

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 3, 2011

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ASUC Announcement

The UC-Haiti Initiative works with the University of Haiti, and brought leadership delegation from the State University of Haiti for a UC-wide Symposium. It would be helpful if graduate students would be interested in coming over for a couple of weeks, a semester, or a summer, to conduct research and engage in teaching programs.

There will be a change in meeting locations for April and May, and they'll meet in Stephen's Lounge, in MLK.

Next week is Mind and Body Week.

The GA will sponsor a City-University Forum on March 10, attended by the Mayor and by three Councilmembers, focusing on making Berkeley more student friendly.

The Union asked to announce a plan to centralize the benefit budgets of departments, with no guarantee departments would pay fee remissions.

The Business Office is conducting a survey that will end on Friday.

The Graduate Social Club will have a spring social next Thursday, from 6:00 to 9 p.m., in Pauley Ballroom.

Elections for all GA Officer positions will occur at the April meeting.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

The following Resolutions were referred to committee:

1103a Resolution on By-law Amendment to Facilitate Communication

1103c, Resolution on Directed Action to Implement the Recommendations of the Outreach Workgroup Committee and Provisions for the Extension of Its Mandate

1103d, Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Transition of Executive Assistant Position

1103f, Resolution on Directed Action to Establish Funding Rounds for the 2011-2012 Academic Year

Elections and Appointments

There were no nominations for an opening for a GA rep on the Grad Council. This will be considered again during GA elections in April.

APPOINTMENT RATIFICATION

Badr Albanna, Physics, was unanimously approved Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator, to bring student interests to the decision-making table of the OE Coordinating Committee and the Executive Committee, and to disseminate information to students.

Reports

A student group applied for \$189.00 from the Contingency Fund that was reimbursed by the Business Office. The GA unanimously approved reimbursing the Business Office.

Report from the Funding Committee

The Funding Committee deferred for a decision by the GA a Contingency request by SANCNAS. The group received \$189 in a previous round, and the GA unanimously approved reducing the group's request in another round by \$189, and funding the group \$311, for GMER funding.

By unanimous vote, the GA approved a Contingency request from the Optometric Student Association, \$1,221.28.

The GA unanimously approved the Funding Committee Report, as amended: Contingency, \$1,628.00; Grants, \$18,056.33; and GMER, \$17,561.27.

Report from the Community Outreach Workgroup

The GA in November started a workgroup on community outreach, which sent out a survey. The responses were representative of the GA. 40% currently participate in outreach; 21% don't seek outreach opportunities from the campus; most grads do outreach by themselves; 39% who don't now participate were interested in doing so in the future. There were about 304 respondents.

One major barrier was time, to both commit to outreach and to make the time commitment many outreach programs require. 23% weren't aware of outreach opportunities; 14% were interested in GA-hosted outreach programs, and 52% were somewhat interested. A GA program would help with time demands by having grads come in and volunteer for a few hours a month, or every other month. There is a list of community outreach partners on the GA Web site, under Advocacy.

Advocacy Agenda

AB 540 is a proposal that would allow undocumented students to have in-State tuition if they went to a California high school.

GA Projects Report

There are seven Projects and eight Project Coordinators.

The Grad Social Club is working on a boat event for April; the Graduate Minority Students Project (GMSP) and the Graduate Services and Support Project (GSSP) put on orientations and workshops; the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project (GMORR) works with undergrads; the Women of Color Initiative (WOICI) puts on the Women of Color Conference; the Graduate Women's Project (GWP); and the Berkeley Graduate.

Announcements (cont'd)

The UCSA voted last weekend that the Berkeley Graduate Assembly is the best graduate student assembly for the year in the UC System.

Mr. Marchand and Ms. Love will go to department meetings, "Around the Campus in 80 Days," to talk about the GA and hear from grads.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 1102a, To Revise Funding Committee Procedures, as amended, was approved unanimously. It sets general principles for funding; explains the extent to which the Funding Committee could ask questions; and sets a conflict-of-interest policy.

By voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, Resolution 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations.

Among other things, the bill establishes the position of GA Treasurer; determines when the E-Board could act on behalf of the GA; and creates an Environmental Sustainability Officer.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, Resolution 1102g, Resolution on Action Agenda Item to Implement a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target.

By voice-vote, the GA approved Resolution 1103b, Resolution on Budget Amendment to Appropriate Funding for Lower Sproul Student Center Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) Creation.

Planning for the Lower Sproul project will conclude by the end of June. Some provisions in the MOU that determine the project need to be revised for greater accountability and assurance on grad student issues. A third MOU was needed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Tiffany Ng at 5:33 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

Announcements

- 4 -

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ASUC Announcement

Will Smelko introduced himself and said he and Niko were present on behalf of the UC-Haiti Initiative, which they started a few months ago. They're trying to work with the University of Haiti, the country's oldest and largest public institution for higher education. They brought out a leadership delegation from the State University of Haiti a week ago for a UC-wide Symposium. Mr. Marchand attended and helped translate, since he speaks French. The U. of Haiti President and the VPs of Research, Health Care, and Engineering met with UC faculty and staff to talk about ideas for collaboration, curriculum building, and other projects they could put on. Tu Tran, last year's ASUC VP, is in Haiti working with students and Administration trying to launch this partnership.

Mr. Smelko said there were two immediate needs they want to see if any Delegates were interested in. One thing that Haitian students have brought up was a thesis mentoring project. At the U. of Haiti, students have to complete a thesis to receive an undergraduate degree. But only 30% are able to complete the thesis because they lack support. And in general, Haiti really lacks general teaching programs and exchanges, such as in basic sciences and math. It would be helpful if graduate students would be interested in coming over for a couple of weeks, a semester, or a summer, to conduct research and engage in teaching programs. Mr. Smelko said he'd pass around a sign-up sheet for people to indicate an interest. There were a lot of ways to help out, and even teaching English would be helpful. He'd send something to Mr. Daal to send out to Delegates to send out to their communities.

Mr. Daal said that UCPD Chief of Police Mitch Celaya was going to be at the meeting to talk about the Resolution the GA passed last month about the Clery Act. The campus complies with this Act, and the issue to address was publicizing the information on crime statistics. Due to the protests occurring, Mr. Celaya had other things to attend to.

Mr. Daal said he had a number of announcements. He would ask Delegates to please fill out their feedback forms, which was how attendance was taken; and GA By-laws state that there's a connection between funding and attendance. Secondly, it has been their practice that after GA meetings, people adjourn to the Bear's Lair for spirits and merriment. The GA pays for beer at these occasions, and people were invited to enjoy the company of graduate students at the Bear's Lair. Thirdly, there will be a change in meeting locations for the months of April and May. They'll meet in Stephen's Lounge, in MLK, on the 3rd floor, right outside Pauley Ballroom.

Ms. Navab said the Tang Center asked to remind people that next week is Mind and Body Week. Different events will occur on Sproul, including stress relief workshops and massages. The schedule of events could be found on the Tang Web site.

Ms. Botstein said that on March 10 the GA will sponsor a City-University Forum to focus on how Berkeley could become more student friendly and about City plans for Telegraph Ave., as well as down-

town, and what students would like to see. It will be the same day as the GA social, from 5:30 to 7:00. Mayor Tom Bates will be there along with Councilmembers Kriss Worthington, Jesse Arreguin, and Laurie Capitelli. It's a chance to give input and find out what was happening. For those who live in

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

Berkeley, it was really important to get students involved and talking about what they'd like to see. There were proposals, e.g., to extend business hours, to have a sit-lie ordinance, and plans for Measure R, the ballot Initiative that passed, and what that will mean for downtown Berkeley. This will be the First Annual City-University Forum, an event they hope to continue.

Mr. Marchand said that Charley Eaton was at the GA meeting last month to talk about the Union and wanted him to make an announcement about a plan to centralize the benefit budgets of departments. If fees rise faster than departments' budgets, there was no guarantee departments would pay fee remissions. As a result, the Union is considering having a collective grievance, since without consulting the Union, ending fee remissions might be against the contract.

Ms. Hsueh introduced herself and said she was the Business Office Manager. She wanted to thank everybody who participated in the Business Office survey. It ends on Friday, but if people complete it at the meeting that evening, they'd get a free laundry bag. Also, during the Spring Break, the Business Office will be open Monday through Wednesday from 10:00 to 3:00 and will be closed on Thursday and Friday.

Ms. Russel said the Graduate Social Club is having a spring social next Thursday, from 6:00 to 9 p.m., in Pauley Ballroom. She would ask Delegates to send a notice out to their departments. They'll have beer, a dj, and a good time.

Mr. Daal said that at the end of last month's meeting he gave notice of a meeting of the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation at the April GA meeting. That meeting may occur, and he'd also like to reserve May as a potential meeting time for the BGSF. He was giving notice now because their By-laws require 35 days notice. Whether the meeting is in April or May depends on feedback they get.

Mr. Marchand said he should also give notice that the elections for all GA Officer positions will occur at the April meeting. Elections could have occurred at the meeting that evening, but the GA was still discussing its structure for next year.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Ms. Ng called for any amendments or objection to approval of the minutes from the February meeting. **THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 3, 2011 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Ms. Ng called for any amendments to the agenda, or any objection to approval.

Mr. Daal moved to fast track Resolution 1103b, Budget Amendment to Appropriate Funding for Lower Sproul Student Center MOU Creation. It would designate funding to hire a graduate student to work on the creation of a Memorandum of Understanding for the Lower Sproul project. They needed to do this immediately and not next month because some things had to be agreed upon by the end of April, things

that would have a positive impact to graduate students. There was also a motion to table until the next meeting Resolution 1102f, Budget Amendment and Directed Action Regarding the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. Some graduate students from the Law School were looking into possible technical issues with the separation between the BGSF the GA. They had to make sure there was a clean

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes (cont'd)
Resolution Referral
Elections and Appointments

- 6 -

separation. Ms. Navab noted that 1103 was misnumbered in the packet as 1109. Mr. Daal said it was 1109b that dealt with funding for a Coordinator to write an MOU. Ms. Ng said that fast tracking a Resolution meant it would be considered that evening, at the meeting at which it was proposed. The motion required a three-fourths vote for approval.

Ms. Navab moved to table 1102f. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO TABLE RESOLUTION 1102f, BGSF, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A Delegate moved to fast track 1103b. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK RESOLUTION 1103b PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, BUDGET AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR LOWER SPROUL STUDENT CENTER MOU CREATION.

Ms. Ng called for any other amendments to the agenda. THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

1103a Resolution on By-law Amendment to Facilitate Communication, to the Communications and Rules Committees

1103b, Resolution on Budget Amendment, was fast tracked

1103c, Resolution on Directed Action to Implement the Recommendations of the Outreach Workgroup Committee and Provisions for the Extension of Its Mandate, to the Communications, External Affairs, Rules, and Funding Committees

1103d, Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Transition of Executive Assistant Position, to the Budget and Rules Committees

1103f, Resolution on Directed Action to Establish Funding Rounds for the 2011-2012 Academic Year, to the Funding, Budget, and Rules Committees.

On 1103e, In Support of an ASUC-GA LED Board, Mr. Marchand said the bill was moot because the project would not be going forward that year. So he wasn't going to submit the bill. But Ms. Williams submitted a bill on Wednesday, numbered 1103e, Resolution on Directed Action to Establish Funding Rounds for the 2011-2012 Academic Year. Mr. Marchand said it was okay to submit a Resolution up to the meeting itself as long as it was referred to committee. Mr. Daal asked to number the new Resolution 1103f. Ms. Ng said it would be referred to the Funding, Budget, and Rules Committees.

Seeing no objection, Ms. Ng said that the Resolutions were referred.

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Elections and Appointments
Appointment Ratification
Reports

- 7 -

Ms. Ng called for any nominations for the open position of Graduate Council representative. The Grad Council is the policy-making body for graduate academic affairs. It reviews the affects of Operational Excellence on graduate academics and research and has allowed students to submit electronic dissertations. The person filling the position and presents graduate student perspectives, such as on normative time, and attends E-Board meetings.

Mr. Helu asked about the current majors of Grad Council reps. Ms. Ng said they're in Engineering and Music.

In response to questions, Ms. Ng said that Officers couldn't be on the Grad Council and the rep didn't have to be a Delegate.

Seeing no nominations, Ms. Ng said that they would let this election lapse and will consider it when they hold other GA elections. In the meantime, they'll notice the position widely and the Alternate will attend.

