to help Ned's keep costs down as well.

Mr. Deutsch said he wanted to keep this brief, and make sure that grads knew that the Store was their Store and secondly, that they're passionate about affordability and those kinds of issues. There were countless things he would like to talk to the GA about, but he didn't have time. He'd really love to see every one of them. Anyone who wanted to come by his office was welcome to do so, or if there was more time for him to come back, he'd be glad to speak more about the Store to the GA. He'll put his e-mail up. He would like to reserve the rest of his time for questions, feedback, and concerns about the Bookstore in general.

Mr. Klein said he's been going to Lower Sproul programming meetings. He asked how Mr. Deutsch saw the textbook section of the Store changing with the new Lower Sproul. Mr. Deutsch said he understood that the Store will be on Bancroft. In terms of what the Store actually does, that wouldn't change much at all. The Store was essentially a course materials provider. That includes not just books, but anything students might need for a class, including software and readers. There's definitely a shift towards digital textbooks, and the Store has done its best to say ahead of that curve. But it was ridiculous how little interest there was in digital books. He'd be curious to hear feedback from grad students on that. Digital sales account for less than 1% of textbook sales. But the Store will be ready for this, although he didn't see it changing much.

A Delegate asked what the general price difference was between a digital book and a printed book. Mr. Deutsch said nobody has a pricing model figured out. When they talk about that, they talk about a 50% discount. But he's seen it vary from 20% of the price to actually being more expensive. It depends on what was involved in a digital book. A digital book might be more expensive than a regular book because it has interactive software or because the publishers can't figure out how to price it. This was such a new business, with supply and demand shifts. Figuring out the pricing was really tough. They have a company that they work with that was founded by a Cal graduate, "CafeScribe," which is a really cool program. Those tend to be around 50%.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 10 -

The Delegate asked if there was any digital protection. Mr. Deutsch said they are protected. The one he mentioned was a for-life program. It doesn't expire, and people can't copy it.

Mr. Deutsch said he was wondering if GSIs or graduate students were using the textbook Store, and if not, then why not. Mr. Rabkin said that a lot of graduate departments don't have courses with textbooks, such as his department, Computer Science. They have textbooks, but they're largely PSIs. And he thought the Store's prices were high. Mr. Deutsch said they price books based on the contracts they have with the ASUC. Prices are set in the contract, which states that there's a 25% markup. It was totally transparent. After they pay staff and pay the bills, if they have revenue to pay to students, it was really razor thin. He knew that they were students and were on the other side of the cash register, but they should know that the perception that the Store was gouging students was totally inaccurate. He would rather have people buy a sweatshirt for \$50 than buy a textbook, compared to what the Store makes from the sale of those two items. The prices are contractually bound.

Mr. Deutsch said another thing that was important to know was that Ned's sometimes lowers the price by \$.25¢, or \$.50¢, or \$1.00, to compete with the Store. And the Store will match those prices.

A Delegate asked about the amount that was sent back to the publisher at the end of each semester. Mr. Deutsch said their goal over the year was to have about 27% returned. The Store wanted to over-order. The Delegate asked if they generally do that. Mr. Deutsch said they were over that. The Delegate asked if there was a surcharge of any kind from the publisher. Mr. Deutsch said a lot of publishers have restocking fees. It was totally art, and not science, figuring out what to order and how much to order. But the Store tries to be conscientious of all those factors.

A Delegate asked if the Store was moving away from readers. Mr. Deutsch said readers are huge. The Store sells maybe 1% of the readers out in the market. He didn't want to get too much into detail as to why, but the Store was adamant about copyright protection and paying whoever did the work. That might be prohibitively expensive. If people wanted to talk about how expensive textbooks are, readers were crazy expensive. The Delegate asked if they were losing out to copy shops. Mr. Deutsch said he wasn't saying that. What he was saying was that the Store's readers were really expensive and it was hard to be competitive. He was sorry to be political. He wouldn't name names, but essentially, that was the answer.

Mr. Marchand said that blue books and green books are the same price, with green books using recycled paper. He asked why the Store didn't just therefore sell the green books. Mr. Deutsch said the answer was that this was one of the things they do, but they never talk about; but he was glad to talk about it. The green books are not the same price and are more expensive. The Store pays more for them. But the Store wanted to support them, so they charge the same, and eat that margin. The readers were only the

same price because the Store wanted to make them the same price. They've had a longstanding issue with faculty, which asks for blue books. He did a campaign about two years ago and sent a letter to the faculty, through the Academic Senate, asking faculty to please call them "examination books," not "blue books." It was a stupid thing, but the Store did that. And it's been helping, as green book sales have been really big in terms of the market share. Mr. Deutsch said he's been working with the Store's sourcing team to try and find a blue book that was recyclable, because that's the other question, as to why they don't just put a blue cover on the recycled paper. Mr. Deutsch said he finally got to that point, and they're really close. They won't have it for finals that semester, but he was hoping to have them by next semester. But they'll definitely have them by the next academic year.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Deutsch said he thought Mr. Marchand sent out a link to the Store. Mr. Deutsch said he had a bunch of information, feedback, and a lot of stories to tell about the Store, so he'd ask people to please take him up on his offer to visit. His e-mail was css_admin@berkeley.edu.

Grad School Application Assistance

James introduced himself and said he was an undergraduate working in the Academic Affairs VP's office, under Viola Tang. He was organizing a graduate student application drop-in on Tuesday, November 16, 6:30 to 8:30, in the Tan Oak Room. The goal was to help seniors with their applications to grad school, med school, and law school. Grad students will read over their material and give advice on improvements. He was in the process of recruiting graduate students who were able and willing to help out seniors who are applying. The event was also open to undergrads who were interested in applying to grad school but have not yet done so, such as juniors. He had a sign-up sheet and his e-mail was included. If people were interested, he would ask them to please sign up.

Business Office

Ms. Hsueh said she wanted everybody to pay attention to her report. December was just around the corner, and people shouldn't wait for the last minute to apply for reimbursements. By December 6 she literally has no students working in the office, during RRR Week. If people file on December 6 or after, they won't get their reimbursement until the end of January. This also applies to all staff who have a budget. Secondly, the GA has a big barrel from the Alameda County Food Bank. If people have cans of food, she would ask them to please stop by. November is Food Bank Month, so if people come to the GA to pick up a check, she would ask them to bring a couple of cans with them and drop them into the barrel.

GA Announcements

Ms. Love said Faculty Mentor Award nominations will come out at the beginning of next month. She'll send something out and ask Delegates to get something to their departments.

Ms. Ng said the Coffee Hour will be on Monday, November 8. Fliers were available to put up in people's departments, with correct information on time and date. And for the last announcements, she would like to draw their attention to feedback form question number 2. If people have any suggestions about IT, they can go there. Also, she would ask them to please look at the survey, at the bottom. And if people

were interested in signing up for the mission statement work group, she would ask them to please put their name down.

Mr. Marchand said that for people who are new, the feedback form is the way attendance at GA meetings is recorded. They ask each Delegate, or their Alternate, to only miss one meeting per semester. Ms. Ng said that according to the By-laws, if a Delegate misses two GA meetings, the President can choose to dismiss them.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes
Resolution Referral
Reports -- Student Services Fee

- 12 -

Ms. Ng called for any amendments to the agenda.

A Delegate moved to add in a report on Contingency Funding. Ms. Ng said they could add that to section 3. She called for any objection to the amendment, and seeing none, said the amendment was adopted.

Ms. Ng called for any other amendments to the agenda, and seeing none. THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING, AS AMENDED, WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Navab said the Contingency Report that was referred to wasn't on the table when people came in. She asked if it was available. Ms. Ng said that Ms. Love will bring in extra copies to distribute, and Ms. Ng said she would like to thank Ms. Navab for pointing that out.

Ms. Ng called for any amendments to the September 30 GA meeting, or any objection to approval. THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 30, 2010 GA MEETING WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Ms. Ng said they did not distribute hard copies of this, but people received them electronically, and they'd put the bills up on the screen.

Ms. Ng referred the following bills to committee:

1011a, Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, and Rules Committees

1011b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, and Rules Committees

1011c, Directed Action In Support of a Study of Lower Sproul Program and Funding Options which Enhance the UC Berkeley Student Experience, to the Campus Affairs and Rules Committees

Ms. Ng called for any amendments to the referrals. Seeing none, the Resolutions are referred.

REPORTS

Student Services Fee

Ms. Ng said that Mr. Marchand will give an update on the GA's efforts regarding the Student Services Fee. This will also give people a context for Resolution 1011b, which was just referred.

Reports -- Student Services Fee (cont'd)

- 13 -

Mr. Marchand said that President Daal, the External Affairs VP, and some other members of the Exec Board went to the SAGE meeting, so he was doing a few reports on behalf of the President. Mr. Marchand said he was also one of the two GA representatives on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services and Fees. The other rep, a Delegate, should feel free to add to this.

Mr. Marchand said the Student Services Fee was something he started working on when he was interim President, during the summer. It's also something Mr. Daal worked on last year. Every student pays this fee, about \$450 a semester. It used to be called the Registration Fee. It adds up to a pool of about \$30 million. This pool was meant to fund student services that were not part of the core academic function. A large part of it goes for University Health Services and some of it goes to Intercollegiate Athletics, to the Career Center, the Recreational Sports Facility, etc. One issue was that this pool of money was allocated in a way where it was not really possible to have student input because it was essentially mixed with other revenue and passed down to the units. For example, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs got a cut from this Fee. The State budget was cut, so the campus took the money from the Student Services Fee and used it to fund other student services, and redirected it. For example, even if they collected as much Student Services Fee as they did before, because funding to University Health Services has decreased because of the State budget cuts, the campus cut funding to other student services.

