

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

May 6, 2010

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This regular meeting concluded the Spring Semester and was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Announcements

Viola Tang, ASUC representative to the GA, said a number of bills were approved by the External Affairs Committee of the ASUC. SB 118A, In Support of ASUC Divestment from War Crimes, would have had the ASUC divest funds from General Electric and United Technologies, which contribute to the Israeli government. There were three long Senate meetings, with over 1,000 people attending. But the bill did not pass. The Committee also passed the following: SB 195, to Support State Senate Bill 970, which would allow for early voting at various campuses; SB 201, In Support of Replacing California's Super-majority Requirement on the Budget with a Simple Majority; SB 226, In Support of Urgent Reform of the UC Board of Regents; and SB 228, To Oppose Arizona's Senate Bill 1070. The ASUC Senate also just concluded spring budgeting. For ASUC elections, the turnout was 12,383, a 12.4% increase from last year, one of the highest turnouts for an ASUC election. Ms. Tang will be Academic Affairs VP next year

Yomaira Figueroa, Women of Color Initiative Project Coordinator, can't continue in the position next year and there was a call for applicants. The Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project Coordinator position will also be open next year.

Andrea, from the GA External Affairs Committee, asked people to consider about a question on the feedback on whether the GA should get involved in efforts to divest from companies that profit from human rights violations.

Mr. Marchand noted that there were a number of openings for next year for grad reps on campus committees, including the Committee that will oversee Lower Sproul reconstruction.

Ms. Hsueh acknowledged people for their dedication and hard work: Mr. Daal, Mr. Rajan, Ms. Chavez, Mr. Tahir; Mr. Kramer, Mr. Briggs, Brandon, Ms. Scown, Ms. Berkeley, Ms. Figueroa, Mr. Nicholson, and Ms. Anderson. She wanted to thank them.

Presentation on the Student Portal by Rachel Hollowgrass and Bernadette Geuy

The portal project has been a grassroots effort initiated by students. Ms. Geuy was from Campus Life and Leadership and Ms. Hollowgrass was from IS&T, so this was a cross-campus project.

The portal will develop incrementally. People with common interests could and reach across disciplines and find others with similar interests. This project would consolidate things students deal with into one place. MyProfile will allow for academic networking; MyCommunities will help to form groups; and MyReminders will consolidate reminders of important dates and tasks. The portal will be based on Sakai 3, which was the replacement for bSpace.

Funding was coming from the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and hopefully IS&T, and it will be a

The initiative's Web site asks groups to imagine a Web site with the key things they'd want to see, such as their balance on the Cal 1 Card. The site is campuslife.berkeley.edu/myberkeleyproject.

Staff programmers will write code. Policy decisions will probably be collaborative, since so many groups were involved in developing this. It was a new model.

Nanxi Liu introduced herself, and said she will be the ASUC Executive Vice President next year. She looked forward to working with the GA.

GA Elections

People elected to some positions in the GA have resigned, and new elections had to be held.

The GA elected Reikia Jibrin for Campus Affairs, a fourth-year grad in Education.

There were no nominations, and the position of Project Coordinator Liaison remained open. The Exec Board may appoint someone to temporarily fill the position during the summer.

Reports

Mr. Daal, GA President, reported that the Lower Sproul Referendum passed, with a sizable margin of victory. An MOU students negotiated with the University creates three committees to oversee Lower Sproul development: the Fee Committee, made up with mostly students; the Program Committee, which will be the executive committee, with six students, appointed by students; and a working group, with 50%-plus-one students. The Referendum had been an Action Agenda Item, having passed, the GA decided, with no objection, to dissolve the Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item.

Mr. Tahir and Mr. Rajan reported, Budget Committee Chair and Budget Officer. The GA's main source of revenue was student fees from about 9,500 grads, at about \$420,000 a year. GA Reserves include the Student Fee Reserve, \$100,000; Commercial Reserves, \$322,000; and Carryforward, \$104,000.