APPOINTMENT RATIFICATION

Ms. Ng said that Badr Albanna was up for consideration for Operational Excellence Communications Coordinator. Mr. Daal said this position would bring student interests to the decision-making table of the OE Coordinating Committee and the Executive Committee and will help in disseminating information to students. The GA approved funding for this last month.

Mr. Albanna said he's a seventh-year graduate student in Physics and has been involved in physics education and teaching and in working with undergraduates. Mr. Daal suggested that he apply for this position. He saw a lot of his mandate as trying to create an information flow and increase accountability for OE processes.

A motion to approve the appointment was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE BADR ALBANNA AS OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Albanna said his e-mail was oecc@ga.berkeley.edu if people wanted more information or wanted to voice their concerns.

REPORTS

Ms. Hsueh said that last month she distributed 70 copies of the January Contingency report, but it wasn't discussed. A student group applied for \$189.00 and it was approved by the Funding Committee. Because the GA didn't consider it, the Business Office reimbursed the group that amount, and she was asking to reimburse the Business Office. It was for a GMER social event held on February 11 by SANCNAS.

Reports (cont'd)

- 8 -

Report from the Funding Committee

A motion to reimburse the Business Office from the Contingency Fund for this event was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO REIMBURSE THE BUSINESS OFFICE \$189.00 OUT OF THE CONTINGENCY FUND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Report from the Funding Committee

Ms. Williams asked people at the Funding Committee meeting to please raise their hands, and said they were amazing. For five hours they go through applications, and they're intelligent and compassionate. (Applause) She noted that the Funding Round they had was very generous.

Ms. Navab said the Funding Committee tabled a Contingency request by the Optometric Student Association and decided to defer the question to the GA to decide. The group got funding in Round 2, but due to a communications problem, failed to get reimbursed in time. So they requested Contingency Funding for the event. Ms. Williams said there were overlapping funding rounds, and that seemed to be part of the confusion. As a result, people thought they had more time to hand in receipts.

Ms. Navab said there were no universal cuts and everybody was fully funded, aside from groups that were automatically denied Round 4 funding because they were funded in Round 3, or because of a couple of other violations. Some tweaks were done after they talked to the groups involved.

Mr. Kline said he would like to amend the Report, for GMER funding, item #38. SANCNAS just received \$189 and he would like to amend the GMER allocation to reduce the request by that amount and reduce the allocation from \$500 to \$311. He said that was standard practice. They would typically not allow Round 4 funding for a group that received Round 3 funding. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND GMER ITEM #38, SANCNAS, REDUCING IT \$189, TO TOTAL \$311, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Rabkin said if people were late with receipts, and moved to fund the Optometric Student Association only the Contingency allocation. Ms. Navab said there was miscommunication between the GA and the group.

Mr. Helu said that not funding the group was unfortunate, but at the same time, last semester the GA punished a lot of groups for not following all the rules. It seemed like the GA wasn't following the same standards and wasn't treating everybody equally.

A Delegate said this was for funding that had been approved, and money was spent.

Ms. Bright said that the money that's spent is often from an individual's credit card. So not approving this reimbursement would be particularly harsh.

Mr. Kline said the receipt due date is at the front of the application.

Ms. Bright said that Round 3 is a much shorter time period and overlaps with Round 4. Ms. Williams said she had a Resolution that would take away Round 4 and consolidate funding rounds to have three,

Report from the Funding Committee (cont'd)
Report from the Compromise Outreach Workgroup

- 9 -

making it clear what the deadlines are. Ms. Bright said the group applied for Round 3 and realized they couldn't fit their events into that timeframe, and had a Round 4 request.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE CONTINGENCY FUND REQUEST #5, THE OPTOMETRIC STUDENT ASSOCIATION REQUEST, \$1,221.28 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A motion to approve the Funding Committee Report, as amended, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE: CONTINGENCY, \$1,628.00; GRANTS, \$18,056.33; AND GMER, \$17,561.27.

Report from the Community Outreach Workgroup

Ms. Mendoza said that GA in November voted to start a workgroup on community outreach. They sent out a survey and would report on the responses. The ethnic distribution of responses was generally the same as the grad population, as was the age distribution, and it was representative of the GA. A chart of college/program response distribution was shown. It was mostly representative, with an incredible showing from Public Health, a low showing for Engineering, and nothing from Business.

Mr. Niederhut said that in the first question of the survey, 40% said they currently participate in outreach opportunities. A very small portion do something with outreach through their departments, and 21% were not seeking things from the campus. Most grads do outreach by themselves, such as volunteering with such as a church they go to, or a school near their house. For people who weren't currently participating in outreach, 21% had no interest in doing so. About 39% who don't participate were very interested in doing outreach in the future. There were about 304 respondents, so that figure represented between 2,100 and 2,700 graduate students, not including Business and Engineering.

One major barrier why people weren't participating in outreach had to do with time. And it wasn't just not having time to commit to outreach, but also because a lot of outreach programs require a year-long commitment, not something grads could participate in if they're not here for the whole year. Other programs require five hours a week. Another problem was the time taken to find outreach opportunities.

Mr. Niederhut said 23% of respondents weren't aware of outreach opportunities. About 6% said money was a problem, and another 6% marked other, and from verbatims, most of them couldn't get transportation to events.

Ms. Mendoza said 14% were interested in GA-hosted outreach programs, and 52% were somewhat interested. The next screen showed unmet need, the relationship between department-hosted and GA-hosted outreach. In general, when a department does not have a community outreach program, grads were more interested in having a GA-hosted program.

The next screen showed differential benefits of Resolution 1103c and what would help to get a community outreach program. Eight percent said awareness would help them be a part of community outreach;

Report from the Compromise Outreach Workgroup (cont'd)
Advocacy Agenda

- 10 -

and 26% said having time would help. Awareness could be improved by going out to social networks and going to orientation programs of the Grad Division. A GA program would help with time demands of grads by not requiring any added time by grads to get into a program. Grads could just come in and volunteer for a few hours a month, or every other month. Awareness and time were problems for participating in community outreach programs for 67% of grads. Awareness, time, and money/transportation would help with 77% of respondents. So having programs near public transportation, or setting up a car-pool, would make GA-hosted community outreach events more accessible.

Mr. Niederhut said that to address awareness, there were several ideas in the Resolution. The workgroup talked about social networking, with the GA possibly hosting a Facebook calendar. They could host workshops or invite outreach partners in the community to come to campus and have an event, and explain to grads who they are and what they do, and how grads could participate. They could have information at the New Grad Student Orientation at the beginning of the year. There is already a list of community outreach partners hosted on the GA Web site under the "Advocacy" tab.

Another thing that came up in the survey could be addressed by having the GA having its own outreach opportunity and designing it to play to the strengths of grads, while also getting around grads' time constraints.

Satisfying money/transportation deterrents to outreach could be addressed by a few minor changes to the Funding Committee. They could say they want to focus on funding outreach opportunities by graduate student groups. This money could be used for transportation to or from events, and to host events.

Ms. Williams asked if there was a sense of the amount of the budget that would be requested for this. Mr. Niederhut they didn't. That would be up to the GA, and that was why he wanted the Resolution to go to the Funding Committee.

Mr. Rabkin asked about reorganizing projects and setting up an outreach project. Mr. Niederhut said that could work, but wouldn't speculate on that at that time.

Seeing no further questions, Ms. Ng said she would like to thank them for the report.

Advocacy Agenda

Ms. Love said that people received a copy of the current and proposed Advocacy Agenda. People were asked to share the work they were doing to the Executive Board, since there was a request at the E-Board retreat to post this information online. The proposal will be posted to allow people to give feedback, after which they'll finalize it and publish it next month.

Mr. Mikulin asked about AB 540. Ms. De La Torre said a bill was passed a while ago, 2001, that no longer allows California to select students by race. AB 540 would allow undocumented students and students who have left the State to have in-State tuition if they went to a California high school.

Ms. Love said that if people have general feedback, they should let her know.

GA Projects Report

- 11 -

GA Projects Report

Ms. De La Torre introduced herself and said she was the Project Coordinator Liaison. There are seven Projects and eight Project Coordinators.

Ms. Russel said the Grad Social Club is also working on a boat event for April. They're having some trouble with it because the company wants to charge the GA a lot more. Apparently people drank a lot last year and the business didn't make money from the GA the last time. Instead of \$45 per person the company wants to charge them \$55. Last year the Grad Social Club charged \$40 and came up with the money to cover the extra \$5. Since for this year they haven't charged for past events, their budget was low.

Ms. Navab said she would suggest something the grad association at UCLA does, the GSA. It holds a very popular graduate student speed dating event for which it charges an entrance fee. It's a good fundraiser and a way to get departments to mix.

Ms. De La Torre some Delegates were confused about the projects so she'd clarify. She had pictures of events to show. For graduate students at Berkeley, there's a big gap in services they need from the Administration. Other schools have graduate centers and the administration at other schools does the projects for grads. At Berkeley, they don't get that. Before there was a GA, projects took over that gap. The Grad Division, e.g., doesn't put on an orientation for new grads. The Graduate Minority Students Project and the Graduate Services and Support Project put on orientations and throughout the year also puts on stress management workshops. The resources are there and it's the Projects' job to kind of pull them together. While people might not see a lot of events happening every month, the Projects work with the Administration and different centers or units to provide events each month that are useful. They try to pull resources together to fill gaps the Administration hasn't been able to fill for them. They don't receive any money from the Graduate Division for the orientation. Ms. De La Torre said the Projects take up a big amount of the GA budget. But for jobs they do that the Administration should be doing, the budget wasn't that much.

The Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project (GMORR) works with undergrads. Every minority group has an administrative home, so to speak, in doing events. GMORR works to have a pipeline so UC Berkeley undergrads have more access to become graduate students at Berkeley. Last Saturday GMORR helped with the Raza Recruitment and Retention Conference. Other project acronyms are WOCI, which also had a big conference, the Women of Color Initiative; GMSP, the Graduate Minor-

ity Students Project; GSC, the Graduate Social Club; GWP, Graduate Women's Project; GSSP, Graduate Social Services Project; and the Berkeley Graduate. The written report includes events that were coming up. She'll send out an e-mail with all the events for people to forward to their departments. If people had a question about any project, Ms. De La Torre could answer them.

The Empowering Women of Color Conference was held in February. There were 600 people there, even though it was raining, and people had to sit on the floor. It cost \$23,000, which didn't come from the GA. Ms. Hsueh said this one-day Conference usually draws 3-400 people. They had to turn people away and over 150 UCB students attended. There were also people from UCSB, UC Irvine, from out-of-State, and from Bay Area colleges. Mr. Daal said it's the longest running person-of-color conference in the nation. Ms. De La Torre this was its 26th year. Mr. Daal said the Conference last year was honored with a Resolution from the State Assembly, introduced by Assemblymember Skinner, a previous GA Chair.

GA Projects Report
Announcements (cont'd)

- 12 -

Ms. Williams asked about the organizational interplay between projects and the GA. Ms. De La Torre said Project Coordinators can be Delegates, but not members of the E-Board. That's why her position was created, to give Projects a vote on the E-Board.

Mr. Kline said there seemed to be some redundancy in the projects and asked if they each deserved to be independent. Ms. De La Torre all the Projects can stand on their own. They're also working to reorganize Projects to include LGBT issues, AB 540 students, and student parents. She thought the question referred to GMSP and GMORR, which works with undergrads and involves all of the graduate student populations; and that creates a community. GMORR also goes to administrators to try and figure out what weaknesses exist for grads and how to make minorities feel at home, and tries to fill that gap. Ms. Navab said graduate departments at Berkeley do a good job in outreach, but not to Berkeley undergrads. The GMSP does a lot of work with student groups and helps fund them, and also does a lot of events. They have a lot of study halls. Everybody could show up to all these events. If people didn't think the Projects were doing their jobs, they should attend events and hold people accountable. But people should be at these events before asking projects to defend themselves.

Ms. Mendoza said she attended a study hall and a GMORR event on Saturday, where a workshop was held on how to get into grad school.

Ms. Williams said everybody was aware of budget constraints, and asked about a budget restructuring, with two projects joined, and asked which two would be most closely related. Ms. De La Torre said they all work with each other and overlap, as well as doing a lot of different work.