Mr. Marchand said that obviously, this decision might be justified and might be something students support. But as students, they want to be able to express priorities, and to have Student Services money distributed at the function of those priorities. Thankfully, last year Mr. Daal was one of the student representatives on a task force that reviewed student service policy for the Regents, and the new policy was very positive for this aspect of student input. It mandates Chancellors on each campus to accept recommendations on how to spend the Student Services Fee from the Student Fee Advisory Committee, which is recognized by the Systemwide Council on Student Fees. These are all student-led committees on different UC campuses. The policy also mentions that the Student Fee Advisory Committee had to be representative of the populations of graduates, undergraduates, and professional students on each campus. That was a really great policy, recognizing that each campus should come to the students to express priorities on what the Student Services Fee should be spent on.

Mr. Marchand said they were now looking at what was going on at the Berkeley campus. The Berkeley Committee recognized by the Systemwide Council on Student Fees is the Committee on Student Fees, or CSF. This Committee is comprised of about 12 students. There had been only one graduate student among them, and whenever there's a vacancy, students on the Committee appointed the new member

through an interview process. So it was more or less like a self-perpetuated, closed system. One thing to keep in mind was that this Committee would mostly look at how student fees were spent, and review how different campus departments spent student fees. So it was like an oversight body. But now, the GA felt that if the Student Fee Advisory Committee had to make recommendations based on student priorities, it should be rooted in an organization that represented students in a broad way, such as the GA or the ASUC Senate.

Mr. Marchand said that during the summer he and the ASUC President, Noah Stern, started a discussion with the Chair of the Committee on Student Fees, to try to reform the CSF one to reform the campus budget process so students could have some input and so fees weren't allocated automatically, but after some process.

Mr. Marchand said the ASUC and the GA brought this to CACSSF, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services and Fees, another Committee that oversees student fees. It is composed of half

Reports -- Student Services Fee (cont'd)

- 14 -

students and half administrators. Four students are appointed by the Committee on Student Fees, two of them by the ASUC, and two by the GA.

Mr. Marchand said students need to find a solution and have a representative committee, have a budget process, and make recommendations. The Chair of the Committee on Student Fees and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Harry LeGrande, and two other members of their staff, would work on it and make recommendations. Mr. Marchand said the students asked that the ASUC and the GA be part of these discussions and define the future process for student services fee consultation. And that was rejected. Actually, the students on the Committee on Student Fees, the 12 students who are self-appointed, were the most vocal against the ASUC and the GA having a part in this. To him, that was quite unfortunate. He was open to have kind of informal discussion with students and reach a united student front, but that was not the case. That's why Mr. Marchand said the GA presented a bill at the ASUC Senate and the GA saying they need to change the Committee on Student Fees or replace it with another committee. It needed to be mostly students appointed by the ASUC and the GA. And they need to put pressure on the Regents and Systemwide. The UCSA was about to take that position. That's why the GA had a Resolution before it. Mr. Marchand said he wished they could fix this by working inside the Committee, but that hasn't worked out so far.

Mr. Rabkin asked what the objection was to the GA and the ASUC having more input. Mr. Marchand said that at the next meeting this will be discussed. They'll get the CSF to present its version. He didn't think it was an exaggeration, and thought he was representing this correctly, but from the CSF's point of view, it was comprised of students who were completely independent from the ASUC and the GA. They might not be completely independent from the campus, since they report to the Provost, but because they're independent from the GA and the ASUC, they're apolitical and just did policy analysis, and were not taken up by politics. For them, the fact that they're isolated from the political representation was actually a strength. Mr. Marchand said he had different view. But that was the cause of this disagreement. In the bill that was being proposed, the GA wasn't saying that all students should be appointed by the ASUC and the GA, but said that because they have a connection with the broad student membership, having more than half of the members who are students appointed by the ASUC and the GA would be a good idea. The Committee on Student Fees could continue to do its analysis and do its work, and review how the campus spends fees, and could still place students on these campus committees. But he thought it was a bit backwards that the ASUC, which most broadly represents the most students, and was most accountable, got the most minor role in the process, compared to a Committee that was self-appointed.

He wasn't the GA President so he didn't represent the view of the GA, and that will be determined by a Resolution.

Mr. Mikulin asked who the students are who serve on the committees and asked how they found themselves there. Mr. Marchand said he wasn't sure, but when there's an open position, there are interviews, and the students themselves make the appointments. They have not been discriminating against grad students, but it was the nature of these positions. They're paid to do analysis of the budget. It could be good as an undergrad, but if a grad already had a GSI position, for instance, this kind of work was not really something that was attractive. Maybe that was one reason they don't have many grad students represented. Mr. Marchand said he tried to communicate this, but couldn't get his point across. This will be comprised mostly of undergrads, more than two-thirds.

Mr. Mikulin asked if people who interview the Committee members were from the Provost's office. Mr. Marchand said they're members of the Committee. Committee members do the interviews of future Committee members. And only the Provost's office was interpreting that. They're self-contained. The

Reports -- Student Services Fee (cont'd)
Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

- 15 -

Committee on Student Fees does, however, make positive suggestions. Last year he would go to a Fee Committee meeting and they wanted to charge every student for bSpace, as a course material fee. That was not okay, because such fees were supposed to be for a specific class. In the end, Berkeley decided to not impose this fee. People don't know why and don't know if it was the GA that was responsible for swaying this view. But they do know that the Committee on Student Fees was actually advocating for the fee. So the CSF does take positions. If you someone wanted to change the direction of the CSF, it would take a long time because people there select the people who continue.

Mr. Mikulin said it seemed that the process was the biggest problem in that people had the right to hand pick their successors, with no public process to allow the greater student community to have input. Ms. Love said the position is posted on Cal jobs. The grad student on the Committee found the position on the listing. So it was kind of public but the GA didn't have any say in appointments. Mr. Marchand said it's a job position that was also representative. There's a fundamental conflict. It's not an ASUC or GA program. But it would be great to have an SFC that was independent and accountable. But there was no interest to change the process. And the CSF thinks that any change to the process would have to be done by the CSF itself. Considering all the power this Committee could gain, he thought the GA should put more attention on this. He asked Ms. Love to invite the CSF to come and talk to the GA. A Resolution about this will be voted on by the ASUC Senate next week.

Mr. Klein asked if the CSF has ever come to a GA meeting to say it was hiring, like the Technology Committee did that evening. Mr. Marchand said he didn't think so. Mr. Klein asked if the GA got an e-mail asking Delegates or grads to apply. Mr. Marchand said he thought the deadline occurred before the first GA meeting. He and Mr. Stern, in the summer, started to have discussions about this. But in the previous year, there was even less communication between the CSF and the GA and ASUC. He thought there's been some progress. But the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services and Fees, as well as he and Mr. Daal, had hoped for an internal resolution.

Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation

Ms. Ng said that Mr. Daal is the President and the incorporator, and in his stead, Mr. Marchand will speak about this.

Mr. Marchand said the GA decided last year to create a 501(c)3, a non-profit organization. It will essentially invest the GA's commercial reserves, the part of their reserves that are not restricted because they don't come from student fees. This money comes mostly from the Coca-Cola contract. And if the GA does any fundraising, people could give tax exempt donations to the GA or any graduate students. The GA was creating a foundation and it has been incorporated. In the next month the papers will be filed. The Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation Board had its first meeting. The Board is composed of five GA Officers who are automatically on the Board, including the President, the Rules Committee Chair, the CAVP, the EAVP, and the Budget Chair, as Treasurer of the 501(c)3. There are also two open seats, for a GA alum and for a Delegate. If any Delegate was interested in being on the Board of this 501(c)3, they should let him or Mr. Daal know. As soon as it's set up, they'll have the first members meeting of the 501(c)3. The membership of the organization was all the Delegates.

Reports -- Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation (cont'd)

- 16 -

Mr. Marchand said that when this is set up, they could accept donations that are directed for a specific purpose. The GA will make a donation to the organization. They have about \$300,000 in reserves. The GA will make a donation to the organization that will be invested and make revenue. As part of this contract, from this gift, there's another organization, which they also control. That organization will pay back interest on that money to fund GA activities.

The reason the GA had to do this was two-fold. Right now, if they have their money in campus accounts, they could have interest from that taken by the campus, and secondly, by having a 501(c)3, the GA can access donations for graduate student life and projects. Right now, the GA wasn't incorporated, and was part of the ASUC. Essentially, those are the reasons they created the BGSF. There will be an update when something more substantial happens. He just wanted to make an announcement about this so people know what it is. If a Delegate was interested in being on the Board of this non-profit that will serve the GA, they should contact him or Mr. Daal. Ms. Ng said this wasn't a huge time commitment. Mr. Marchand said there will be two meetings a semester.