The main budget challenge was that the GA spends more than it takes in. The extra money comes from savings; and the GA was going through its savings. The GA budget has been successively cut about 10% every year and was pretty lean. For the next couple of years, the GA had \$104,000 to balance a budget that was about \$100,000 more than they bring in. They'll "borrow" \$50,000 to balance the budget and have successive cuts, of about 13% this year. However, demand for services continues to increase.

One weakness with the budget was with student group funding. It fell to \$142K this year, down from \$150K last year; and will be \$119K next year. Every unit in the GA was taking cuts.

Major expenses include: \$31K on dues and agreements, with the UCSA and with ASUC elections costs; the Executive Board budget, \$70K, about 15% of the total; IT and the Business Office, \$97K, about 21%; student group funding, \$119K. About 25% of the GA budget went to projects and student groups.

Most of the overhead was to make sure the reimbursement process was fast.

With no objection, the GA approved the 2010-11 GA budget.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

Presentation by Jeff Deutsch, Cal Student Store Director

Mr. Deutsch noted that the Bookstore was literally the students', and the ASUC and the GA received almost \$2 million from the Store last year. The Store wanted as much feedback and ideas as possible. Affordability was a big issue, and early adoption was the best way to keep prices down, as well as having the maximum number of used books.

Textbook rental will start in the fall, and will cost 50-55% off a new book's cover price. Books could be rented for a semester, with the option to keep them. Highlights and notes can be made on rental books, like a regular book. A cheaper option might still be to buy a used book and sell it back. But rental was the least risky option. Titles they rent will be based on the national wholesale market. For the campus, if a book will be used for four semesters, it would become rental eligible. Students were encouraged to sign up on the Web site to make for a faster rush, and there were two sweepstakes as incentives.

There wasn't a lot of money in textbooks, and it was clothing and other such things that generate revenue.

Reports (cont'd)

Mr. Marchand, Campus Affairs Vice President, reported on the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey, which had 2,100 respondents. 53 out of 68 departments or schools had at least 10% participation.

A question on whether students would recommend their program to a friend was 7-8, based on a scale of 1 to 10. But students became less happy as they progressed. Mentorship, on a scale of 1 to 4, was rated about 3.0. There were 600 comments on improving mentoring or grad support, the question with the most comments. People want the GA to advocate for that.

Over 25% of all respondents had unclear information about funding. The effect of budget cuts varied by department. Natural Sciences and Engineering were largely shielded and the professional schools were highly affected. What got a very bad rating by students was support for student parents, who are 9% of the population.

Survey information will be shared widely, to people from administrators to the UAW.

70% of grads don't know what the GA does, going down to about 50% for people in their fifth year.

Alberto Ortega, External Affairs Vice President, reported. Survey data was being used by grad reps on UCOP's Systemwide GSHIP group. They were working with the OP, the Provost, and the UCSA on the Professional Degree Fee, to change some provisions. The UCSA held a number of big events in Sacramento. The UCSA has also been working on Cal Grants, which affect grads since they're part of the lump sum that went to the University. Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE) has been advocating on a tax exemption for scholarships and fellowships not just for tuition, but for room and board as well. SAGE was also working on immigration reform and loan forgiveness. Currently, if a debt of \$50K was forgiven, a student would owe tax on that income.

Asad Tahir, Funding Committee Chair, reported. The big challenge the Committee has faced was with global budget cuts that all student groups receive. Global budget cuts have been increasing steadily, and were 47% last year. There are no funding caps on individual departments, and some get more than they

Reports (cont'd)

- 4 -

would according to population, such as the Law School, Public Policy, Education and others. A Resolution addresses that, which the GA will discuss later.