Mr. Rabkin asked what she would recommend cutting if she had to. Mr. Kehoe said it wasn't cutting one thing, but reducing the total amount of work; so they may be cutting across the board. Ms. De La Torre said that if the GA wants to make cuts, it shouldn't be up to her as to what to cut. Seeing no other discussion, Ms. Ng said she would like to thank her.

Announcements (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said he had one other announcement. The UCSA voted last weekend that the Berkeley Graduate Assembly is the best graduate student assembly for the year in the UC System. Mr. Ortega said a big

factor was how schools' External Affairs offices were involved with the UCSA's initiatives and how engaged schools are with what the UCSA decides are its initiatives.

Mr. Mikulin said that Mr. Ortega was a good face for the GA, and if he was one of the reasons they got the award, Mr. Ortega was filling the EAVP position well.

Mr. Marchand said he sent an e-mail but wanted to announce that along with Ms. Love, Campus Affairs VP, he's been working on the idea of going to department meetings, "Around the Campus in 80 Days." Instead of telling people to come to the GA, the GA would go to department meetings. If Delegates have a department association with regular meetings, GA reps could attend and get feedback, answer questions, and hear what students thought the GA should do. If a department doesn't have a student association, they might join forces with a close-by department. They've already gone to four or five department meetings. People could talk to him if they have questions or want help in setting up a meeting.

Resolution 1102a, To Revise Funding Committee Procedures

- 13 -

RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolution, 1102a, was authored by Ariel Rabkin:

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, the funding rules seek to allocate money fairly and efficiently, not to make fraud impossible, and the GA relies on honor and politeness more than on loophole-proof rules; and

WHEREAS, the previous revision to the Funding Committee procedures (in November 2010) left a number of loose ends and rough edges; and

WHEREAS, the intent of this Resolution is to clarify ambiguities and fix mistakes, rather than to make major changes;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, to amend the Funding Committee procedures to add new "General Principles" and "Reporting" sections at the top, with the rest of the document renumbered accordingly.

1. General Principles

- A. The Graduate Assembly has granted the Funding Committee substantial responsibility and discretion. This must be balanced with accountability and transparency.
- B. The Committee should deny funding to requests that they determine are abusive, or that contain significant and deliberate misstatements.
 - i. In reaching these conclusions, Funding Committee members are not restricted to the content of the request form, but can use any other information they have legitimate access to. In particular, Committee members have the right to contact a group and ask for clarifications.

- ii. Individual Committee members may research and contact groups on their own initiative, but should always bear in mind that they will be viewed as representatives of the Graduate Assembly and should act with tact and courtesy and within the bounds set by the GA Bylaws.
 - iii. In their discussions with outside groups, Committee members should make clear when they are speaking for themselves and when they are speaking for the Committee.
- C. The Funding Committee may deny funding to groups that have committed serious and willful violations of the funding rules within the last 10 months.

Resolution 1102a, To Revise Funding Committee Procedures (cont'd)

- 14 -

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES (cont'd)

- D. Committee members must recuse themselves on votes concerning organizations they are affiliated with, or that are affiliated with their departments. They should also recuse themselves when not doing so would result in the appearance of any conflict of interest.
- i. Committee members who have recused themselves may speak to the Committee on behalf of a group or allocation in the same manner as any other member of a group seeking funding.
 - ii. Recusal does not affect Committee quorum: A recused member is still present for quorum purposes.
2. Reporting
- A. The Funding Committee shall report the results of its deliberations to the Delegate Assembly in the in the form of a Funding Report.
 - B. This report should list the proposed allocation for each group. Groups should be listed alphabetically. Supergroup affiliation shall be listed alongside each group.
 - C. The Funding Committee should strive to give the delegates succinct but complete explanations when a student group is denied funding. If a group is denied funding based on current or past abuse of the system, a detailed explanation to the group and the Graduate Assembly is required.
 - D. In the event of disagreement within the Funding Committee about whether a request should be granted, whether a group is abusive, or any other substantive question, the non-prevailing side may present a minority report to the Delegates, explaining their view.

- E. The Funding Committee must take minutes. Minutes must include a record of those members present, plus the votes for and against all funding decisions taken without unanimous consensus. The committee may also record additional information in its minutes. Minutes must be made available prior to the delegate meeting discussing a Funding report prepared for that meeting.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the changes to the written procedures in this Resolution are as much as clarification as revision. This Resolution does not imply that the Funding Committee was previously unable to consult outside information sources or required to approve requests they believe abusive.

Mr. Rabkin said the GA spend a lot of time worrying about nitty-gritty details of funding and what the formula should be. The Resolution was an attempt to do three things. It sets up general principles the GA was trying to do; explains the extent to which the Funding Committee was authorized to ask questions; and sets up a conflict-of-interest policy, situations where people could vote on allocations for their own student groups or for their friends’.

Resolution 1102a, To Revise Funding Committee Procedures (cont'd)

- 15 -

Mr. Rabkin said the Resolution says that for serious, willful violations, the Funding Committee could cut group funding for up to ten months. That was intended to be a statue of limitations, not a stated penalty. The idea was to not punish one year’s management for the sins of the past. It wasn't a one-size-fits-all response. Also, he thought it would be a good idea to have a breakdown of who voted which way on what, to see what the Funding Committee was doing and if patterns were developing. He was told that Funding Committee members were worried that student groups would be pushy and scold them. Mr. Rabkin said he didn't have strong feelings about that clause. He would request that the GA not spend a lot of time tinkering with Whereas Clauses and the style of the bill. The Whereas Clauses weren't operative and weren't worth polishing.

The Funding Committee recommended the following amendments:

Begin Funding Committee recommended amendments

- 1) As the bill incorrectly states that the Funding Committee can allocate and deny funding, even though it really just makes recommendations, the Funding Committee recommends amending “deny” to read, “recommend denying” in 1.B. and 1.C. and 2.C., “recommend denied.”
- 2) The Funding Committee recommends amending 2.E. to read, “... plus the *number of* votes for and against....”
- 3) The Funding Committee recommends amending the first Whereas Clause, since it makes it seem that preventing fraud is not a priority, and it actually is a priority.
- 4) The Funding Committee recommends amending the first Whereas Clause to remove everything after “efficiently.”
- 5) The procedures in section B3 currently have language on deterring fraud. B3 in the procedures conflicts with language in the Resolution, clause 1.C. The Funding Committee recommends striking 3b in the current procedures and replacing it with language in the Resolution. The language in the Resolution,

1.C., would be amended to read, "The Funding Committee may recommend denying groups funding for 10 months following the groups' serious and willful violations of the funding rules."

End Funding Committee recommended amendments

Mr. Kehoe moved to accept recommendations 1, 4, and 5 from the Funding Committee. Mr. Rabkin moved to amend the amendment, to remove recommendation 5 since it seemed to say that when every group misbehaved, there should be a 10-month denial of funds. He thought that was overly restrictive on the Funding Committee. He moved to divide the question, and do recommendations 1 and 4 together, and 5 separately. The motion to divide passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS, 1 AND 4, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng called for discussion on recommendation 5.

Resolution 1102a, To Revise Funding Committee Procedures (cont'd)

- 16 -

A Delegate said a lot of clubs change members and might overlap. People who made mistakes might not be in the group, given the 10-month period.

Mr. Kehoe asked if they could determine whether a group that dissolves and reforms under a new name was the same group. Mr. Kline said there was no way to do that. Mr. Rabkin said the 10-month period functions as a statute of limitations. Something that happened a year ago would be irrelevant. The way the Funding Committee wants to revise this is to make it a standing penalty and say it may recommend denying funding for 10 months. The Funding Committee wants it to be forward looking for 10 months whereas he wanted this to be a cutoff.

Ms. Navab asked if including the words "for up to" 10 months satisfy him. Mr. Rabkin said it would.

Ms. Williams said the 10-month period wasn't a standard penalty and gives the Funding Committee room to operate.

A Delegate asked if groups knew what "serious" violations are. Mr. Kline said that groups could be creative in ways that couldn't be foreseen, but the Funding Committee would know a violation when it saw it.

Mr. Ellsworth said any penalty the Funding Committee determines could be appealed, and the Committee didn't have final authority.

Ms. Navab moved to amend the Committee's recommended amendment to 1.C., to say "up to" 10 months. She didn't think the GA should have a blanket policy, and all-or-nothing seemed harsh. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Rabkin moved to call the question and end debate on recommendation 5, as amended. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT 5, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Kehoe moved to approve recommendation 2. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rabkin said the question was whether the GA was more worried that the Funding Committee would be unfair to groups or that the Committee would be overwhelmed by students going to individual Committee members to lobby.

Ms. Williams said that more than 50% of the Committee's membership has dropped out from when she came in. Ms. Navab was kind enough to join the Funding Committee, or else they wouldn't have been able to establish quorum. So Ms. Williams said she would caution against making it any harder for Committee members. She thought the number of votes would give people a sense of any trends.

Ms. Navab said people could tell if members recused themselves because there would be fewer votes.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION 2 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution 1102a, To Revise Funding Committee Procedures (cont'd)

- 17 -

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1102a, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO REVISE FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.

Ms. Ng said they would next consider Resolution 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations. [See Appendix 1 for the bill, as amended.]

Mr. Marchand said the GA discussed this last time. He would like to introduce an amendment that was distributed on a separate sheet, "Amendment to 1102e proposed by the Structure Review Workgroup." Mr. Marchand said the Workgroup proposed these amendments after talking to different people.

Mr. Mikulin said a lot of work has gone into this. The GA didn't want to restructure the organization in haste. He moved to table the motion until the next GA meeting. Ms. Navab said they couldn't do that because they need to hold elections, and the positions would be determined by the By-law amendment. Mr. Mikulin withdrew his motion. Ms. Love said it looked more complicated than it actually was.

Mr. Marchand said there were really two changes. Ms. Navab said one big change was to elevate the Budget Officer to Treasurer. The idea behind that was because the GA didn't really have anyone to monitor its spending for the Business Office. But the Business Office wasn't there to watch the GA's spending and make sure they don't overspend. The Treasurer would sit on the Executive Board as a non-voting member, to keep the position impartial.

Ms. Navab said the other big change was from some feedback they got in talking to the Projects. People wanted to make sure the Projects were a bigger part of the Advocacy Agenda process and for them to have a voice on the E-Board. The other big change was to have the Campus Affairs VP advocate on behalf of the Projects to the E-Board. Project funds would be monitored by the treasurer.

Mr. Kline asked how the treasurer would monitor spending. Mr. Marchand said the Budget Committee discussed how this could be enforced. When a reimbursement was submitted, it's approved by the Business Office and then the ASUC Auxiliary. The treasurer could be in that line of approval; but that wasn't the main thing. One option was to have the treasurer pre-approve spending over a certain amount for items that were somewhat discretionary, like stipends. As a member of the E-Board, the treasurer would know its plans and would report on the budget. Ms. Epstein said the treasurer would also report to the Delegates.

Ms. Williams said the other part of this was to facilitate a smooth transition, so that when Ms. Hsueh retires, the GA wasn't left with a gaping hole. If they create this position, the person will have an opportunity to become familiarized with the system.

Mr. Mikulin asked if the GA would expect a cash flow statement at GA meetings. Mr. Marchand said the Budget Committee could get updates, and the GA could get updates depending on what it wanted. The treasurer was accountable to the Assembly.

Mr. Rabkin said the By-law amendment would create an office that was blank, and it would be a creature of the person who fills it. It was a position where ambitious people could do good and where people who weren't ambitious would be harmless.

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 18 -

Ms. Navab moved to approve the amendments from the Structure Review Workgroup. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO 1102e PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Kehoe moved to adopt the recommendations of the Communications Committee with regard to the implementation date and the Campus Affairs VP. Mr. Rabkin said the Communications Committee wants this implemented starting from last July, 2010. The Committee wanted that to coincide with the start of the 2010-11 fiscal year.

Mr. Rabkin objected to the Committee's proposed amendment to the proposed section 2.3.10.3, having the CAVP oversee committee appointees to ensure they adequately represent the will and desires of the GA. He said his understanding of this was that when they put somebody on a campus committee, the GA was purely a matchmaker, helping an interested grad student represent grad students as a whole to the campus. People appointed to committees should use their own best judgment, not the GA's best judgment.

Ms. Love said that in the past that's how committees have operated. These people are appointed by the GA and should be accountable to the GA and provide it information. Mr. Rabkin asked if grad committee members had to be appointed by the GA. Ms. Love said that for administrative and Academic Senate committees, the GA has an MOU with the campus to approve them grad reps.