Mr. Mikulin said he just wanted to make sure why this Foundation was started and its role, and about insulating it from mismanagement by the Administration. Mr. Marchand said the GA has about \$100,000 in student fee reserves. In commercial reserves, when they get the pay-out from Coca-Cola that year, they'll have about \$370,000. Student fee reserves has been invested in the UCB Foundation, and functions as an endowment. The GA wants to invest most of the commercial reserves in the 501(c)3. So they'll make a donation to that 501(c)3 to generate interest and to then give grants back to the GA. The reason they're doing that is because student fee money has strings attached. It can't be used to buy alcohol, e.g. Commercial reserves has no strings attached. If they pooled that with student fee money in the UCB fund, there were a lot of things they couldn't do, such as give scholarships based on race, due to Prop. 209. There will be some costs to have this and to administer it, which will be done by an investment foundation. The reason they're pulling these reserves away from their bank account is because the bulk of that money is managed by the ASUC Auxiliary. The Auxiliary is a University entity, and the University has a habit of just taking the interest from the Short-Term Interest Pool, STIP. When money is paid to UC, it's not used right away, and there's a huge short-term investment pool, hundreds of millions of dollars. The interest from that doesn't go back to the units where the money came from, and it becomes funds for the campus. The GA doesn't want that to happen with its money.

Ms. Ng said the money the campus takes really adds up over time. In 2007, STIP interest was about \$120,000. And the University tried to redirect all of that permanently towards the Administration.

Mr. Rabkin asked if the interest, the \$120,000, was all of STIP. Ms. Ng said it was. Mr. Rabkin said the GA's slice of that would be very small. Mr. Mikulin said it was to make sure the interest the GA earns was kept by the GA.

Ms. Love said the Berkeley Foundation gets 5%. Mr. Marchand said the GA's money in the Berkeley Foundation will get about 5% a year and will come back to the GA. They should have their first payout in the spring. The reason they're not investing all of it with UC Berkeley is because of the restrictions that come with University money.

Ms. Ng said that if people would like to learn more about the history around this, she would suggest they go to the GA Web site and look up Resolution 0909c. The Whereas Clauses give the reasons that the BGSF was founded.

Reports -- Projects Reports

- 17 -

Projects Reports

Elizabeth De La Torre said she just wanted to show some pictures of immediate events that have been held that past month. GA Projects have been really busy, with an event almost every week. The screen showed the first event, by GMORR, which was really successful. It brought undergraduates and graduates together, about half and half. So the graduate response was actually really big.

The next screen showed an event, Bridging the Gap, a signature event that happens every year and anchors the year, something people were excited about. For GMSP, they had a workshop on surviving oral exams, provided by the Graduate Support Services Project. It was also pretty successful, and people left a little more relaxed about their exams. Ms. De La Torre said she just basically wanted to show the GA pictures, really. The screen showed a picture of the study hall, put on by the Graduate Women's Project. Anybody was welcome to attend. It's a good place to study. The next will be on November 13, a Saturday. It's really quiet most of the time, although people sometimes get a little rowdy during lunch. These are held at Anthony Hall. The next screen showed the Sex and Dessert Workshop that took place October 21. It was a safe space to talk about sex, education about sex, STDs, and to get information about one's body. People didn't think there was enough information out there for graduate students about this topic, and wanted a safe space to discuss this. She thought it was pretty successful. The next screen showed a picture of the Grad Social Club's event on October 21, and the picture showed Tiffany Ng. Ms. De La Torre said that if she saw Delegates there, she tried to take their picture. Pictures were shown of the beer fest. Ms. De La Torre said they also have study halls during the week. They're a little more social, but people study and eat. The Women of Color Initiative was really busy, and the planning that went into its one event was enormous. The Women of Color Conference will be held on February 19. Kim McNair, the WOCI Coordinator, has been gathering people to be on the Committee. More than the event itself, she thought building coalitions through actually putting the event on was also as important. Ms. McNair went out to every single possible event in September and October and tried to recruit people to join the Committee.

Ms. De La Torre said that *The Berkeley Graduate* asked her to report that the blog had a lot of visits and the Coordinator was asking for ideas, on what people thought should be done, or if people wanted to write something. She's having a contest next week that people should be on the lookout for.

The next screen showed upcoming events. The Coffee Hour on Monday will be co-sponsored with GMORR. It will be for three hours, so hopefully people could attend. The screen showed other events that will be happening.

Mr. Klein said the sex education event had 20 attendees, and he asked what the budget was. Ms. De La Torre said it was about \$400, including the workshop presenter. Kara Young was really trying to make sure that parents were invited to the event. They had one child show up. For the next one, they'll really advertise that babysitters will be present. They're trying to be conscious of the fact that sometimes parents can't make it to events because they need childcare.

A Delegate asked if men were welcome at study hall. Ms. De La Torre said they were. Everybody was welcome, which was the same for all of the events.

Report on Operational Excellence

Reports -- Operational Excellence

- 18 -

Mr. Marchand said he wanted to draw people's attention to the sheet he included online and in the agenda packet. He asked how many people know what Operational Excellence is, and noted that about close to half knew. Essentially, it's a large restructuring initiative the campus was taking on things, including student services. There are different ways this could affect grads. OE will try to make things more efficient and centralize services, such as procurement, IT, and student services, including academic advising. There was also a process of organization simplification, which was basically sending out a matrix, such as having less people supervising, with each supervisor being responsible for more people, and requesting each campus unit to see if things could be more efficient. So OE was a very broad initiative.

Mr. Marchand said the GA has been pushing since the summer to get students involved in this. He had a number of points for gathering feedback from the general student population. They have applications for students to become members of the initiative teams in different areas of OE. Unfortunately, the time commitment was rather high, between 10 and 15 hours a week. It wasn't compensated other than getting course credit, which for grads, wasn't useful. If people want to volunteer, but didn't have that much time, they could still sign up and tell people what they thought. OE has meetings with the ASUC and the GA Presidents every month and people could pass the word on. And nothing prevented Delegates from passing a message on to OE.

Elliot Goldstein said that the communication for Operational Excellence was very poor, and most students didn't actually know what was going on. They're now in the second phase of OE, the design phase, which was similar to the program phase of the BEARS Initiative. It's the roadmap for how they're going to change the University

Mr. Goldstein said there are seven initiative committees. After a lot of pressuring, students have been guaranteed to have two students to serve on each of the seven committees as full participants. The committees include energy, finance, high performance, culture, IT, organization simplification, procurement, and student services.

One issue was that within the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly, there wasn't enough communication about student knowledge of the OE plan. Presidents Daal and Stern meet with Al Pisano, the Programming head. But that doesn't get information to the Senate, and information was often not distributed to grads. So that's where the idea of SOEC came from, the Student Operational Excellence Committee. It will meet bimonthly and will have people from the ASUC Senate, the GA, and the Campus Affairs and Academic Affairs VPs on it, as well as the Presidents. The role of this committee will be to nominate a student Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator to really bring together all the knowledge of what was happening with the progress of each initiative. The position will keep people updated and give regular updates and will bring together the knowledge students have so they can create an educational campaign to educate the student body about the progress and about ways they could get involved, so this wasn't happening at arm's length. They're looking for three to five GA Delegates to serve on the committee as well. It wouldn't be a very large time commitment. It will be really a good way to get involved in OE on the student side. He called for any questions.

`1

A Delegate asked how OE actually anticipates effecting. Mr. Goldstein said one initiative was student services. OE was looking to restructure things and was looking for redundancies. They'll get student input from advisory councils that Dean Poullard and Vice Chancellor LeGrande. Some services will be dropped and some might be consolidated. Students will definitely be impacted. Mr. Marchand said a final report showed the number of grad students advised by each academic advising staff, and it went

Reports -- Operational Excellence (cont'd)
Contingency Funding Report
Senate on Written Officer Reports

- 19 -

from 20 students to 200 students to one staff. And the level of satisfaction was similar. OE would have fewer staff advise more people. Chemistry has 800 students, and couldn't have four advisors. So it's not scaled that easily. Mr. Marchand said they just want to make sure that for student services, one problem is with reallocation by formula, and that was something students can be critical of.

Mr. Goldstein said OE was looking at the Auxiliary as a student service, and parts of the Auxiliary might be centralized. From the ASUC's point of view, that was the opposite, moving further away. There was a lot of conversation about how this plays in relation to the Commercial Activities Agreement and the MOU. The ASUC lawyer, Mark Himelstein, talked to the Senate about this issue. The GA might want to invite him as well. There were a lot of conversations happening over this.

A speaker asked about the faculty on some of the initiative teams and the positions they represent. Mr. Goldstein said the breakdown is at oe.berkeley.edu, the Initiatives page shows faculty and administrators on the committee. Mr. Marchand said most faculty and staff were nominated by their dean or unit director. They weren't chosen by the Academic Senate.

Ms. Ng called for Delegates to serve on the OE/ASUC committee. Ms. McCoy, Ginger Jui, Eva Hagberg, Dave Trautman, and Paz Arroyo expressed an interest. Ms. Ng said they'd try and convene in a week. She would like to thank them for volunteering.

Contingency Funding Report

Ms. Whelan said they got two applications for Contingency funding. One already got money for events they asked for and one was recommended for denial and the other was recommended for \$111.80.

Mr. Rabkin moved to approve the Funding Committee's report.

A Delegate asked why they were funding general meetings out of Contingency, and thought that was manage that was done out of GMER funds. Mr. Klein said it was formed after the deadline for Round 2, so it didn't exist for the application deadline for GMER. That's covered as part of the description of contingency, things that were out of the deadline.