Funding doesn't have a system to determine how well funds were spent. The new structure being proposed would create "super groups" of departments, with budget caps. Also, meeting resources and events would be lumped together. Grants, travel awards, and the discretionary/contingency fund would continue. The Events timeline would be the entire semester, to cut down on paperwork. A cap on the amount people could apply for would be dropped to a maximum of \$500 per group per semester.

Resolution Referral

A motion was made to fast track 1005a, By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review. Funding decisions would be granted to the Committee, not the GA. The motion to fast track the bill failed 6-15-0, and the bill was referred to the Budget, Rules, and Funding Committees.

RESOLUTIONS

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, Resolution 1004A, To Create an Action Agenda Item Focused on Restructuring the GA Budget. The GA could only have three Action Agenda Items, and Sustainable Budget Restructuring would replace the Lower Sproul Item. This would be an Action Agenda Item for a year. The bill sets up an independent body, working with the Budget Committee, the Exec Board, and other stakeholders, to expedite budget restructuring.

By unanimous voice-vote, Hagar Zohar was elected Chair of the Advocacy Agenda Item Committee on Sustainable Budget Restructuring.

The GA considered Resolution 1004b, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement. The old mission statement focused a little on advocacy, while the GA has taken on programming and support functions.

Suggestions from Delegate feedback forms were taken into consideration. Mr. Froehle went through them and had great difficulty trying to craft a mission statement from them.

It was noted that people might argue that the GA should have a mission statement that was consistent with the amount of funding the GA allocates to things.

By a voice-vote, the GA tabled Resolution 1004b until the October GA meeting, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved Resolution 1004c, as amended, To Affirm the Graduate Assembly's Support for Replacing California's Supermajority Requirement on the Budget with a Simple Majority. The bill has the GA support changing California's super majority requirement for budget approval to a simple majority; endorses the work of the Coalition for a Strong UC; calls for letters to be written to the Governor and nine legislators within the UC Berkeley constituency; and calls for the External Affairs VP to partner a similar Resolution with the UCSA.

The meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

Announcements

- 5 -

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Spring Semester, was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daal said he would like to welcome them to the last GA meeting of the 2009-2010 year, and his last GA meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daal said the first announcement was from Viola Tang, the ASUC representative to the GA. Ms. Tang said she wanted to congratulate Delegates for making it through the year. A number of bills passed through the External Affairs Committee of the ASUC that past month. People may have heard about SB 118A, In Support of ASUC Divestment from War Crimes. The bill would have had the ASUC divest funds from General Electric and United Technologies and their contributions to the Israeli government. Over three long Senate meetings, over 1,000 GA members, students, and faculty came in and talked during the public comments section of the meetings. But after three meetings, the bill did not pass. She believed there might be students coming to speak to the Graduate Assembly about this issue next year. So that was something to think about and prepare for.

Ms. Tang said SB 195, which was in support of State Senate Bill 970, would create a pilot program to increase voter participation in California by allowing for early voting at various campuses across the State. The ASUC Senate bill supports this bill and also looks to ensure that students of UC have access to this program.

SB 201, In Support of Replacing California's Supermajority Requirement on the Budget with a Simple Majority. The GA will consider a very similar bill that evening. It gives their support of student government for that initiative. SB 226, In Support of Urgent Reform of the UC Board of Regents, brings to light some of the inefficiencies and ineffective occurrences that year with the Board of Regents, and addresses some of the issues that the Regents face. It looks to the ASUC, especially the External Affairs Vice President, to review eight different options provided by a group, UC Democracy. People could look them up in detail at ucdemocracy.org. It looks for the ASUC to consider restructuring the UC Board of Regents and to recommend that to the Chancellor and to UC President Mark Yudof.

SB 228 is To Oppose Arizona's Senate Bill 1070. Ms. Tang said that Assembly they might know, the Arizona State Senate passed SB 1070, which basically puts into place immigration policy that makes it a violation of Arizona State law to have no documentation and gives police officers the ability to detain people they suspect of being illegal immigrants, and gives the local police broad powers to stop anyone, such as at a gathering at someone's house or on the street. In the bill, the ASUC Senate condemns the State bill and demands that the ASUC, and the rest of the UC system, no longer purchase goods that are produced in Arizona or from companies headquartered there.