Mr. Kehoe said he's on the Student Technology Council, under the office of the campus CIO. There's an ex officio position for grads. Grads apply and are hired by the Council. He represents the GA, but there's no mechanism to do that. Mr. Daal said there are only two committees like that. And this topic was a point of ongoing contention with the Administration.

Mr. Marchand said the proposed language shows that committee members were representative beyond just themselves. Ms. Love said these are arguments they have with the Administration about the representativeness of students hired by a committee.

Ms. Murrell said she had no idea what the “will and desires” of the GA meant.

Mr. Zachritz said two committee appointments that didn't go through the GA were the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Sustainability, and the TGIF Committee. It was critical those were channeled through the GA. Mr. Marchand said people could delegate questions to competent members of the Assembly, such as asking a question to the Technology Chair.

Mr. Ellison called the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Ms. Ng said the amendment was to the Resolved Clause, making it effective on July 2010; to proposed section 2.3.10.3; and correcting a typo in proposed section 2.2.4.5. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS OUT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Kehoe moved to adopt the amendment from the Communications Committee, to proposed section 4.5.1.2., on the E-Board acting “on behalf of” the GA, instead of acting “for the GA” on matters of

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 19 -

immediate concern, which occurs when financial or legal circumstances have changed significantly since the last GA meeting. Mr. Kehoe said the proposed text basically says that financial or legal harm would come to people or to the GA’s assets before the E-Board could act on its own prerogative. The original language that was proposed would allow the E-Board to take action on matters that “require attention” when the GA wasn't in session. The new language was narrower, and would require that matters needed “urgent attention.”

Mr. Marchand said that one thing the E-Board could do was to call for an emergency meeting of the GA.

Ms. Navab said these changes wouldn't prohibit the GA from telling the E-Board to do something over the summer. The GA could always grant the E-Board additional powers, such as permission to approve Round 1 funding. Giving blanket power would just lead to drama like the GA saw at the beginning of the year. Especially when there are four people making decisions, they want to keep checks and balances in place.

Mr. Rabkin said the text doesn't say that the Assembly can refer or delegate something. Ms. Navab said that was in another clause in the By-laws. Last year the concern was obvious to everybody, and some people felt that the E-Board redoing the entire funding structure was not a matter of immediate concern and could have waited until the Assembly was in session. For things like that, the By-laws had been ambiguous. So people tried to define what “urgent” was, and defined it as things that would put the GA in jeopardy. Mr. Rabkin said that if they cut down the Executive Board, they should trust them more than a larger body, and three Vice Presidents and the President were more trustworthy than 12 people. Ms. Navab said this was just one check they included in order to try to make things more accountable.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT, TO PROPOSED SECTION 2.3.10.3, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE.

Mr. Ortega said that while the Officers give monthly reports to the GA, that wasn't explicit in the By-laws. So he would recommend including in the By-laws that all Officers provide monthly reports to the Delegates. Also, for the External Affairs section, the EAVP should also bring back all information from the Board in which the EAVP and its appointees represent the GA. So with the UCSA, e.g., or any other place they act on behalf of the Delegates, the representatives should report to the Board on anything of matter to the Board.

Mr. Daal said that sometimes administrators only want the President to meet with them, and these By-laws stipulate that some administrators meet with the Campus Affairs VP. That could be an issue with the Chancellor, e.g. The Chancellor currently meets with the President and invites others. Ms. Navab said the By-laws currently state that the CAVP also meets with administrators, so nothing would be changed.

Mr. Daal said he thought these changes widen the gap between the GA's Charter and By-laws. The Charter should be addressed as soon as possible if the By-laws are approved. Ms. Ng said the Rules Committee has been working to bring the Charter up to date, and they'll take care of that there's a structural change to the By-laws.

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 20 -

Mr. Froehle moved to amend, under "4. Committees," 4.1, Current Committees, and to 4.2, Creation and Dissolution. The amendment would remove the Sustainability Officer and Committee and would allow workgroups to remain up to five years. The intention would be that the Sustainability Officer could be replaced by someone from the workgroup. The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Froehle said that as written, the proposed By-laws have the Sustainability Officer as an internal advisory position that mostly advises the E-Board about the GA's sustainability efforts. Everybody else on the E-Board brings something to the table, but he didn't see the Sustainability Officer at the same level. They could have a workgroup rather than something written permanently into the By-laws.

Mr. Zachritz said that of primary importance to the Environmental Sustainability position was in terms of credibility. This position is very much interwoven into the workings of organizations, and being sustainable was essential to holding them accountable.

Ms. Love said this ought to be an integral part of what the GA does. The position doesn't just advise the E-Board and was involved in a lot of broader campus work; and there's been discussion about broadening this to have more advocacy.

Mr. Kehoe said that advocacy was more appropriate to a workgroup or project of the GA. The ES officer was largely advisory in terms of the GA's operation.

Mr. Zachritz said the way they work on campus was that the ES Committee was largely responsible for the number of bike racks around campus and the new recycling bins. They're very connected to a lot of different organizations.

Mr. Mikulin said the Environmental Sustainability Committee has shown leadership on campus. Internal operations of the GA were somewhat limited. The advocacy role the Committee plays on behalf of the GA to other student groups, of which there are 40 operating in the ES arena, was to be able to coordinate a unified voice on this issue. An officer has more cachet than a project leader or quasi-related entity. Given the prominence of this issue on campus, it was essential for the GA to have a concerted, institutionalized position separate and apart from a project officer or workgroup.

Mr. Ortega said that for internal affairs recommendations, they suggested that instead of this being an officer position, that it be a director position. That position would still be elected.

Mr. Marchand said that because sustainability could apply to different units in the GA, they couldn't place it in one unit. It seemed natural to have an in-house person to work with everyone.

Ms. Love said a huge motivator for this was simplification.

Mr. Ellison said he didn't think the GA should be worried about changing the By-laws to make this a workgroup. They've already seen that the GA wasn't as well connected to projects as they'd like to be. He didn't want to have something else that the GA wasn't well connected to. He didn't think making it into a workgroup was very plausible or a long-term solution. Sustainability had to be high profile.

A Delegate said sustainability wasn't a project but a way of life that fell across everything, across the board.

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 21 -

Mr. Froehle said he didn't think people could speak derogatorily about any workgroup they've had, and some have been highly effective, like the Outreach or Structure Review Workgroups, perhaps more effective than committees.

Mr. Kehoe asked if there's a budget for ES Committee outreach. Mr. Zachritz said there was, about \$1,000, the same as the other committees. Mr. Kehoe asked what the average budget was for GA Projects. Ms. Navab said Projects were totally different and have hired staff. Mr. Daal said Projects are budgeted \$10-15,000. Mr. Kehoe asked if sustainability would be more effective as a project. Projects hold conferences and are longer term. Projects are the arms of the GA that do high-impact things.

Mr. Marchand said a "yes" vote is to keep the ES as proposed in the original Resolution. It would get rid of the ES Officer and committee, and a "no" vote meant they keep those.

The motion to approve the amendment to strike proposed sections 4.15.5, and to amend 4.2, and to strike 2.3.10.8, failed by hand-vote. Ms. Ng said the Environmental Sustainability Officer and Committee would remain.

Ms. Navab moved to call the question on the Resolution, as amended. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1102e AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE STRUCTURE WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS.

Ms. Navab said that on behalf of the Workgroup, she would like to thank them. (Applause)

The following Resolution, 1102g, was authored by John Mikulin:

RESOLUTION ON ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO IMPLEMENT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley does not have a stated target for campus-wide energy efficiency; and

WHEREAS, the Cal Climate Action Partnership (CalCAP) has set a 2014 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target for the campus (i.e. reduce total campus GHG emissions to 1990 levels = 166,600 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) by 2014 versus 201,110 in 2009); and

WHEREAS, according to the 2010 UC Berkeley Sustainability Report, campus-wide energy use included 157,105,948 kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity, 156,301 million British thermal units (MMBtu) of natural gas, and 844,972 MMBtu of steam in 1990 versus 218,515,767 kWh of electricity, 219,401 MMBtu of natural gas, and 1,075,197 MMBtu of steam in 2009; and

WHEREAS, the close interrelationship between energy consumption and GHG emissions make it prudent to establish a campus-wide energy efficiency target that compliments CalCAP's existing GHG emissions reduction target; and

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 22 -

RESOLUTION ON ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO IMPLEMENT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET (cont'd)

WHEREAS, reducing energy consumption saves money and reduces pollution, which is in the interest of all UC Berkeley students; and

WHEREAS, getting more students involved will provide additional guidance and support for administrative efforts to improve campus resource efficiency and conservation; and

WHEREAS, it is important for UC Berkeley to maintain its role as the environmental and resource efficiency leader within the UC System; and

WHEREAS, John Mikulin is the Coordinator for this GA Action Agenda Item;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Action Agenda Item Resolutions 1002d (March 4, 2010) and 1009e (October 7, 2010):

Standing Policy:

- 1) Goal - The GA supports the implementation of a campus-wide energy efficiency target for UC Berkeley that reduces energy consumption across all campus buildings to 20% below 2009 levels by 2014.
 - a. Metrics for CalCAP Consistency - In 1990, total GHG emissions for the UC Berkeley campus were 166,600 tons, of which 69% was from purchased electricity, steam, and natural gas. In 2009, campus GHG emissions were 201,110 tons, of which 78% was from purchased electricity, steam, and natural gas. Hence, the campus needs to reduce its emissions by 17% in order to meet the 2014 CalCAP target. The GA recommends reducing campus electricity, steam, and natural gas consumption to 1990 levels by 2014 in order to help achieve the CalCAP target. If campus square footage increases at 1.95%/year (the 2008-09 growth rate), then electricity consumption in existing buildings would have to fall by 40% and steam and natural gas consumption by 30% in 2020 (assuming new buildings are built to achieve the same energy consumption per square foot as existing buildings in 2009). Thus, absolute energy consumption in existing buildings should be reduced by 20-30% below 2009 levels by 2014 to comply with the existing CalCAP target.
- 2) Implementation - The GA encourages the CalCAP Steering Committee, the Operational Excellence (OE) Initiative, as well as UC Berkeley students, faculty, and staff members to collaboratively implement the GA's adopted campus-wide energy efficiency target in a cost effective, technologically feasible, and timely manner. In service of this objective, the GA offers the following guidance, which will to help reduce energy consumption throughout the campus:¹
 - a. Comprehensive Approach – Successful implementation of a campus-wide energy efficiency target will require a combination of organizational incentives, staffing, training, and stakeholder buy in as well as technology procurement, installation, configuration, and maintenance.

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 23 -

RESOLUTION ON ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO IMPLEMENT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET (cont'd)

- b. Stakeholder Outreach – Outreach to campus staff, departments, faculty, and students to obtain their perspectives and buy in for more inclusive efficiency programs (e.g., through the OE Initiative).
 - i. Consumer Education – Inform all building occupants of behavior changes that they can implement to reduce campus energy consumption (e.g., lighting & climate control adjustments, computer equipment shut downs, etc.).²
 - ii. Lab Outreach – Laboratory buildings are the biggest energy consumers on campus (per square foot) and consistently populate the top ten buildings in terms of absolute energy use. Because much of the load in lab buildings is directly or indirectly driven by laboratory equipment, addressing these loads must be a priority. This will require working with lab groups (as the Office of Sustainability has begun) to change behavior patterns and investigate opportunities for sharing lab equipment or decommissioning equipment like fume hoods and freezers that are redundant or not in use.

- c. Staff Training & Performance – Proactively find and correct wasteful operational practices through a continuous process of identifying, applying, and replicating best practices. Update staff job descriptions and evaluation criteria to include resource efficiency metrics (e.g., through the OE Initiative).
- d. Expand the Strategic Energy Plan (SEP) – Currently the SEP only applies to buildings larger than 50,000 square feet, which comprise 57% of campus square footage and 74% of campus electricity consumption. The SEP should be expanded to cover all campus buildings and lab plug loads.
- e. Accelerate Commissioning – Thus far, monitoring-based commissioning projects at UC Berkeley have achieved ~10% energy savings per building. However, specific examples have shown that the commissioning process can do better than 10% when building occupants have a stake in the outcome (e.g., Wurster Hall and Tang Health Center). Monitoring-based and continuous commissioning projects should be accelerated and expanded in order to identify near-term, cost-effective options for improving campus energy efficiency.
 - i. Technical Assistance – Utilize faculty and student experts to assist with commissioning and facility optimization processes.
 - ii. Phase
 II Upgrades – Apply the systems and operational insights gained through commissioning projects to implement phase II upgrades, and to redesign building systems. Commissioning is focused mainly on tuning existing systems, replacing worn or malfunctioning parts, and double-checking control set points and schedules. However, even more savings can be achieved by applying the data and insights that come out of the commissioning process to the design of inherently more efficient systems.