Mr. Rabkin moved to approve the Funding Report. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONTINGENCY FUNDING REPORT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, AWARDING \$700 IN CONTINGENCY FUNDS FOR OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER.**

Questions on Written Officer and Staff Reports

Ms. Ng said that people received the printed reports. Reports were in a slightly different format. Instead of combining them, they were sort of separate. She would ask people to please send any feedback on whether or not this worked better. She called for any questions.

Questions on Write Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 20 -

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide

Seeing no questions, Ms. Ng said she would like to take a couple of minutes for some announcements. First of all, there's a new campus climate Web site. People can give feedback anonymously. It's a pilot program and hasn't been sent out to everyone. Delegates could take a look at it and send it to their constituencies.

Ms. Ng said that Aleks Polosukhina, former Graduate Council representative, has been appointed Campus Affairs VP Chief-of-Staff. She'll remain a Delegate for Vision Science, but she had to vacate her position on the Grad Council. As a result, there's an opening, with an election to be held at the December 2 meeting. She said that Nick Kohut, the Alternate representative, would talk about the position.

Mr. Kohut introduced himself and said he was the Grad Council Alternate. The Grad Council is made up of 10 to 12 professors and three student representatives. They discuss a wide range of topics, almost anything that affects graduate study or graduate life. One major undertaking they always have was departmental reviews. They meet once a month and there's some outside work that had to be done. In addition, there was a level of confidentiality required to facilitate honest discussion.

Mr. Klein asked if he would become the representative. Mr. Kohut said he'll be the representative for the upcoming meeting, but when there's a vacancy, there's an election.

Mr. Marchand said that anyone can run for Grad Council rep, but they try to reflect, in general, the academic diversity of the student population. The two current representatives are from Engineering and Law. So applications were encouraged from the Humanities and Social Sciences. There are issues that affect those students that the Grad Council considers, like Dean's Normative Time Fellowships. So it was good to have wide representation. Mr. Kohut said they also discuss professional degree fees.

Ms. Love said people didn't have to be a Delegate. Ms. Ng said she thought they did. Mr. Marchand at some point their rules say the Grad Council rep did have to be a delegate, and then it says they "may" be a delegate. Ms. Ng said the Rules Committee will clarify that.

Continuing announcements, Ms. Ng said there's a resignation from the Buddhist Studies Group, which possibly never had a Delegate before. So the GA was very sad to see them go.

Ms. Ng said she would like to take nominations for the workgroup chair that was created in 1004b, the Resolution to approve an amended GA mission statement. People could sign up to be a member on their feedback form, but it might be useful to select a chair that evening. She asked if anybody was interested. Eva Hagberg, in Architecture, nominated herself. Ms. Hagberg said she's worked as a writer for seven years before coming to school, so she felt fairly confident about how to use words. Seeing no other nominations, Ms. Ng said she was approved. **EVA HAGBERG WAS APPROVED AS CHAIR OF THE MISSION STATEMENT WORK GROUP, WITH NO OBJECTION.**

RESOLUTIONS

Regarding Resolution, 1009d, Resolution to Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide, Ms. Whelan said that some issues came up. They don't necessarily want to

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd) - 21 -

say this was authored by the Funding Committee, and they could have it authored by herself, Chris Klein, and Mr. Marchand. But the Resolution was the consensus opinion of the Funding Committee.

Ms. Whelan said that Mr. Marchand had already put together a beautiful Resolution, so they just fleshed it out and added a lot more detail. She had a hand out, but she didn't think it got printed out. If they look at grants, it says that grants are allocated based on their merit. As to how "merit" was defined, there's a section in the Funding Guide that rather eloquently spells it out and delineates the values the GA wants to promote. So instead of reiterating all of that in the Resolution, there's a note in the language that this was dealt with in the Funding Guide. It's already spelled out. If people would like to discuss that, it could be added to the next version of the Funding Guide.

Ms. Whelan said that in the Whereas Clauses, they tried to provide some motivation as to why it was important to put together the procedures for the Funding Committee and how much grief this has caused. What the GA would be resolving was to adopt these procedures formally and then include a copy of the Resolution in the next Funding Guide. Ms. Whelan said that one problem they had in coming up with funding procedures was that people don't necessarily pay attention to resolutions that were moved on years ago.

Ms. Ng called for any objection to the amendment by substitution of 1009d. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION OF 1009d PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

The following Resolution, 1009d, as amended by substitution, was authored by the Funding Committee:

RESOLUTION TO OUTLINE AND EXTEND FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FROM THE SUMMER 2010 FUNDING GUIDE

WHEREAS, the Funding Committee procedures proposed in summer 2010 and utilized for fall 2010 funding disbursement have not been codified; and

WHEREAS, this has caused some confusion among graduate student organizations and the graduate student committee; and

WHEREAS, funding procedures have been removed from the bylaws and have been vague and undefined since 2007, when the Graduate Assembly overhauled its By-laws; and

WHEREAS, the funding procedures proposed in this Resolution are the product of several years of informal and formal collaboration across Delegates; and

WHEREAS, these proposed funding procedures attempt to ensure a baseline level of funding for all departments, to pursue balance for non-merit based funding across departments, to accommodate diverse student group organizational structures, and to provide access to funding across several merit- and non-merit based categories of need; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for GA funding for regular meetings of graduate student groups, for groups putting on special events, for individual students traveling as part of their study, and for

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd) - 22 -

RESOLUTION TO OUTLINE AND EXTEND FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FROM THE SUMMER 2010 FUNDING GUIDE (cont'd)

unusual and unforeseen opportunities: funding is dispersed via four separate categories in order to best support these different aspects of life

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following Funding Committee procedures be adopted and a copy of this Resolution be included in the Funding Guide:

1. Categories of Funds. The GA distributes four categories of funds: group meetings, events, and resources (GMER); group Grants; individual Travel Grants; and Funding Contingency and Appeals. The following activities and items will not be granted funding in any category: weapons, alcohol, illegal substances, fundraisers, gifts, fellowships, computer software, direct contributions to political campaigns, and durable goods that cannot be made accessible to all graduate students.

A. GMER Allocations. Funding awards made for Graduate Meetings, Events, and Resources (GMER) are allocated in an attempt to serve the largest graduate student population. GMER applications that are completed accurately and in accordance with the policies and guidelines set forth in these procedures and the Funding Guide will be funded as determined by the Supergroup method described below. Merit is not assessed during the funding allocation process for GMER applications.

i. **Supergroups.** In order to serve the maximum number of departments across campus, the Funding Committee established disciplinary ‘supergroup’ for the following funding year by the preceding May Delegates meeting.

1. **Definition.** Departments are categorized into supergroups based on anticipated social affiliation, disciplinary overlap, or by departmental petition. Supergroups include one or more academic units in related disciplines and are guaranteed a percentage of available GMER funds relative to the student population. This supergroup system also addresses the concerns of allocating funds to small departments that serve communities larger than the number of graduate students dedicated to that discipline would indicate.

2. **Populations.** The number of students in each academic unit is determined by the Graduate Division. The population count will take into account only units that pay the ASUC activity fee. In cases where there is a discrepancy between the number reported by the Graduate Registrar (e.g., for the professional schools), a GA Delegate from that academic unit may submit an official letter from his or her Registrar (or equivalent administrator) to the Funding Committee to correct the discrepancy. The Funding Committee will use the most recent official numbers of graduate students available when calculating GMER funding.

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer
2010 Funding Guide (cont'd)

- 23 -

RESOLUTION TO OUTLINE AND EXTEND FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FROM THE SUMMER 2010 FUNDING GUIDE (cont'd)

3. **Notice and Delegate Approval.** The listing of the Membership of Supergroups used for the current funding year will be made available by the April Delegates Meeting. Delegates are asked to suggest changes to the Membership of Supergroups by the May Delegates Meeting, at which time the Delegate Assembly can approve the Membership of the Supergroups by a two-thirds majority. If a two-thirds majority cannot be reached, the previous year’s Membership of Supergroups stands.

ii. **GMER Allocation Process.** If the funding requests in a supergroup are below its guaranteed allocation, the remainder of funds is distributed to remaining unsatisfied supergroups in proportion to their graduate student population. This process is repeated until all funds are allocated. If the funding requests from a supergroup exceed its guaranteed allocation each student group in this supergroup receives a fraction of the amount requested; that fraction is equal to the ration of the allocated funds over the requested funds for the whole supergroup.

iii. **Departmental Declaration.** Applications for all funding rounds (except before the Fall Semester begins. See below.) require the signature(s) of the GA

Delegate(s) that represent that group's membership. By default, when a graduate student group submits a GMER funding application the Funding Committee will use the department affiliation(s) of the signatory GA Delegate(s) to assign the student group to a supergroup for that funding round using the Membership of Supergroups.

Groups applying before the Fall Semester begins must list their expected and accurate department affiliations(s). The Funding Committee will review previous group department affiliations(s) to ensure accuracy, and follow up with GA Delegates once they are appointed. Applicants who are later found to have misrepresented their group will be ineligible for GA funding for the remainder of the school year.

iv. **Interdisciplinary and Cross Supergroup Applications.** In the case of multiple GA Delegates signatories from different supergroups, the Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging in equal fractions to each of the different supergroups linked to from the GA Delegate signatories.

If a student group is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate, the group must submit a membership roster (containing student names, individual department affiliations, and student ID numbers) with their GMER funding application. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups indicated in the membership roster in proportion to representation in the membership roster.