Ms. Tang said that the ASUC Senate also just concluded spring budgeting, so if the GA's Budget Committee has questions regarding allocations to groups, Ms. Tang said they could talk to her or to other members of the Finance Committee. Finally on ASUC elections while it's already been almost a month

she had a quick statistic. The election turnout was 12,383 that year, which represents a 12.4% increase from last year. It was one of the highest turnouts for an ASUC election, so she wanted to commend the GA for helping out with that. Ms. Tang said she will be the ASUC Academic Affairs Vice President next year. It's been a great honor that year to work with some members of the GA. And next year she'll be

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

working very closely with the GA's Campus Affairs VP, hopefully, on issues that affect both graduate and undergraduate students. In her campaign, she said that she would be a huge ally to graduate students. So if people had any concerns or ideas, they should feel free to come and talk to her, and they could work together.

Yomaira Figueroa introduced herself and said she was the Women of Color Initiative Project Coordinator. Due to some unforeseen circumstances, she will not be able to continue with the Woman of Color Initiative next year and she wanted to announce that Lucero Chavez, the Project Coordinator Liaison, has sent out a call for interviews for anyone who wanted the position with WOCI. If people could disseminate information about this opening, that would be appreciated. The person doing WOCI also coordinates the Empowering Women of Color Conference, as well as a few other events throughout the year. Also, she didn't know if Bradon Nicholson was present, but the Graduate Minority Outreach, Recruitment, and Retention Coordinator was also opening up for next year. She was told to say that the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project Coordinator position will also be open next year. Ms. Chavez will disseminate information and will require a cover letter and a résumé. If anybody was interested, they should send Ms. Chavez an e-mail with that information. And Ms. Figueroa said that if people had any questions, they could send her an e-mail, or ask Mr. Nicholson or Ms. Chavez.

Andrea introduced herself and said she was a member of the External Affairs Committee and just wanted to take two minutes to bring their attention to question No. 3 on the feedback form for the meeting that evening. The question regards Delegates' opinions on whether they think the GA should get involved in efforts to divest from companies that profit from human rights violations. They might know that in the past, UC Berkeley students were very active in divestment from companies that invested in apartheid South Africa. This is a question the External Affairs Committee has discussed, and the Committee would like to know Delegates' views. So she would ask them to please take the time to respond to these questions.

Mr. Marchand said that while looking at the feedback form, there was one question on whether people wanted to serve on a campus committee. For anyone who was new, he introduced himself and said he was the Campus Affairs Vice President. He's responsible for ensuring that campus committees have graduate representatives from the GA. A number of people were leaving next year so a number of positions will be open next year. If people in the room were interested in volunteering to fill a position for next year, they should volunteer right away. That would really ease the transition and ease the work of the next Campus Affairs VP. He had a list of openings that he would pass around. People should feel free to write on their feedback form the three committees they might be interested in. The workload was not the same on all committees, but they could assume an average of about one meeting a month.

Mr. Daal asked if he included the Committee that will revise the Code of Student Conduct. Mr. Marchand said he did. He also included the mention of committees that will be created to oversee the project and the fee for the Lower Sproul reconstruction, which was approved by the Lower Sproul

BEARS Initiative. This can be a very high workload. If people were interested, Mr. Marchand said he would recommend that people talk to him or to Mr. Daal. It was a great opportunity.