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 24 -

RESOLUTION ON ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO IMPLEMENT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET (cont'd)

- iii. Real-Time Energy Information – Real-time metering systems contribute to better diagnostics of building energy consumption and continuous commissioning. In addition, these systems serve as a platform for providing feedback to building occupants. These systems could lead to energy savings of up to 20% per building.
- f. Expand Lighting Retrofits – Lighting retrofit projects could achieve savings in lighting electricity consumption of 35-60% by taking advantage of more sophisticated time of use and daylight responsive controls, and by eliminating over illumination of hallways. Lighting accounts for approximately 30% of UC Berkeley’s electricity consumption, which implies a potential electricity savings of 10-20% through lighting retrofits alone.
- g. Learn from Other Schools – Apply lessons learned from other universities that have achieved similar energy efficiency goals by upgrading building automation and control systems, installing energy sub-meters, implementing unoccupied setbacks of heating

ventilating & air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, implementing campus-wide temperature standards, issuing departmental energy bills, etc. (e.g., Stanford, University of British Columbia, and Texas A&M).

- i. Departmental Energy Statements – Provide administrators with information on their department’s actual and desired energy consumption trends to prepare them for future efficiency measures.
- ii. Departmental Energy Rebates & Fees – Establish a departmental energy tariff system using each department’s 2009 consumption as the baseline for assessing rebates for those that reduce consumption, and fees for those that increase consumption (e.g., rebate & fee rates = \$0.14/kWh for electricity, and \$8.44/MMBtu for natural gas).³ Stanford found that charging departments for their electricity consumption led to electricity savings of over 3%.

3) Sunset & Outreach Assistance – This Resolution effectively sunsets the GA Campus Energy Efficiency Action Agenda Item initiated by Resolution 1002d (March 4, 2010). The GA will assist campus administrators with outreach to the UC Berkeley graduate student community when and where appropriate to implement the GA’s recommended campus-wide energy efficiency target.

¹ Technical assistance on campus energy performance and efficiency opportunities provided to the GA by the students and instructors of the ER298N - Cal Climate Action Course (Spring 2010).

² Examples of energy saving tips can be found at:

Electricity - <http://www.pge.com/mybusiness/energysavingsrebates/tips/smallbusiness/index.shtml>

Natural Gas - <http://www.pge.com/mybusiness/energysavingsrebates/tips/gassavings/>

³ Departmental energy rates based on average Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) on average medium business electric and large commercial natural gas consumer rates rounded to the nearest cent.

Electricity - <http://www.pge.com/about/news/topics/ratereduction.shtml>

Natural Gas - http://www.pge.com/tariffs/tm2/pdf/GAS_SCHEDS_G-NR2.pdf

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 25 -

Mr. Mikulin introduced himself and said he was the Action Agenda Item Coordinator for Campus Energy Efficiency. He thought the Resolution contained some pretty good guidance for the Administration on how to go about implementing a feasible energy efficiency target for the campus. He did a significant amount of due diligence in working with faculty, staff, and appropriate grad departments in the analysis that went into the Resolution.

Mr. Mikulin said the GA in October adopted a policy target, a 20% reduction in campus-wide energy consumption based on 2009 levels, by 2014. The entire impetus behind the initiation of the Action Agenda Item was the fact that the campus already has a greenhouse gas reduction target. This Agenda Item was seen as a complimentary measure to help the campus go about achieving that goal by 2014, and doing that by investing in improvements on campus rather than buying offsets outside the campus grounds, or outside California. The investments should have sustained, long-term benefits for UC Berkeley and its students.

Mr. Kehoe asked what the feasibility was of a 20% cut. Mr. Mikulin said there were a number of measures. The first measures in the rank ordering were seen to be the most feasible, and the ones at the tail

end were a little more controversial, like charging departments for their energy usage and setting up a structure that requires them to set baseline performance and to pay the differential, which was the most controversial of the elements. But simple things were feasible, like lighting retrofits or doing energy audits on existing buildings and figuring out usage patterns and making small tweaks to improve efficiency. He liked to think that hobbled together, some of the lower hanging fruit could get the campus through the 20% target. Folks recommended between a 20-30% goal, and Mr. Mikulin said he took the bottom end of that to recommend to the GA for adoption.

Mr. Marchand asked if he was suggesting this would become an Action Agenda Item, and said that since it's a long-term goal, it should be a standing policy of the GA. Mr. Mikulin said that would be a friendly amendment. Even if they don't get there by 2014, the campus was part a Statewide goal for 2020.

Ms. Ng said a standing policy is a statement of position of the Graduate Assembly. It is recommended that a standing policy be paired with a directed action. Something in the Resolution could be pretty easily amended to be labeled a directed action. Mr. Marchand the directed action could be the last part, under "Sunset & Outreach Assistance," the part about the GA doing outreach to the GA Berkeley graduate student community to implement the GA's target.

Ms. Ng said the motion was to change the Resolution from an Action Agenda Item to a standing policy and directed action. The title would be amended by replacing "Action Agenda Item" with "Standing Policy and Directed Action," to have the title read, "Standing Policy and Directed Action to Implement a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target." The amendment would also title the entire section after the Resolved Clause as a "Standing Policy." Finally, the amendment would create a new section, "Directed Action," after the first sentence of section 3), Sunset & Outreach Assistance. The new section would contain the wording of the remainder of language in section 3).

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

Ms. Ng said that seeing no further discussion was called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1102g, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO IMPLEMENT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET.

Res. 1102e, By-law Amendment to Implement Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd) - 26 -
Res. 1103b, On Budget Amendment to Appropriate Funding for Lower Sproul Student Center
MOU Creation

Ms. Ng said she would like to thank Mr. Mikulin. Mr. Mikulin said he would like to thank everyone.
(Applause)

The following Resolution, 1103b, was authored by Miguel Daal:

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR LOWER SPROUL
STUDENT CENTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) CREATION

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley students voted to approve a fee referendum to fund the construction of a renovated/new Lower Sproul Student Center in April 2010; and

WHEREAS, prior to referendum approval, the ASUC, including the GA drafted, negotiated and executed a legally binding MOU between the ASUC and the Regents of the University of California which assured among other things certain project programmatic and structural components, roles in project decision making, funding contribution obligations, acceptable uses of fee revenue; and

WHEREAS, included in the assurances of this MOU are the following aspects of particular graduate student interest:

- [the Chancellor shall] Withhold consent to commence construction of that portion of the LSP Project relevant to the portions of the LSP Project described in (a), (b), (c) and (d) below unless the LSP Project shall provide for:
 - (a)
 - (b) A Graduate Student Center, preferably located in Caesar Chavez Hall, programmable by the Graduate Assembly, with views of Strawberry Creek (or comparable space reasonably acceptable to the GA), such facility to be designed for use as a 24-hour space dedicated to graduate students.
 - (c)
 - (d) Use of Anthony Hall as the headquarters of the Graduate Assembly after completion of the LSP Project.
- [project funding may be spent on] renovation of certain interior portions of the MLK Student Center, Cesar Chavez Center (including, at the option of the GA, a graduate student center) and Anthony Hall (to be LEED gold or better) reasonably satisfactory in size and configuration to the ASUC.
- [project funding may be spent on] an [operation and maintenance of plant] and capital renewal fund functioning as an endowment (on terms reasonably agreeable to the GA) for Anthony Hall.
- [best effort to incorporate] family friendly/child accessible space; and

WHEREAS, a second MOU for the project between the ASUC and the Regents of the University of California amending and extending the first MOU was executed after the affirmative referendum vote; and

Resolution 1103b, On Budget Amendment to Appropriate Funding for Lower Sproul Student Center MOU Creation - 27 -

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR LOWER SPROUL STUDENT CENTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) CREATION (cont'd)

WHEREAS, programming for the Lower Sproul Student Center -- the specification of types of activities and spaces and their adjacencies based on expressed desires of the student users of the Community Center -- concluded in December 2010; and

WHEREAS, schematic design for the Lower Sproul Student Center -- the specification of location, and spatial allocations, for programmatic elements as well as circulation and utility pathways -- is underway and scheduled for completion in June 2011; and

WHEREAS, a third MOU is now required to amend and extend the previous two, which would, among other things:

- Reconcile design and programming decisions made with provisions of the previous MOUs
- Promote long-term planning for the spaces created and renovated by the Project
- Secure grad student and undergraduate student interests
- Serve as a historical document articulating the intentions for the spaces created and renovated by the Project; and

WHEREAS, the timely execution of such an MOU (before schematic design completion) is of high priority for the ASUC, including the GA, and will contribute to the creation of a Lower Sproul Student Center that is attractive and accommodating to graduate students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly transfer up to \$1,200 from its budgeted contingency to the President's staffing budget to fund the employment of a graduate student to draft, negotiate and pursue the timely execution of a third MOU for the Lower Sproul Student Center Project, in collaboration with the ASUC lawyer.

Mr. Daal said that last April the students of Berkeley passed a Referendum to renovate and renew the Sproul Plaza area. There's a fee attached to that, the Lower Sproul Fee, which went into effect that semester. Over the course of its lifetime, UC Berkeley students will have paid \$840 million to this Fee. One-third of that will come from graduate students. The project is governed in broad strokes by agreements in two MOUs that are in effect that stipulate that, e.g., there will be a graduate student center, that Anthony Hall will continue as the Graduate Assembly headquarters, that investments will be made toward LEED Certification of Anthony Hall, and that there will be, for example, child-friendly facilities in this renovated Plaza. The planning for this project will pretty much conclude by the end of June. So it was important that they make sure they get what they're paying for between now and June, because after that, the plans are frozen and the building plan is implemented, with all the programs that are in them.

Mr. Daal said there are some provisions in the MOU that are in effect that needed to be revised to have a desired level of accountability and assurance with regard to graduate student issues such as things relating to the continuing use of Anthony Hall as a graduate student headquarters, and many, many other things. The campus has demonstrated interest in writing a third MOU that would kind of seal the deal in terms of intentions for the new facilities and would reconcile design decisions in the design process with what was promised in the MOU.

Resolution 1103b, On Budget Amendment to Appropriate Funding for Lower Sproul Student Center MOU Creation - 28 -

Mr. Daal said an MOU is a tremendous amount of work and time. He was asking for funding so that he could appoint someone from the graduate student community to draft, negotiate and see to the execution of a third MOU for Lower Sproul which does those things. Mr. Daal said this person would work with him, the ASUC lawyer, and the ASUC, to do this task.

Mr. Mikulin asked how many man-hours he thought it will take. Mr. Daal said it was hard to tell. If there was contention, then it could take a long time; if not, it could be a breeze. He calculated the requested amount at 8 weeks, \$15 an hour, 10 hours a week. But it could easily be two-thirds.

Mr. Helu asked if they already have somebody appointed to represent them in Lower Sproul discussions. Mr. Daal said that's the Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator, an undergrad. He makes sure all the constituent groups are satisfied. Creating a Lower Sproul Student Center MOU is not something an undergrad should be doing for the GA.

Mr. Kline asked if they were sure no one would do it for free. Mr. Daal said if someone stepped forward who was interested in doing it, they could do that.

Ms. Williams said they'd get what they pay for and they need this to be done at a professional level. Mr. Daal said the document had to ensure the continuing use of facilities.

Mr. Kline asked if they could get a Law student to do it. Ms. Williams said the Law School has a grant program for doing public interest work, for non-profits, but the hours had to be done by April 1. Mr. Daal said that was a tight timeline.

Ms. Navab asked why their lawyer wasn't doing this. Mr. Daal said the lawyer would work on this as well. Mr. Daal said he's learned from previous experience in negotiating these things with the campus that it was best for grads to do the initial negotiations with the students at the table and the lawyer in the background, not at the table. They'd bring the lawyer in later, to help write and propose aspects of the deal. If they bring the lawyer in before, the campus tends to be very reticent about everything. It would be a shared task. There will be a lot of interpretation of student desires into legal language, so they need a student; and the lawyer would be paid much more than \$15 an hour.