RESOLUTION TO OUTLINE AND EXTEND FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FROM THE SUMMER 2010 FUNDING GUIDE (cont'd)

B. Group Grants Allocation. Group grant applications are evaluated based on the extent to which grant projects serve the goals and values delineated in the Funding Guide: diversity, community service, student activist, and educational improvement. Grant applications either receive the full amount requested (up to the funding limit) or are denied funding. An expensive application with moderate merit will receive a lower funding priority than an application with a moderate budget and equivalent or greater merit. This policy facilitates the Funding Committee in allocating the GA's limited availability funds in a manner which best serves the graduate community.

A representative from each group is invited to make themselves available, either by phone or by email, to respond to questions or requests to modify a grant funding application at designated Funding Committee meetings. The student group representative may be asked to amend the request of remove a specific line item to allow for a modified project to be fully funded.

C. Travel Grants Allocations. Individual graduate students are encouraged to apply for up to \$300 in travel money to present at a conference. If the amount requested in

travel grants exceeds the available funds, the applicants the grants will be determined by lottery. The Business Office administers the distribution of travel grants.

D. Funding Contingency and Appeals Allocation. Applications for contingency funding will be granted funds at the discretion of the Funding Committee, based on the application's merit and urgency. Groups are also encouraged to apply under this category for durable goods that will be housed in Anthony Hall and are available for check-out by all graduate student groups. The Funding Appeals Committee will allocate contingency funds to resolve funding appeals.

At the end of each academic semester (not more than three weeks before the last day of the semester), the Funding Committee may allocate any unallocated Contingency funds in service to the GA by contributing to GA projects funding, purchasing property for the GA, or supplementing other GA budget categories. Traditionally, the Fall Semester surplus Contingency funding will be rolled over into Spring Semester group funding.

2. Funding Rounds. Funds in each category are distributed over several funding rounds. The application deadline and time period covered by each round is published in the Funding Guide. The allocation of funds amongst different rounds and funding categories will be determined by the Funding Committee, in accordance with historical trends of funding demand (as obtained from the GA Business Office).

3. Funding Limit. By the May Delegates meeting, the Funding Committee may set a limit for the amount that can be request by any applicant in a given funding category. Applications that request more than the limit will be denied.

Ms. Ng called for any debate on the Resolution.

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer
2010 Funding Guide (cont'd)

- 25 -

Ms. Navab said that in the categories of funds, some of the things that couldn't be funded made sense, like alcohol. But others were either a little vague, like "durable goods," or slightly problematic, in her opinion, like "computer software." She asked about the thinking behind that.

Ms. Ng said that to facilitate debate, the Chair would ask which parts of the Resolution they want to amend. Once they knew the number of proposed amendments, they could determine a reasonable limit for debate and ensure everybody got heard.

Ms. Whelan said that in answer to the question, the idea behind a lot of their funding allocations, the things they pay for are to promote the good will and well being of all graduate students. That's why wouldn't fund "durable goods" that could not be made accessible to all graduate students. The reason they included that language was so that someone doesn't apply for an espresso machine that they lock in their office. They suggest that Funding could be used by people who apply for durable goods, which would be housed in Anthony Hall, and could be checked out by every graduate student. That wouldn't necessarily eat up a group's GMER or grant money. With that said, she wanted to remind everyone that there are projectors at the GA, as well as projector screens and computers that groups could borrow. So those were things groups shouldn't apply for. That was the idea of "durable goods." The idea of an espresso machine has come up more than once.

Ms. Whelan said computer software was also problematic for that reason because students often apply for expensive software when a freeware version was available that did the same thing. She has not yet encountered a situation where freeware wasn't available to meet the need.

Mr. Klein said the GA could buy software licenses which could then be lent out to student groups and maintained by the GA. If a group really needed a program, the GA could buy it and allow it to be used and brought back. Ms. Whelan said people apply for things for their own personal computers, and that was unfair.

Ms. Love asked what the process would be to apply for the GA to buy something. She's part of a journal and it needs software to publish. She asked how they'd apply for that. Mr. Klein said the group could apply for Contingency funding. There are a lot of journals and if a lot use the program, maybe a license could be shared. Five journals that wanted a license would be a strong Contingency Fund request.

Ms. Navab said the language states that they couldn't apply for that in any category, including Contingency. Mr. Klein asked to have that added to the amendment list.

Ms. Ng asked to generate an amendments list. Mr. Marchand asked to add computer software to what could be purchased by and stored at the GA. A Delegate said the section of supergroup membership was vague. Mr. Froehle said he would like to amend the bill as coming from the actual authors as opposed to the Funding Committee. Ms. Navab said she would like add language stating that all funding allocations were subject to Delegate approval. A Delegate asked to amend the vote needed for the GA to approve supergroups, from a two-thirds vote to a simple majority. A Delegate asked to delete to the second paragraph of 1.A.iv, "If a supergroup is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate... [t]he Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups... in the membership roster." A Delegate asked to remove the last sentence of 1.B., "This policy facilitates the Funding Committee in allocating the GA's limited availability funds in a manner which best serves the graduate community." Ms. Navab asked to delete or modify the second paragraph of 1.A.iv., calling for a group to submit its membership

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd) - 26 -

roster with its GMER funding application if they don't have a Delegate's signature. A Delegate asked to put limits on the funding procedure.

A Delegate moved to amend authorship from the Funding Committee to Mary Whelan, Chris Klein, and Jason Kim. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Rabkin moved to amend "1. Categories of Funds," to grant funding for durable goods and computer software as long as they were made available to all graduate students.

A Delegate asked how the amendment would solve the problem. Mr. Rabkin said it would not allow software to be bought that couldn't be shared with anyone else. Mr. Klein said the amendment would allow people to apply for software under Resources and the Funding Committee would recommend what people thought about funding it from Contingency.

Ms. Navab asked if the GA had computers that groups could use. Ms. Hsueh said they did, and said that anyone could come in during normal business hours and use their computers. There are computers set up for people to come in and use as a guest.

Mr. Rabkin's motion to amend was seconded.

Ms. Love said the amendment would render the software essentially useless for anybody who wanted to publish a journal. Mr. Klein said groups could also get a license to use a program on a local machine. Ms. Love said that if somebody had to go Anthony Hall, that could render this policy useless.

A Delegate said they should amend the language to make it much clearer what they were trying to say. It was open to interpretation. Putting it in two sentences would make it clearer.

Mr. Rabkin moved to amend 1. Categories of Funds, to delete:

“The following activities and items will not be granted funding in any category: weapons, alcohol, illegal substances, fundraisers, gifts, fellowships, computer software, direct contributions to political campaigns, and durable goods that cannot be made accessible to all graduate students.”

It would be replaced with the following:

“The following activities and items will not be granted funding in any category: weapons, alcohol, illegal substances, fundraisers, gifts, fellowships, direct contributions to political campaigns. Durable goods and computer software may be granted funding so long as they are made accessible to all graduate students.”

The motion to amend was seconded.

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

Ms. Navab moved to add “All funding allocations are subject to Delegate approval.”

Mr. Klein said that would just reiterate the By-laws.

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer
2010 Funding Guide (cont'd)

- 27 -

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

A Delegate moved to amend 3. Notice and Delegate Approval, to amend the vote needed to approve membership of supergroups, from a two-thirds majority to a simple majority. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Klein said they decided to have a two-thirds vote because they wanted to make it more difficult than a simple majority to change the composition of the supergroups.

Mr. Rabkin said that these rules dealt with Funding Committee procedures, and he didn't think anything in Funding Committee procedures could require a two-thirds vote of the Delegates to do anything. A simple majority would suffice. The Funding Committee has no authority to disagree with the majority of the Delegates.

A Delegate said that he thought they should lower the threshold since departments disappear and new departments are made. It would almost be impossible to obtain a super majority, especially if certain schools represent a huge majority of the grad student population.

Mr. Marchand said he thought having a two-thirds vote was out of order because the Funding Committee procedures state that the Funding Committee should designate how the Committee operates. The Delegate Assembly could approve any motion by a simple majority, according to its By-laws. This change should be made in the By-laws, not in Funding Committee procedures.

THE MOTION TO CHANGE THE VOTES NEEDED TO AMEND THE MEMBERSHIP OF SUPER-GROUPS FROM TWO-THIRDS TO A SIMPLE MAJORITY PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, IN "3. NOTICE AND DELEGATE APPROVAL."

A Delegate moved to amend the bill, by deleting the last line of "B. Group Grants Allocation": "This policy facilitates the Funding Committee in allocating the GA's limited availability funds in a manner which best serves the graduate community." The motion to amend was seconded.

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

A Delegate said she thought it was unnecessarily punitive for a group that requested more funding than the limit. They could just be capped at the limit. She didn't see how a larger request harmed anyone. Ms. Whelan said that unfairly penalizes people who applied with budgets that were more reasonable. If a group makes a mistake and asks for more than \$500, the total budget was still \$500. But if a group made a mistake and applied for \$499, they could get \$300 because of the mistake.

A Delegate said the Funding Committee has expressed the difficulty of going through all the applications. Being able to apply the right methods to the right categories would help the Committee a lot.

Ms. Navab said that in theory, she understood the intention, but the way the current applications are done, it was really hard for a student group to say their event will cost more, but they were only going to ask for a smaller amount, and didn't have the rest figured out. That was the only way a group wouldn't ask for

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd) - 28 -

the full amount. Unless the GA was willing to fix its funding application every year, they couldn't make sure it would fit every year. She would recommend something like the Funding Committee sending groups an e-mail saying their request wouldn't happen and asking the group to modify its application.