A Delegate asked about what the student's role was in terms of advising. Mr. Daal said they'd need a precise thinker on the law and someone who was diplomatic, for negotiations.

Mr. Helu what the threat was of needing a fourth or fifth MOU. Mr. Daal said he really hoped they wouldn't need that. The Student Center MOU was made necessary and immediate by the schedule of the schematic design phase in June.

Mr. Sheen said there seemed to be a lot of students involved in this process. He was unclear about other students involved. Mr. Daal said the Lower Sproul Student Council provides a formal mechanism for students to give input into design preferences.

Mr. Daal said one thing that would be involved was alcohol policy, which a grad student was needed to articulate.

Resolution 1103b, On Budget Amendment to Appropriate Funding for Lower Sproul Student Center MOU Creation - 29 -

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1103b PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR LOWER SPROUL STUDENT CENTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) CREATION

Ms. Ng said that concluded the meeting. They were all invited to the Delegates' social where they may imbibe drinks, celebratory or therapeutic, depending on their state of mind.

This meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

APPENDIX 1

Amended Version of Resolution 1102e, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations

The following Resolution, 1102e, as amended, was approved by the GA and was authored by Philippe Marchand, on behalf of the GA Structure Review Workgroup:

RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE STRUCTURE WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

WHEREAS, at its November 2010 meeting, the Delegate Assembly adopted Resolution 1010b to create a GA Structure Review Workgroup; and

WHEREAS, in conformity with this Resolution, the Structure Review Workgroup is presenting a report at the February 2011 Assembly meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Workgroup's report is recommending changes to the GA structure with the objective of improving the GA Delegate experience, focusing the work of the Executive Board, increasing communication and collaboration between the different components of the GA, and facilitating the development of a coherent set of goals for the organization; and

WHEREAS, to implement the Workgroup recommendations, a set of amendments must be made to the GA By-laws;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA By-laws be amended as specified below effective July 1, 2011.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Rules Committee is directed to draft amendments to the GA Charter to make it consistent with the updated GA By-laws, and present these amendments at the April meeting of the Delegate Assembly.

Proposed By-law Amendments (additions are italicized and deletions are struck over.)

(under 2.2.4. Responsibilities of Delegates)

2.2.4.5. Failure to Fulfill Responsibilities. Failure of a Delegate-Alternate pair to attend two (2) Assembly meetings during a given semester or failure of a Delegate-Alternate pair to fulfill the "Representation Requirement" subsection for the period spanned by two (2) Delegate Assembly meetings will constitute cause for dismissal as a Delegate. *The Assembly Affairs Vice President* ~~President~~ may dismiss the Delegate. If a Delegate is dismissed, the *Assembly Affairs Vice President* ~~President~~ shall duly notify the Delegate Assembly and the Delegate's Academic Unit of the dismissal. This does not preclude the Delegate from recertification in the following semester. *If a Delegate- Assembly Alternate pair fails to attend two (2) Committee or Workgroup meetings, the Assembly Affairs Vice President may reassign the pair to a different Committee, Workgroup, or campus committee.*

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

(under 2.3. Officers)

2.3.1. Positions. The Officers of the Graduate Assembly shall be the President, *the Assembly Affairs Vice President*, the *Campus Affairs Vice President* ~~for Campus Affairs~~, the *External Affairs Vice President* ~~for External Affairs~~, ~~the Project Coordinator Officer~~, the ~~Budget Officer~~ *Treasurer*, and the Rules Officer, *the Funding Officer and the Environmental Sustainability Officer*. Officers may not be Delegates or Alternates.

2.3.2. Directed Action. The Officers shall take specific action as directed by the Delegate Assembly, the Executive Board, ~~and/or the President~~ provided that those actions are consistent with the Charter and By-laws. If the directed actions contradict each other, the action directed by the Delegate Assembly shall take precedence, ~~followed by the action directed by the Executive Board~~.

2.3.3. Elections. Elections for all Officers shall take place as early as the March Assembly. All Officers shall be elected by a majority vote of the Delegate Assembly. If no candidate for an Officer position receives a majority of votes of the Delegate Assembly, then the two candidates with the greatest number of votes shall proceed to a run off in which the Delegate Assembly, by majority vote, shall then elect the Officer, choosing between only these two candidates. ~~A unanimous and anonymous vote of the Project Coordinators (excluding the Graduate Social Club coordinator) may veto the choice of the Project Coordinator Officer.~~

(...)

2.3.10. Specific Responsibilities

2.3.10.1. President. The President shall represent the Graduate Assembly where appropriate and as the Delegate Assembly or the Executive Board shall direct, but the President shall not speak or act on behalf of the Delegate Assembly except with the concurrence of that body. The President shall serve as *a voting member* and *as the chair* for meetings ~~of the Delegate Assembly and~~ of the Executive Board, unless the President chooses to delegate this *chair* responsibility to another member of the Executive Board. *In the absence of the Assembly Affairs Vice President, the President shall chair the meetings of the Delegate Assembly. The President shall be the official representative of the Graduate Assembly to the ASUC and, together with the Campus Affairs Vice President, shall meet regularly with the Chancellor and relevant members of the UC Berkeley administration. The President shall work with the Executive Board to develop a Graduate Assembly advocacy agenda for the academic year.*

2.3.10.2. Assembly Affairs Vice President. *The Assembly Affairs Vice President shall serve as chair for meetings of the Delegate Assembly. The Assembly Affairs Vice President shall coordinate the preparation of Assembly meeting materials, the recruitment and orientation of new Assembly members and the assignment of Assembly members to Assembly Committees and Workgroups. The Assembly Affairs Vice President shall act as liaison between the Executive Board and the Business Office and work on any issue*

pertaining to the physical space, resources and means of communication controlled by the Graduate Assembly. The Assembly Affairs Vice President shall also meet regularly with the ~~Budget Officer~~, the

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- iii -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

Rules Officer, the Funding Officer, and the Sustainability Officer. The Assembly Affairs Vice President shall chair the Funding Appeals Committee.

2.3.10.23 . ~~Campus Affairs Vice President for Campus Affairs~~. The ~~Campus Affairs Vice President for Campus Affairs~~ shall monitor campus policies affecting graduate students, and shall work on other issues as ~~directed by the Delegate Assembly~~ ~~agreed upon by the President~~. The ~~Campus Affairs Vice President for Campus Affairs~~ shall chair meetings of the ~~Delegate Assembly~~ and of the Executive Board in the absence of the President. ~~The Campus Affairs Vice President for Campus Affairs~~ shall serve as the chair of the Campus Affairs Committee. ~~The Campus Affairs Vice President shall oversee~~ ~~communicate with and advocate on behalf of the Graduate Assembly Projects and meet regularly with the Project Coordinators~~. The Vice President for Campus Affairs shall also be responsible for placing Delegates, Alternates, and other graduate students on ~~Committees, Workgroups, and Academic Senate~~ and administrative campus committees with designated seats for graduate students. ~~The appointees for each committee, as Graduate Assembly representative, shall, in conjunction with the Campus Affairs Vice President, submit once per semester a report summarizing the action of the committee and the position of the Graduate Assembly representatives on the relevant issues of the committee. The Campus Affairs Vice President shall oversee the committee appointees to ensure that they adequately represent the will and desires of the Delegate Assembly. The Campus Affairs Vice President, in conjunction with the President, will meet with campus administrators to promote the Graduate Assembly's advocacy agenda for the academic year. Whenever possible the Vice President for Campus Affairs shall assign graduate students to Committees, Workgroups, and campus committees in the following order.~~

(Strike list of committees in current By-laws but not listed here)

2.3.10.34. ~~External Affairs Vice President for External Affairs~~. The ~~External Affairs Vice President for External Affairs~~ shall monitor policies of the Regents and the President of the University of California, as well as policies and legislation of local, state, and federal governments, affecting graduate students, and shall work on other issues as ~~directed by the Delegate Assembly~~ ~~agreed upon by the President~~. The ~~External Affairs Vice President for External Affairs~~ shall represent the Graduate Assembly at meetings of the University of California's Student Association (UCSA) and Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE), and shall be responsible for informing ~~these bodies~~ ~~that body~~ of positions taken by the Graduate Assembly on appropriate issues. ~~The External Affairs Vice President will promote the Graduate Assembly's advocacy agenda as appropriate in meeting with the Regents, UCSA, SAGE, and government officials. The Vice President for External Affairs shall be responsible for placing Delegates, Alternates, and other graduate students on system-wide committees.~~ The ~~External Affairs Vice President for External Affairs~~ shall also serve as the chair of the External Affairs Committee.

2.3.10.4. ~~Project Coordinator Officer~~. The ~~Project Coordinator Officer~~ shall supervise the ~~Project Coordinators~~, and shall meet regularly with the ~~Project Coordinators~~ individually and as a group. The ~~Project Coordinator Officer~~ shall also advise the ~~Project Coordinators~~ on programming, advertising, and budgeting. The ~~Project Coordinator Officer~~ shall represent the interests, needs, and concerns of the ~~Project~~

~~Coordinators to the Executive Board and shall communicate the broad directives of the Executive Board to the Project Coordinators.~~

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- iv -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

2.3.10.5. ~~Budget Officer-Treasurer~~. *The Treasurer shall be a non-voting member of the Executive Board. The Treasurer shall proactively monitor all Assembly spending (including speaking by the Executive Board and Projects) and make recommendations for any necessary budget and spending adjustments. The ~~Budget Officer-Treasurer~~, with the assistance of the Budget Committee, shall oversee and make recommendations regarding the fiscal health of the Graduate Assembly and its budget. The ~~Budget Officer-Treasurer~~ and the Finance Officer (i.e., the Business Officer Manager) shall prepare financial documents regarding the fiscal health of the Graduate Assembly and its budget. The ~~Budget Officer-Treasurer~~ and the Finance Officer shall be responsible for requesting additional sources of financing. The ~~Budget Officer-Treasurer~~ shall serve as the chair of the Budget Committee. The ~~Budget Officer-Treasurer~~ shall, in consultation with the ~~Executive Board President~~ and the Business Office Manager, determine which revenue sources shall fund the various expenses as determined by the GA's budget.*

2.3.10.6. Rules Officer. The Rules Officer, with the assistance of the Rules Committee, shall oversee and make recommendations regarding the status and upkeep of the Charter and these By-laws, and shall work to ensure that all aspects of the Graduate Assembly comply with the Charter and these By-laws. The Rules Officer, with the assistance of the Rules Committee, shall oversee and make recommendations regarding the status and upkeep of Memoranda of Understanding between the Graduate Assembly and other entities, and shall work to ensure that all aspects of the Graduate Assembly and these other entities comply with the requirements of the Memoranda. *The Rules Officer shall be an impartial member of the Graduate Assembly and shall act as parliamentarian for Delegate Assembly meetings.*

2.3.10.7. Funding Officer. *The Funding Officer shall serve as chair of the Funding Committee. The Funding Officer, with the assistance of the Business Office, shall prepare for each round of funding allocations a report of Funding Committee recommendations and present it to the Delegate Assembly. By the April meeting of the Delegate Assembly, the Funding Officer, with the assistance of the Funding Committee and the Business Office, shall prepare a Funding Guide for the following academic year and present it to the Delegate Assembly for approval. The Funding Officer shall also serve as a member of the Funding Appeals Committee.*

2.3.10.8. Environmental Sustainability Officer. *The Environmental Sustainability Officer shall chair the Environmental Sustainability Committee. The Environmental Sustainability Officer, with the assistance of the Environmental Sustainability Committee, shall monitor the implementation of Graduate Assembly sustainability policies, suggests ways to improve the Graduate Assembly's sustainable practices, and prepare an annual report on the Graduate Assembly's sustainability. The Environmental Sustainability Officer, with the assistance of the Environmental Sustainability Committee, shall also advise the Executive Board on campus and external advocacy initiatives pertaining to sustainability.*

2.3.10.79. Job Descriptions. These By-laws incorporate the job descriptions of each Officer into the responsibilities for each Officer. The job description for each Officer shall be reviewed annually ~~and may~~

~~be modified by a majority vote of the Executive Board.~~ *by the Executive Board. Modifications to these job descriptions require a majority vote of the Delegate Assembly.*

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- v -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

(under 2.4. Graduate Council Representatives)

2.4.1. Responsibilities. The Graduate Council Representatives and Alternate are responsible for informing the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate of positions taken by the Graduate Assembly on appropriate issues. ~~The Graduate Council Representatives and Alternate must be certified as Delegates from their respective Academic Unit.~~

2.4.2. Directed Action. The Graduate Council Representatives and Alternate shall take specific action as directed by the Delegate Assembly, the Executive Board, and/or *the Campus Affairs Vice President* ~~President~~ provided that those actions are consistent with the Charter and By-laws. If the directed actions contradict each other, the action directed by the Delegate Assembly shall take precedence, followed by the action directed by the Executive Board.

(under 2.5. Committee & Workgroup Chairs)

2.5.1. Directed Action. In addition to the duties and responsibilities as chair, the chair of a Committee or Workgroup shall take specific action as directed by the Delegate Assembly, *and/or* the Executive Board, ~~and/or the President~~, provided that those actions are consistent with the Charter and Bylaws. If the directed actions contradict each other, the action directed by the Delegate Assembly shall take precedence, ~~followed by the action directed by the Executive Board.~~

2.5.2. Job Descriptions. These Bylaws incorporate the job descriptions of each chair into the responsibilities for each chair. The job description for each chair shall be reviewed annually ~~and may be modified by a majority vote of the Executive Board.~~ *by the Executive Board. Modifications to these job descriptions require a majority vote of the Delegate Assembly.*

(under 3. Delegate Assembly Meetings)

3.2. Special Meetings. The Delegate Assembly shall also have special meetings at such times as the Delegate Assembly shall deem necessary, by call of the *Assembly Affairs Vice President* ~~President~~, or upon the receipt of the written petition of at least fifteen (15) Delegates. The *Assembly Affairs Vice President* ~~President~~ shall call a special meeting of the Delegate Assembly to be held within seven (7) days of the time of the presentation of petition.

(under 4. Committees)

4.1. Current Committees. The current Committees shall be the Budget Committee, the Rules Committee, the Funding Committee, ~~the Communications Committee,~~ the Environmental Sustainability Committee, ~~and the International Student Affairs Committee,~~ the Campus Affairs Committee, and the External Affairs Committee.

4.2. Creation and Dissolution. A Committee shall be created or dissolved only through an amendment to these Bylaws. A Workgroup may be created or dissolved, before the end of the academic year in which it

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- vi -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

is created, through the appropriate resolution by a majority vote of the Delegate Assembly, ~~or as is deemed necessary by the Executive Board.~~

(...)

4.6. Voting. Each member shall cast his/her own vote and shall represent the feelings of his/her unit. Proxy votes are not allowed. The chair *of a Committee or Workgroup* may only vote to break a tie, *with the exception of the Executive Board chair who may always vote.*

4.7. Chairs. 4.7.1 Elections and Removal. Unless otherwise directed by these bylaws, chairs shall be elected (by majority vote) or removed (by 2/3 majority vote) by members of their committee or workgroup. Committee chairs shall be subject to approval by a majority of the Delegate Assembly at the first Assembly meeting following their election. Chairs shall be elected when convenient or necessary provided that vacant chair positions are filled as soon as possible. Should any Committee fail to present a chair to the Assembly before the meeting at which officer elections are held, the *Assembly Affairs Vice President* ~~President~~ may choose to open the position to the Assembly in these elections.

(...)

4.15.1. Executive Board

4.15.1.1. Primary Responsibilities. The Executive Board is a coordinating body that ensures that all aspects of the Graduate Assembly are informed of ongoing matters and that the members of the Graduate Assembly support one another in their individual or joint efforts.

4.15.1.2. Authority to Act. The Executive Board may act *on behalf of and not as for* the Delegate Assembly on matters of immediate concern *when the Delegate Assembly is not in session*. Matters of immediate concern are those matters on which the Delegate Assembly would normally take action but which require *urgent* attention ~~when the Delegate Assembly is between sessions or is not in session.~~, *and those matters for which the financial or legal circumstances have changes significantly since the last Delegate Assembly session. Urgent is defined as requiring action to prevent or respond to legal or physical harm to the Graduate Assembly or its assets. Minutes of the meeting in which the decision to act is made must be recorded and include a roll call of the vote.*

4.15.1.3. Assembly Review. All actions of the Executive Board, *including Executive Board actions on behalf of the Delegate Assembly when the Assembly is not in session*, are subject to approval, reversal, or

modification by a majority vote of the Delegate Assembly, except ~~in regard to contractual obligations agreed to by the Executive Board. This includes Executive Board actions on behalf of the Delegate Assembly when the Delegate Assembly is between sessions or not in session.~~

4.15.1.4. Reports. The President, on behalf of the Executive Board, shall make a written or oral report of the *Executive Board's* activities to the Delegates at every Assembly meeting.

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- vii -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

4.15.1.5. Committee Replacement. In the event that any Committee cannot act on an issue of immediate concern, the Executive Board may assume the responsibilities of that committee if it chooses.

4.15.1.6. Membership. The President shall serve as chair of the Executive Board, which shall consist of *the President, the Assembly Affairs Vice President, the Campus Affairs Vice President, Treasurer and the External Affairs Vice President* ~~any position elected by the Delegate Assembly. The Treasurer is a non-voting member.~~

4.15.1.7. Attendance. ~~Voting members~~ *Members* of the Executive Board are required to attend every Executive Board meeting. ~~Non-voting members of the Executive Board are required to attend one Executive Board meeting each month.~~

4.15.1.8. Consensus. Although final decisions of the Executive Board shall be made by a majority vote of *the voting members* ~~of the voting members~~ of the Executive Board, all reasonable efforts shall be made to reach consensus with all members of the Executive Board before making a final decision on behalf of the Executive Board. *In the event of a tie vote, the motion under consideration shall fail.*

(...)

~~4.15.5. Communications. The Communications Committee shall advise the Graduate Assembly on effective ways to communicate both internally and with the larger campus community. It shall identify appropriate ways to inform, solicit feedback, and foster dialog on significant institutional issues. It shall make recommendations on new opportunities and technologies to enhance internal and external communications. It shall establish policies that govern the use of and placement of content on the Graduate Assembly's website and other electronic presences. It shall also establish policies that govern the use of other Graduate Assembly technology. It shall work, on behalf of the Graduate Assembly, with any entity or individual that provides support for the Graduate Assembly's communications or technology.~~

4.15.65. Environmental Sustainability. The Environmental Sustainability Committee shall advise the Graduate Assembly, as well as all necessary individuals within the Graduate Assembly, on the sustainability of all relevant actions and politics of the Graduate Assembly. It shall also issue an annual report on the Graduate Assembly's sustainability and shall work with the relevant parts of the Graduate Assembly to improve sustainable practices and implement sustainable policies.

~~4.15.7. International Student Affairs. The International Student Affairs Committee shall serve and support all international graduate students on campus. This shall include monitoring all policies of the University of California relating to issues affecting international students and making recommendations on these issues to the Delegate Assembly.~~

~~4.15.86. Campus Affairs. The Campus Affairs Committee shall aid the *Campus Affairs* Vice President for Campus Affairs in studying and making recommendations to the Delegate Assembly on issues related to campus policies and procedures. It shall also assist the *Campus Affairs* Vice President for Campus Affairs in organizing, recruiting, and planning efforts that are the responsibility of the *Campus Affairs* Vice President for Campus Affairs.~~

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- viii -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

~~4.15.97. External Affairs. The External Affairs Committee shall aid the *External Affairs* Vice President for External Affairs in studying and making recommendations to the Delegate Assembly on issues and developments of concern to graduate students on the local, system- wide, state, and national levels. It shall also assist the *External Affairs* Vice President for External Affairs in organizing, recruiting, and planning efforts that are the responsibility of the *External Affairs* Vice President for External Affairs.~~

(under 5.3. Project Coordinator Responsibilities)

~~5.3.4. Job Descriptions. These By-laws incorporate the job descriptions of each Project Coordinator into the responsibilities for each Project Coordinator. The job description for each Project Coordinator shall be reviewed annually and may be modified by a majority vote of the Executive Board. by the Executive Board. Modifications to these job descriptions require a majority vote of the Delegate Assembly.~~

(under 6.4.2. Resolutions – Process)

~~6.4.2.3. Committee Referral. The *Assembly Affairs* Vice President President shall refer each resolution to the appropriate committee(s) for analysis and shall announce to the Delegate Assembly the committee(s) to which each resolution is referred. The Delegate Assembly may, upon an appropriate motion, modify the specific committee(s) to which the *Assembly Affairs* Vice President President refers each resolution if there is no objection or by a majority vote. The chair of the Delegate Assembly shall remind author(s), or another person delegated by the author(s), that it is the common practice of the Graduate Assembly for authors to attend committee meetings in which resolutions are analyzed to answer any questions and provide the committee with background information on the resolution.~~

(...)

~~6.4.2.7 Executive Board Exception. The Executive Board may also suspend these procedures by unanimous consent and present a resolution to the Assembly for consideration at the same assembly meeting at which the resolution is introduced, provided that notice of immediate consideration is given in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda, and the full text of the resolution is provided to the Delegates at least six days before this Assembly meeting.~~

6.5 Advocacy Agenda. The advocacy agenda shall be re-created for each academic year and shall identify goals that the Graduate Assembly is working towards and that it will promote in meetings with campus administrators, the Regents, local and state government officials, UCSA and SAGE. The President shall work with the Executive Board and the Project Coordinators to develop a Graduate Assembly advocacy agenda for the academic year. ~~Input should be sought from the Project Coordinators.~~ This advocacy agenda shall be presented at the September meeting of the Delegate Assembly for approval but may be amended by the Delegate Assembly at any time.

6.5 Action Agenda Item

~~6.5.1 Definition. An Action Agenda Item is a quantified goal, together with a specific plan for achieving that goal, determined by the Graduate Assembly. The Graduate Assembly may not have more than three~~

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- ix -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

~~(3) Action Agenda Items at any one time. Each Action Agenda Item shall have a Coordinator, who is elected by the Delegate Assembly and supervised by the President.~~

~~6.5.2 Adoption. During a Delegate Assembly meeting, any Delegate, Chair, or Officer may introduce a proposed Action Agenda Item, provided that the Graduate Assembly does not already have three Action Agenda Items. The proposal must be in writing, and must contain the name of at least one (1) person who has agreed to serve as Coordinator for the proposed Action Agenda Item, if elected. The President shall refer each proposed Action Agenda Item to the Rules Committee and the Campus Affairs Committee. The Delegate Assembly will consider adoption of the proposed action agenda item at the Delegate Assembly meeting following the meeting at which it was Proposed. A two thirds (2/3) vote is required to adopt an Action Agenda Item.~~

~~6.5.3 Coordinators. Immediately after the adoption of an Action Agenda Item, or upon the resignation of an Action Agenda Item Coordinator, the Delegate Assembly shall elect an Action Agenda Item Coordinator. If no Coordinator is elected for two (2) consecutive meetings of the Delegate Assembly, the Action Agenda Item is considered dissolved. An Action Agenda Item Coordinator does not serve on the Executive Board.~~

~~6.5.4 Reports. Action Agenda Item Coordinators shall make regular reports, in writing and orally, to the Executive Board and the Delegate Assembly. Reports shall include an update on the progress made towards the quantified goal.~~

~~6.5.5 Amendment and Dissolution. An Action Agenda Item may be amended or dissolved a by two thirds (2/3) vote of the Delegate Assembly, but notice of the proposed amendment or dissolution must appear in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda, and the full text of any amendment must be included in the Delegate Assembly meeting's supporting materials.~~

~~6.6 Census. Once an academic year Every Spring Semester, the Assembly Affairs Vice President President shall determine the number of graduate students enrolled in each Graduate Degree-Granting Program, and make this tabulation available on the GA's Web page. This census shall determine the number of delegate~~

seats allocated to each Graduate Degree-~~Granting-Getting~~ Program, in accordance with the GA Charter, for the following academic year.

6.7 Graduate Student Group Funding

6.7.1 The Funding Guide. Before ~~each~~ *the April meeting of the Delegate Assembly, academic year*, the Funding ~~Committee Chair~~ shall work with the Business Office to create the Funding Guide, which will outline the procedures that Graduate Student Groups should follow to apply for GA funding *the following academic year*. The Funding Guide should be presented to the ~~Executive Board for approval on or before August 15 of each year~~ *Delegate Assembly for approval on or before its April meeting*.