Ms. Whelan said the application has a column for money being requested, what was needed, and doesn't even ask for other funding sources. The group just had to put no more than \$500 for the amount they're asking for. That was all, and that was on the application.

Mr. Klein said there's a column for money that groups think they'll get from other sources, where they can put predicted revenue. The Funding Committee just didn't want to see more than \$500 in the request going to the GA.

Mr. Kohut asked if the application makes it clear that if a group makes a request that was over the limit that it would be denied. Mr. Klein said that for the current practice for this semester has been to allow groups to reduce the request to \$500 and to give them a warning, so the group was prepared for next semester. Mr. Kohut asked if that could be made explicit next semester. Mr. Klein said they could do that.

Ms. Ng said that seeing no motions to extend time, they would now vote on the amendment to 3. Funding Limit, to delete the last sentence, "Applications that request more than the limit will be denied."

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

A Delegate said he would like to discuss how membership of supergroups will be determined. Mr. Klein said they just changed it to a vote of a simple majority. The Funding Committee currently has a list of all the supergroups and the departments in them. They want to allow Delegates to change that list as they want, once a year.

A Delegate asked if those changes would happen with its own vote. Mr. Klein said that the Funding Committee envisioned that when the current list was presented, amendments could be proposed in a normal fashion and debated, and the Funding Committee would apply whatever the result was for the next year. There's a difference between department affiliation and group affiliation. They tried to make that clear in the Resolution. This would be only for changing department affiliations within supergroups. Individual groups can change their supergroup affiliation through either Delegate signatures or membership rosters with their applications.

Mr. Rabkin said he didn't see why they had to forbid the GA from considering this only in May. He moved to strike the entire paragraph, "3. Notice and Delegate Approval," and replace it with: "3. Notice and Delegate Approval. The listing of the membership of supergroups, to be used for the forthcoming year, will be made available by the April Delegates meeting. The Delegate Assembly may change this list by majority vote at any time."

A Delegate asked if the supergroup membership would not need a vote to be in effect. Mr. Rabkin said it wouldn't.

The motion to amend was seconded.

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd) - 29 -

A Delegate asked what repercussions this amendment would have for the Funding Committee. Mr. Rabkin said he wanted to clarify that the Delegates could change supergroup membership whenever they felt like it. Mr. Klein said that should be assumed. They want to say that the Funding Committee had to present a list at the May meeting. Mr. Rabkin said that's what his amendment would say; and the Delegates could change that by majority vote. A Delegate said the wording suggests that the list could only be changed in May.

Mr. Rabkin asked to withdraw his amendment. Ms. Ng said the amendment was withdrawn.

Ms. Navab moved to strike, in the second paragraph of "iv. Interdisciplinary and Cross Supergroup Applications," the requirement for groups to submit a membership roster, including student ID numbers.

She said that information could be sensitive for queer groups, Muslim student groups, or other kinds of student groups. The amendment would delete the second paragraph of “iv. Interdisciplinary and Cross Supergroup Applications:”

“If a student group is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate, the group must submit a membership roster (containing student names, individual department affiliations, and student ID numbers) with their GMER funding application. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups indicated in the membership roster in proportion to representation in the membership roster.”

Ms. Navab said the amendment would replace the wording of the second paragraph of iv. with the following:

“If a student group is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate the group may submit a funding application and make its case to the Funding Committee. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups indicated in a membership roster, if provided, in proportion to representation in the membership roster or at the discretion of the Funding Committee.”

Ms. Whelan said they included the using a roster in case a group’s GA Delegate was a jerk and didn’t want to sign the form. Ms. Navab said a group should be able to apply without a Delegate signature and then explain their case to the Funding Committee. The GA should have a plan in the event a group doesn’t have a GA Delegate or their Delegate doesn’t sign.

Mr. Rabkin said he believed that student ID numbers were private information. He didn’t think the GA was allowed to ask for that.

A Delegate asked what would constitute membership. Mr. Rabkin said that if a group wanted to be a student group, it would have to submit some of its members to the Center for Student Leadership and have a Constitution. They had to say who their members are, without listing names. The student group’s constitution defines a member.

A Delegate said that one reason this wording was in the Resolution was because it wasn’t vague and was spelled out for the Funding Committee.

Ms. Navab said this was a rare case. She was okay with the Funding Committee making the call rather than subjecting students to unnecessary exposure of the private choices of their members.

Ms. Navab said that if a student group was unable to obtain a Delegate’s signature, it should be able to submit an application and make a case before the Funding Committee.

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont’d) - 30 -

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MS. NAVAB’S AMENDMENT TO IV. INTERDISCIPLINARY AND CROSS SUPERGROUP APPLICATIONS, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE. A Delegate asked what the count was. Ms. Ng said it was 24-17-0.

Mr. Froehle moved to call the question on the resolution, as amended. The motion to end debate on the Resolution failed by hand-vote.

A motion to extend time on the Resolution by ten minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate moved to amend the Resolution, “**B. Group Grants Allocation,**” by deleting: “Grant applications either receive the full amount requested (up to the funding limit) or are denied funding.”

The Funding Committee will not modify an application without consent. If there are minor problems with the application, the group wouldn't receive funding. If there's a date that was out of range, the application would be struck.

Ms. Whelan said that the idea was that if a group applies for a bunch of events, and one event was out of the round, it's stipulated that if a group representative makes themselves available by e-mail or phone, and makes sure the application could be changed, then the group could get funding. They want the group itself to modify the application to come up with a project that the GA can fund fully. It was important to have changes come from groups, but it was too much work for the Funding Committee to just start to draw lines on people's applications.

Mr. Rabkin said that having groups able to make changes before the Funding Committee was reasonable protection, and all or nothing was good for keeping people honest. The Funding Committee could discuss changes but wouldn't make those changes unless a group wished. He felt the current text was a reasonable compromise.

Ms. Navab said that the Resolution doesn't actually say that back-and-forth dialogue would occur. Mr. Rabkin said it wasn't required, but was encouraged to happen.

A Delegate said the wording doesn't promote the spirit of negotiations, and if it wasn't explicit, he asked how it would be passed on. Ms. Whelan said the text reads that a rep from groups would be invited to make themselves available by phone or e-mail to respond to questions to modify an application and may be asked to amend the request to allow for modified funding. She didn't think that was vague. Ms. Navab said the preceding line doesn't allow for that to happen. The wording should say that grants applications should either receive the full amount or that the group would be contacted. Ms. Whelan said nothing was ambiguous there.

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

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

Resolution 1009d, To Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd) - 31 -
Resolution 1010a, To Amend the GA Budget to Restore External Affairs Funding for Student Advocates For Graduate Education (SAGE)

Mr. Klein moved to amend to have the original wording of the Resolution. Ms. Ng said that was a motion to reconsider. It had to be made by someone on the prevailing side.

A Delegate moved to amend “iv. **Interdisciplinary and Cross Supergroup Applications,**” the second paragraph, to delete:

If a student group is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate, the group must submit a membership roster (containing student names, individual department affiliations, and student ID numbers) with their GMER funding application. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups indicated in the membership roster in proportion to representation in the membership roster. That wording would be replaced by: "If a student group is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate the group may submit a funding application and make its case to the Funding Committee. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups indicated in a membership roster, if provided, in proportion to representation in the membership roster, or at the discretion of the Funding Committee."

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Klein said that he believed that not having a check on groups that don't have affiliations allows for abuse of this rule by the Funding Committee. If the Astronomy Department wanted to be in the Humanities supergroup because it could get more funding, they could have friends agree with that. The idea of having some sort of requirement for a student group to prove that it belongs in a particular department would prevent the Funding Committee from abusing its discretionary power.

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

Seeing no other discussion, Ms. Ng said the question was called.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1009d, AS AMENDED BY SUBSTITUTION AND ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO OUTLINE AND EXTEND FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FROM THE SUMMER 2010 FUNDING GUIDE.

The following Resolution, 1010a, was authored by Michael Nicholas and Alberto Ortega:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO RESTORE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FUNDING FOR STUDENT ADVOCATES FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION (SAGE)

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly's Mission states: "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"; and

Resolution 1010a, To Amend the GA Budget to Restore External Affairs Funding for Student Advocates For Graduate Education (SAGE) (cont'd) - 32 -

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO RESTORE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FUNDING FOR STUDENT ADVOCATES FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION (SAGE) (cont'd)

WHEREAS, sharing of best practices amongst peer institutions' graduate student governments as well as direct advocacy on behalf of graduate students at federal, state and local governments to

increase access, affordability and quality of education as well as quality of life for graduate students is an important undertaking of the GA to satisfy its mission; and

WHEREAS, the Coalition of Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE) was created at the UT Austin 2008 Fall Summit where UC Berkeley became one of 10 charter members with the intent of being a national coalition to share graduate student government best practices and serve as an advocacy group to lobby at the federal level on behalf of graduate students at public graduate universities to increase access, affordability and quality of education as well as quality of life at public graduate universities; and

WHEREAS, for the past two years, representatives from the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly have participated in summits of the premier public universities organized by SAGE and hosted by the University of Texas at Austin and University of Washington respectively with the intent to strategize how best to serve our constituents; and

WHEREAS, for the past two years, representatives from the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly have participated in SAGE's annual Day on the Hill in Washington DC, where SAGE members met with over one hundred legislators (including over forty from California) and the US Treasury, to advocate for improved tax treatment of graduate student fellowship and grants, better immigration policy for graduate students, and expansion of loan forgiveness programs for students seeking careers in public service; and

WHEREAS, SAGE will be organizing a Fall Summit at UCLA on November 4-7, 2010 to continue sharing of best practices and begin planning the Day on the Hill at Washington, DC for March 2011; and

WHEREAS, the SAGE budget line item was improperly removed from the current year's budget; and

WHEREAS, the External Affairs travel line item which is intended for UC Student Association monthly travel to other UC campuses for the monthly Board of Directors meetings was inadequately renamed to "Travel (SAGE)"; and

WHEREAS, the current budget does not account for any of SAGE's expenses and does not have sufficient monies to participate in the SAGE Fall Summit and DOH; and

WHEREAS, the EAVP is currently the Chairperson of SAGE and his involvement is critical to SAGE's advocacy; and

WHEREAS, although we are currently seeking external funding from the Chancellor's Office and Graduate Division, which if received will help cover some of the costs, we do not believe we will receive adequate support from these avenues alone; and

Resolution 1010a, To Amend the GA Budget to Restore External Affairs Funding for Student Advocates For Graduate Education (SAGE) (cont'd) - 33 -
Resolution 1010b, To Create a GA Structure Review Workgroup

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO RESTORE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FUNDING FOR STUDENT ADVOCATES FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION (SAGE) (cont'd)

WHEREAS, at the time the current budget was approved there was an allocation for the line item ASUC Elections in the amount of \$17,000 and we now know this to be much higher than needed, as the cost for ASUC Elections is now known to have been under \$11,000;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA budget be amended to add a line item in the EAVP Budget for SAGE travel expenses and funded with \$4,000 from the aforementioned ASUC Elections line item to support the GA's engagement with SAGE.

Mr. Nicholas said that when the previous Budget Committee Chair made the current year's budget, he accidentally left out a line item under the External Affairs VP. The current budget, which people don't have but was available online, has a travel line item. There used to be a separate travel line item for SAGE, which was where Mr. Ortega and Mr. Daal were at that time. Mr. Ortega is the current Chair of SAGE, Student Advocates for Graduate Education, a coalition of about 14 research universities around the US that advocates for graduate students. One thing, e.g., they're advocating for was to make fellowships non-taxable income. Mr. Nicholas said he noticed this earlier in the semester and just found out from Ms. Hsueh that the GA over-budgeted another line item, for ASUC elections. They allocated \$17,000 for elections, but the actual cost was under \$11,000. Mr. Nicholas said he asked Mr. Ortega the amount needed to fund travel to SAGE and it was about \$6-7,000. But Mr. Ortega will probably get other funding from the Graduate Division. So the allocation to the line item would be \$4,000.

Mr. Nicholas said he would like to thank the Rules Committee for clarifying the wording with its amendment. The current travel line item would remain, and a new travel line item for SAGE would be created. The \$4,000 would be put into that new line item.

The amendment would replace the current wording of the Resolved Clause with the following:
"Resolved that the GA Budget be amended to correct the line in the EAVP Budget currently labeled "Travel (SAGE)" to "Travel (UCSA)." Furthermore, a line item labeled "Travel (SAGE)" shall be added and funded with \$4,000 from the aforementioned ASUC Elections line item to support the GA's engagement with SAGE."

A motion to approve the Rules Committee amendment was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1010A, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO RESTORE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FUNDING FOR STUDENT ADVOCATES FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION (SAGE)

The following Resolution, 1010b, was authored by Philippe Marchand:

Resolution 1010b, To Create a GA Structure Review Workgroup (cont'd)

- 34 -

RESOLUTION TO CREATE A GA STRUCTURE REVIEW WORKGROUP

WHEREAS the Graduate Assembly has taken on additional responsibilities and projects in the past few years, without a comprehensive review of its internal structure; and

WHEREAS the current workload of GA officers can make these positions out of reach to many graduate students who need to simultaneously do research and teach; and

WHEREAS there have been recurring concerns about the lack of internal communications between the major components of the GA (Delegate Assembly, Executive Board, Projects, Business Office); and

WHEREAS no specific GA committee can currently take on a comprehensive review of the GA structure without negatively affecting its regular work;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a workgroup be created with the following charge:

1. In order to represent a broad cross-section of the graduate student community, the workgroup shall comprise a diverse set of graduate students, including but not limited to several departments from academic and professional schools. A majority of the membership shall consist of GA Delegates.
2. The workgroup will make a good faith effort to seek advice from a non-GA entity specializing in organizational studies (e.g. one or more organizational professors at UC Berkeley).
3. The GA Structure Review Workgroup will analyze the current GA structure, including the division of powers and division of workload within the GA.
4. Based on this analysis, the Workgroup will make recommendations to the Assembly with the dual goals of:
 - a. achieving an adequate division of workload among GA officers and staff;
 - b. increasing coherence and collaboration among the GA components.
5. The Workgroup will submit a report containing its analysis and recommendations no later than the February 2011 Delegate Assembly meeting.
6. The Workgroup will submit and present a comprehensive report detailing methodology, rationale and implementation plans to the full Delegate Assembly at the February 2011 meeting, allowing time for questions and discussion.

Mr. Marchand said he wanted to note that the workgroup that will review GA structure, to hopefully make it work better, and encourage more people to run for GA positions. The Rules Committee proposed two amendments, to replace points 1) and 2) with the following:

“1. In order to represent a broad cross-section of the graduate student community, the workgroup shall comprise a diverse set of graduate students, including but not limited to several departments from academic and professional schools. A majority of the membership shall consist of GA Delegates.

“2. The workgroup will make a good faith effort to seek advice from a non-GA entity specializing in organizational studies (e.g. one or more organizational professors at UC Berkeley).”

The Campus Affairs Committee proposed an amendment to point 5), to read as follows:

“5) The Workgroup will submit and present a comprehensive report detailing methodology, rationale and implementation plans to the full Delegate Assembly at the February 2011 meeting, allowing time for questions and discussion.”

Mr. Marchand said he would consider these as friendly amendments. If they pass the Resolution, he hoped to select a chair and get volunteers to be part of this workgroup, which will probably meet in the next few months to bring recommendations to the GA in February.

A motion to approve the amendments was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE THREE AMENDMENTS OUT OF COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1010b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO CREATE A GA STRUCTURE REVIEW WORKGROUP.**

Ms. Ng said they would form the workgroup immediately she asked who would like to chair it. A Delegate nominated Mr. Marchand to chair it.

A Delegate asked how often it will meet. Mr. Marchand said it will meet once a month for the next few months, and more if people wanted. Most of the work will be done by the chair.

Seeing no other nominations, Ms. Ng said they would vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. MARCHAND AS THE CHAIR OF THE WORK GROUP PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Ms. Ng asked who would like to join the workgroup. Delegates indicating an interest were Ms. Bahr, Apple W., Molly E., Dillon N., Francis B. Ms. Ng said the workgroup was formed.

This meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

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

Resolution to Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide

Whereas, the Funding Committee procedures proposed in summer 2010 and utilized for fall 2010 funding disbursement have not been codified; and

Whereas, this has caused some confusion among graduate student organizations and the graduate student committee; and

Whereas, funding procedures have been removed from the bylaws and have been vague and undefined since 2007, when the Graduate Assembly overhauled its By-laws; and

Whereas, the funding procedures proposed in this Resolution are the product of several years of informal and formal collaboration across Delegates; and

Whereas, these proposed funding procedures attempt to ensure a baseline level of funding for all departments, to pursue balance for non-merit based funding across departments, to accommodate diverse student group organizational structures, and to provide access to funding across several merit- and non-merit based categories of need; and

Whereas, there is a need for GA funding for regular meetings of graduate student groups, for groups putting on special events, for individual students traveling as part of their study, and for unusual and unforeseen opportunities: funding is dispersed via four separate categories in order to best support these different aspects of life

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the following Funding Committee procedures be adopted and a copy of this Resolution be included in the Funding Guide:

1. Categories of Funds. The GA distributes four categories of funds: group meetings, events, and resources (GMER); group Grants; individual Travel Grants; and Funding Contingency and Appeals. The following activities and items will not be granted funding in any category: weapons, alcohol, illegal substances, fundraisers, gifts, fellowships, direct contributions to political campaigns. Durable goods and computer software may be granted funding so long as they are made accessible to all graduate students.

A. GMER Allocations. Funding awards made for Graduate Meetings, Events, and Resources (GMER) are allocated in an attempt to serve the largest graduate student population. GMER applications that are completed accurately and in accordance with the policies and guidelines set forth in these procedures and the Funding Guide will be funded as determined by the Supergroup method described below. Merit is not assessed during the funding allocation process for GMER applications.

i. Supergroups. In order to serve the maximum number of departments across campus, the Funding Committee established disciplinary 'supergroup' for the following funding year by the preceding May Delegates meeting.

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

Resolution to Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide

1. **Definition.** Departments are categorized into supergroups based on anticipated social affiliation, disciplinary overlap, or by departmental petition. Supergroups include one or more academic units in related disciplines and are guaranteed a percentage of available GMER funds relative to the student population. This supergroup system also addresses the concerns of allocating funds to small departments that serve communities larger than the number of graduate students dedicated to that discipline would indicate.