6.7.2 Funding Appeals. Decisions of the Funding Committee to deny or limit funding to a particular Graduate Student Group may be appealed to a Funding Appeals Committee. This committee shall be convened by the *Assembly Affairs Vice President* ~~Rules Chair~~. The membership will consist of the

Appendix 1, Amended Resolution 1102e (cont'd)

- x -

Amended Version of Resolution 11023, On By-law Amendment to Implement the Structure Workgroup Recommendations (cont'd)

Assembly Affairs Vice President, the Rules Officer ~~Chair, the President (or one member of the Executive Board chosen by the President)~~ and the Funding *Officer* ~~Chair~~, (or one member of the Funding Committee). Appeals must be e-mailed to the *Assembly Affairs Vice President* ~~Rules Chair~~ no more than seven (7) calendar days after notification of the Funding Committee's decision. Appeals must contain the specific decision being appealed and the reasons for the appeal. Appellants shall be given the opportunity to present their case in person to the Funding Appeals Committee before a decision on an appeal is made, provided the appeal is timely.

6.7.3. Final Approval. The Funding Committee's report on funding allocations *and all decisions of the Funding Appeals Committee are* ~~is~~ subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly.

APPENDIX 2

Amended Version of Resolution 1102a and 1102g

Final, amended version of Resolution 1102a, as amended at the meeting

Resolution to Revise Funding Committee Procedures

Whereas, the funding rules seek to allocate money fairly and efficiently; and

Whereas, the previous revision to the Funding Committee procedures (in November 2010) left a number of loose ends and rough edges; and

Whereas, the intent of this Resolution is to clarify ambiguities and fix mistakes, rather than to make major changes;

Therefore Be It Resolved, to amend the Funding Committee procedures to add new "General Principles" and "Reporting" sections at the top, with the rest of the document renumbered accordingly.

1. General Principles

- A. The Graduate Assembly has granted the Funding Committee substantial responsibility and discretion. This must be balanced with accountability and transparency.
- B. The Committee should recommend denying funding to requests that they determine are abusive, or that contain significant and deliberate misstatements.
 - i. In reaching these conclusions, Funding Committee members are not restricted to the content of the request form, but can use any other information they have legitimate access to. In particular, Committee members have the right to contact a group and ask for clarifications.
 - ii. Individual Committee members may research and contact groups on their own initiative, but should always bear in mind that they will be viewed as representatives of the Graduate Assembly and should act with tact and courtesy and within the bounds set by the GA Bylaws.
 - iii. In their discussions with outside groups, Committee members should make clear when they are speaking for themselves and when they are speaking for the Committee.
- C. The Funding Committee may recommend denying groups funding for up to 10 months following the groups' serious and willful violations of the funding rules.
- D. Committee members must recuse themselves on votes concerning organizations they are affiliated with, or that are affiliated with their departments. They should also

1102a, Resolution to Revise Funding Committee Procedures (cont'd)

recuse themselves when not doing so would result in the appearance of any conflict of interest.

- i. Committee members who have recused themselves may speak to the Committee on behalf of a group or allocation in the same manner as any other member of a group seeking funding.
- ii. Recusal does not affect Committee quorum: A recused member is still present for quorum purposes.

2. Reporting

- A. The Funding Committee shall report the results of its deliberations to the Delegate Assembly in the in the form of a Funding Report.
- B. This report should list the proposed allocation for each group. Groups should be listed alphabetically. Supergroup affiliation shall be listed alongside each group.
- C. The Funding Committee should strive to give the delegates succinct but complete explanations when a student group is recommended denied funding. If a group is recommended denied funding based on current or past abuse of the system, a detailed explanation to the group and the Graduate Assembly is required.
- D. In the event of disagreement within the Funding Committee about whether a request should be granted, whether a group is abusive, or any other substantive question, the non-prevailing side may present a minority report to the Delegates, explaining their view.
- E. The Funding Committee must take minutes. Minutes must include a record of those members present, plus the number of votes for and against all funding decisions taken without unanimous consensus. The committee may also record additional information in its minutes. Minutes must be made available prior to the delegate meeting discussing a Funding report prepared for that meeting.

Be It Further Resolved, that the changes to the written procedures in this Resolution are as much as clarification as revision. This Resolution does not imply that the Funding Committee was previously unable to consult outside information sources or required to approve requests they believe abusive.

Final, amended version of Resolution 1102g, as amended at the meeting:

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action to Implement a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target

Whereas, UC Berkeley does not have a stated target for campus-wide energy efficiency; and

Whereas, the Cal Climate Action Partnership (CalCAP) has set a 2014 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target for the campus (i.e. reduce total campus GHG emissions to 1990 levels = 166,600 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) by 2014 versus 201,110 in 2009); and

Whereas, according to the 2010 UC Berkeley Sustainability Report, campus-wide energy use included 157,105,948 kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity, 156,301 million British thermal units (MMBtu) of natural gas, and 844,972 MMBtu of steam in 1990 versus 218,515,767 kWh of electricity, 219,401 MMBtu of natural gas, and 1,075,197 MMBtu of steam in 2009; and

Whereas, the close interrelationship between energy consumption and GHG emissions make it prudent to establish a campus-wide energy efficiency target that compliments CalCAP's existing GHG emissions reduction target; and

Whereas, reducing energy consumption saves money and reduces pollution, which is in the interest of all UC Berkeley students; and

Whereas, getting more students involved will provide additional guidance and support for administrative efforts to improve campus resource efficiency and conservation; and

Whereas, it is important for UC Berkeley to maintain its role as the environmental and resource efficiency leader within the UC System; and

Whereas, John Mikulin is the Coordinator for this GA Action Agenda Item;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that pursuant to Action Agenda Item Resolutions 1002d (March 4, 2010) and 1009e (October 7, 2010):

Standing Policy:

- 1) Goal - The GA supports the implementation of a campus-wide energy efficiency target for UC Berkeley that reduces energy consumption across all campus buildings to 20% below 2009 levels by 2014.
 - a. Metrics for CalCAP Consistency - In 1990, total GHG emissions for the UC Berkeley campus were 166,600 tons, of which 69% was from purchased electricity, steam, and natural gas. In 2009, campus GHG emissions were 201,110 tons, of which 78% was from purchased electricity, steam, and natural gas. Hence, the campus needs to reduce

its emissions by 17% in order to meet the 2014 CalCAP target. The GA recommends reducing campus electricity, steam, and natural gas consumption to 1990 levels by

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action to Implement a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target (cont'd)

2014 in order to help achieve the CalCAP target. If campus square footage increases at 1.95%/year (the 2008-09 growth rate), then electricity consumption in existing buildings would have to fall by 40% and steam and natural gas consumption by 30% in 2020 (assuming new buildings are built to achieve the same energy consumption per square foot as existing buildings in 2009). Thus, absolute energy consumption in existing buildings should be reduced by 20-30% below 2009 levels by 2014 to comply with the existing CalCAP target.

- 2) Implementation - The GA encourages the CalCAP Steering Committee, the Operational Excellence (OE) Initiative, as well as UC Berkeley students, faculty, and staff members to collaboratively implement the GA's adopted campus-wide energy efficiency target in a cost effective, technologically feasible, and timely manner. In service of this objective, the GA offers the following guidance, which will to help reduce energy consumption throughout the campus:¹
 - a. Comprehensive Approach – Successful implementation of a campus-wide energy efficiency target will require a combination of organizational incentives, staffing, training, and stakeholder buy in as well as technology procurement, installation, configuration, and maintenance.
 - b. Stakeholder Outreach – Outreach to campus staff, departments, faculty, and students to obtain their perspectives and buy in for more inclusive efficiency programs (e.g., through the OE Initiative).
 - i. Consumer Education – Inform all building occupants of behavior changes that they can implement to reduce campus energy consumption (e.g., lighting & climate control adjustments, computer equipment shut downs, etc.).²
 - ii. Lab Outreach – Laboratory buildings are the biggest energy consumers on campus (per square foot) and consistently populate the top ten buildings in terms of absolute energy use. Because much of the load in lab buildings is directly or indirectly driven by laboratory equipment, addressing these loads must be a priority. This will require working with lab groups (as the Office of Sustainability has begun) to change behavior patterns and investigate opportunities for sharing lab equipment or decommissioning equipment like fume hoods and freezers that are redundant or not in use.
 - c. Staff Training & Performance – Proactively find and correct wasteful operational practices through a continuous process of identifying, applying, and replicating best practices. Update staff job descriptions and evaluation criteria to include resource efficiency metrics (e.g., through the OE Initiative).

- d. Expand the Strategic Energy Plan (SEP) – Currently the SEP only applies to buildings larger than 50,000 square feet, which comprise 57% of campus square footage and 74% of campus electricity consumption. The SEP should be expanded to cover all campus buildings and lab plug loads.

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action to Implement a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target (cont'd)

- e. Accelerate Commissioning – Thus far, monitoring-based commissioning projects at UC Berkeley have achieved ~10% energy savings per building. However, specific examples have shown that the commissioning process can do better than 10% when building occupants have a stake in the outcome (e.g., Wurster Hall and Tang Health Center). Monitoring-based and continuous commissioning projects should be accelerated and expanded in order to identify near-term, cost-effective options for improving campus energy efficiency.
 - i. Technical Assistance – Utilize faculty and student experts to assist with commissioning and facility optimization processes.
 - ii. Phase II Upgrades – Apply the systems and operational insights gained through commissioning projects to implement phase II upgrades, and to redesign building systems. Commissioning is focused mainly on tuning existing systems, replacing worn or malfunctioning parts, and double-checking control set points and schedules. However, even more savings can be achieved by applying the data and insights that come out of the commissioning process to the design of inherently more efficient systems.
 - iii. Real-Time Energy Information – Real-time metering systems contribute to better diagnostics of building energy consumption and continuous commissioning. In addition, these systems serve as a platform for providing feedback to building occupants. These systems could lead to energy savings of up to 20% per building.
- f. Expand Lighting Retrofits – Lighting retrofit projects could achieve savings in lighting electricity consumption of 35-60% by taking advantage of more sophisticated time of use and daylight responsive controls, and by eliminating over illumination of hallways. Lighting accounts for approximately 30% of UC Berkeley’s electricity consumption, which implies a potential electricity savings of 10-20% through lighting retrofits alone.
- g. Learn from Other Schools – Apply lessons learned from other universities that have achieved similar energy efficiency goals by upgrading building automation and control systems, installing energy sub-meters, implementing unoccupied setbacks of heating ventilating & air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, implementing campus-wide temperature standards, issuing departmental energy bills, etc. (e.g., Stanford, University of British Columbia, and Texas A&M).
 - i. Departmental Energy Statements – Provide administrators with information on their department’s actual and desired energy consumption trends to prepare them for future efficiency measures.

- ii. Departmental Energy Rebates & Fees – Establish a departmental energy tariff system using each department’s 2009 consumption as the baseline for assessing rebates for those that reduce consumption, and fees for those that increase consumption (e.g., rebate & fee rates = \$0.14/kWh for electricity, and \$8.44/MMBtu for natural

Amended Resolutions, 1102g (cont'd)

- xvi -

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action to Implement a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target (cont'd)

gas).³ Stanford found that charging departments for their electricity consumption led to electricity savings of over 3%.

- 3) Sunset & Outreach Assistance – This Resolution effectively sunsets the GA Campus Energy Efficiency Action Agenda Item initiated by Resolution 1002d (March 4, 2010).

Directed Action:

The GA will assist campus administrators with outreach to the UC Berkeley graduate student community when and where appropriate to implement the GA’s recommended campus-wide energy efficiency target.

¹ Technical assistance on campus energy performance and efficiency opportunities provided to the GA by the students and instructors of the ER298N - Cal Climate Action Course (Spring 2010).

² Examples of energy saving tips can be found at:

Electricity - <http://www.pge.com/mybusiness/energysavingsrebates/tips/smallbusiness/index.shtml>

Natural Gas - <http://www.pge.com/mybusiness/energysavingsrebates/tips/gassavings/>

³ Departmental energy rates based on average Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) on average medium business electric and large commercial natural gas consumer rates rounded to the nearest cent.

Electricity - <http://www.pge.com/about/news/topics/ratereduction.shtml>

Natural Gas - http://www.pge.com/tariffs/tm2/pdf/GAS_SCHEDS_G-NR2.pdf