2. **Populations.** The number of students in each academic unit is determined by the Graduate Division. The population count will take into account only units that pay the ASUC activity fee. In cases where there is a discrepancy between the number reported by the Graduate Registrar (e.g., for the professional schools), a GA Delegate from that academic unit may submit an official letter from his or her Registrar (or equivalent administrator) to the Funding Committee to correct the discrepancy. The Funding Committee will use the most recent official numbers of graduate students available when calculating GMER funding.

3. **Notice and Delegate Approval.** The listing of the Membership of Supergroups used for the current funding year will be made available by the April Delegates Meeting. Delegates are asked to suggest changes to the Membership of Supergroups by the May Delegates Meeting, at which time the Delegate Assembly can approve the Membership of the Supergroups by a simple majority. If a simple majority cannot be reached, the previous year's Membership of Supergroups stands.

ii. **GMER Allocation Process.** If the funding requests in a supergroup are below its guaranteed allocation, the remainder of funds is distributed to remaining unsatisfied supergroups in proportion to their graduate student population. This process is repeated until all funds are allocated. If the funding requests from a Supergroup exceed its guaranteed allocation each student group in this supergroup receives a fraction of the amount requested; that fraction is equal to the ration of the allocated funds over the requested funds for the whole supergroup.

iii. **Departmental Declaration.** Applications for all funding rounds (except before the Fall Semester begins. See below.) require the signature(s) of the GA Delegate(s) that represent that group's membership. By default, when a graduate student group submits a GMER funding application the Funding Committee will use the department affiliation(s) of the signatory GA Delegate(s) to assign

the student group to a supergroup for that funding round using the Membership of Supergroups.

Amended Resolutions -- 1009d (cont'd)

- iii -

Resolution to Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd)

Groups applying before the Fall Semester begins must list their expected and accurate department affiliations(s). The Funding Committee will review previous group department affiliations(s) to ensure accuracy, and follow up with GA Delegates once they are appointed. Applicants who are later found to have misrepresented their group will be ineligible for GA funding for the remainder of the school year.

iv. Interdisciplinary and Cross Supergroup Applications. In the case of multiple GA Delegates signatories from different supergroups, the Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging in equal fractions to each of the different supergroups linked to from the GA Delegate signatories.

If a student group is unable to obtain the signature of a GA Delegate the group may submit a funding application and make its case to the Funding Committee. The Funding Committee will treat the group as belonging to all supergroups indicated in a membership roster, if provided, in proportion to representation in the membership roster or at the discretion of the Funding Committee.

B. Group Grants Allocation. Group grant applications are evaluated based on the extent to which grant projects serve the goals and values delineated in the Funding Guide: diversity, community service, student activist, and educational improvement. Grant applications either receive the full amount requested (up to the funding limit) or are denied funding. An expensive application with moderate merit will receive a lower funding priority than an application with a moderate budget and equivalent or greater merit.

A representative from each group is invited to make themselves available, either by phone or by email, to respond to questions or requests to modify a grant funding application at designated Funding Committee meetings. The student group representative may be asked to amend the request of remove a specific line item to allow for a modified project to be fully funded.

C. Travel Grants Allocations. Individual graduate students are encouraged to apply for up to \$300 in travel money to present at a conference. If the amount requested in travel grants exceeds the available funds, the applicants the grants will be determined by lottery. The Business Office administers the distribution of travel grants.

D. Funding Contingency and Appeals Allocation. Applications for contingency funding will be granted funds at the discretion of the Funding Committee, based on the application's merit and urgency. Groups are also encouraged to apply under this category for computer software that can be made accessible to all graduate students, and

durable goods that will be housed in Anthony Hall and are available for checkout by all graduate student groups. The Funding Appeals Committee will allocate contingency funds to resolve funding appeals.

Amended Resolutions -- 1009d (cont'd)
-- 1010a

- iv -

Resolution to Outline and Extend Funding Committee Procedures from the Summer 2010 Funding Guide (cont'd)

At the end of each academic semester (not more than three weeks before the last day of the semester), the Funding Committee may allocate any unallocated Contingency funds in service to the GA by contributing to GA projects funding, purchasing property for the GA, or supplementing other GA budget categories. Traditionally, the Fall Semester surplus Contingency funding will be rolled over into Spring Semester group funding.

2. Funding Rounds. Funds in each category are distributed over several funding rounds. The application deadline and time period covered by each round is published in the Funding Guide. The allocation of funds amongst different rounds and funding categories will be determined by the Funding Committee, in accordance with historical trends of funding demand (as obtained from the GA Business Office).

3. Funding Limit. By the May Delegates meeting, the Funding Committee may set a limit for the amount that can be requested by any applicant in a given funding category. Applications that request more than the limit will be denied.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all funding allocations are subject to Delegate approval.

The following Resolution, 1010a, was amended at the GA meeting to read as follows:

Resolution to Amend the GA Budget to Restore External Affairs Funding for Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE)

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly's Mission states: "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"; and

Whereas, sharing of best practices amongst peer institutions' graduate student governments as well as direct advocacy on behalf of graduate students at federal, state and local governments to increase access, affordability and quality of education as well as quality of life for graduate students is an important undertaking of the GA to satisfy its mission; and

Whereas, the Coalition of Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE) was created at the UT Austin 2008 Fall Summit where UC Berkeley became one of 10 charter members with the intent of being a national coalition to share graduate student government best practices and

serve as an advocacy group to lobby at the federal level on behalf of graduate students at public graduate universities to increase access, affordability and quality of education as well as quality of life at public graduate universities; and

Amended Resolutions --1010a (cont'd)

- v -

Resolution to Amend the GA Budget to Restore External Affairs Funding for Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE) (cont'd)

Whereas, for the past two years, representatives from the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly have participated in summits of the premier public universities organized by SAGE and hosted by the University of Texas at Austin and University of Washington respectively with the intent to strategize how best to serve our constituents; and

Whereas, for the past two years, representatives from the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly have participated in SAGE's annual Day on the Hill in Washington DC, where SAGE members met with over one hundred legislators (including over forty from California) and the US Treasury, to advocate for improved tax treatment of graduate student fellowship and grants, better immigration policy for graduate students, and expansion of loan forgiveness programs for students seeking careers in public service; and

Whereas, SAGE will be organizing a Fall Summit at UCLA on November 4-7, 2010 to continue sharing of best practices and begin planning the Day on the Hill at Washington, DC for March 2011; and

Whereas, the SAGE budget line item was improperly removed from the current year's budget; and

Whereas, the External Affairs travel line item which is intended for UC Student Association monthly travel to other UC campuses for the monthly Board of Directors meetings was inadequately renamed to "Travel (SAGE)"; and

Whereas, the current budget does not account for any of SAGE's expenses and does not have sufficient monies to participate in the SAGE Fall Summit and DOH; and

Whereas, the EAVP is currently the Chairperson of SAGE and his involvement is critical to SAGE's advocacy; and

Whereas, although we are currently seeking external funding from the Chancellor's Office and Graduate Division, which if received will help cover some of the costs, we do not believe we will receive adequate support from these avenues alone; and

Whereas, at the time the current budget was approved there was an allocation for the line item ASUC Elections in the amount of \$17,000 and we now know this to be much higher than needed, as the cost for ASUC Elections is now known to have been under \$11,000;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the GA Budget be amended to correct the line in the EAVP Budget currently labeled "Travel (SAGE)" to "Travel (UCSA)." Furthermore, a line item labeled "Tra-

vel (SAGE)” shall be added and funded with \$4,000 from the aforementioned ASUC Elections line item to support the GA’s engagement with SAGE.

Amended Resolutions --1010b

- vi -

The following Resolution, 1010b, was amended at the GA meeting to read as follows:

Resolution to Create a GA Structure Review Workgroup

Whereas the Graduate Assembly has taken on additional responsibilities and projects in the past few years, without a comprehensive review of its internal structure; and

Whereas the current workload of GA officers can make these positions out of reach to many graduate students who need to simultaneously do research and teach; and

Whereas there have been recurring concerns about the lack of internal communications between the major components of the GA (Delegate Assembly, Executive Board, Projects, Business Office); and

Whereas no specific GA committee can currently take on a comprehensive review of the GA structure without negatively affecting its regular work;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that a workgroup be created with the following charge:

1. In order to represent a broad cross-section of the graduate student community, the workgroup shall comprise a diverse set of graduate students, including but not limited to several departments from academic and professional schools. A majority of the membership shall consist of GA Delegates.
2. The workgroup will make a good faith effort to seek advice from a non-GA entity specializing in organizational studies (e.g. one or more organizational professors at UC Berkeley).
3. The GA Structure Review Workgroup will analyze the current GA structure, including the division of powers and division of workload within the GA.
4. Based on this analysis, the Workgroup will make recommendations to the Assembly with the dual goals of:
 - a. achieving an adequate division of workload among GA officers and staff;
 - b. increasing coherence and collaboration among the GA components.

- 5) The Workgroup will submit and present a comprehensive report detailing methodology, rationale and implementation plans to the full Delegate Assembly at the February 2011 meeting, allowing time for questions and discussion.
6. The Workgroup will submit and present a comprehensive report detailing methodology, rationale and implementation plans to the full Delegate Assembly at the February 2011 meeting, allowing time for questions and discussion.