Susan Hsueh introduced herself and said she was the Graduate Assembly Manager. She wanted to take time to acknowledge people for their dedication and hard work. The GA was very sad these people were

Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

leaving them, and hopefully, they'll come back and visit. The first person to acknowledge was Miguel Daal, GA President for the last two years. She wanted to thank him for his hard work. She knew he's been involved with the GA for the past number of years, and for the last two years was President. Ms. Hsueh said she also wanted to acknowledge Nish Rajan for being the GA Budget Officer and showing dedication for getting all the numbers right. In addition, Lucero Chavez, who wasn't present, is a Law School student and was graduating, and was probably taking finals at that time. Ms. Chavez was the GA Project Coordinator Liaison. Ms. Hsueh said she also wanted to acknowledge Asad Tahir, the GA Funding Committee Chair, who is graduating; Danny Kramer, the Environmental Sustainability Committee Chair; and Farren Briggs, the International Student Affairs Committee Chair. They also had to acknowledge the GA's Grad Council representatives, Brandon, ??who stepped up and helped when they were short a Chief-of-Staff for the President and the CAVP; Corinne Scown, who wasn't present; and Pam Berkeley. She also wanted to acknowledge Youmaira Figueroa, the WOCI Coordinator; Brandon Nicholson, the GMORR Coordinator; and Meghan Anderson, the Rules Committee Chair, who will also not be continuing. So she wanted to thank them very much. Ms. Hsueh said that Delegates should stay because they'll have cake at the end of the meeting, and people shouldn't leave without some. Ms. Hsueh said she would ask Delegates to thank these people for their hard work. (Applause) She hoped people come back and visit them. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Ms. Hsueh.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Mr. Daal said there was a request to amend the agenda to switch the order so that item 2 came after item 3, with the proviso that they may have to start elections after their first speaker left, as they will be arriving late.

A Delegate moved to fast track Resolution 1005a. Mr. Daal said she should make that motion when they got to Resolution Referral. They'd vote on it then, and if the motion passed, would immediately consider the bill with the other Resolutions.

Mr. Daal called for any other agenda modifications, and seeing none, called for a motion to approve the amendment. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.** Mr. Daal called for any objection to approving the agenda, and seeing none, said the agenda was approved. **THE AGENDA WAS APPROVED, AS AMENDED, WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Daal called for a motion to approve the minutes from the April meeting. It was so moved and seconded by Ms. Figueroa and Mr. Mikulin. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 1, 2010 MEETING, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

PRESENTATION ON THE STUDENT PORTAL BY RACHEL HOLLOWGRASS AND
BERNADETTE GEUY

Presentation on the Student Portal

- 8 -

Mr. Daal said the GA would hear from Rachel Hollowgrass and Bernadette Geuy, who will speak at the GA about the student portal.

Ms. Geuy said she would like to thank the GA for moving them up on the agenda. There were a couple of people there who were familiar with the portal and with their project. The portal project has been a grassroots effort that was initiated by students, mostly undergrads, as well as some graduate students. People have been working on this in earnest for about nine months. Ms. Geuy said she's a grad student in the evening MBA program, so she was very interested in student portals. She works in Campus Life and Leadership, under the Dean of Students office. Rachel Hollowgrass introduced herself and said she works in the central IS&T organization, and said this was a cross-campus project.

Ms. Geuy said they're calling this "MyBerkeley Project." It's another application or project. If people were freshmen there as an undergrad, they might have used MyBerkeley app, which guides them through the Berkeley application and initiation processes. But once they get there, they were on their own.

Ms. Hollowgrass said there were many facets to this project. They have taken an incremental approach to it, so they'll be able to deliver smaller aspects in sequence. A lot of direction was coming from students, and they've talked to a lot of groups. They haven't talked to nearly enough, so they were making a pitch to the GA. They'd do a little vignette that had to do with one small aspect of the project.

Say a CNR student was studying mushrooms and came up with great data that weren't complete. People were all in their academic silos. What if that student looked for someone else on campus who was also studying mushrooms. This app would find people with common interests and reach across disciplines. This could apply to hobbies, research, or grant money. The question was how people, today, could meet someone in another discipline who had a similar interest. Mr. Kline said one possibility would be to have papers published by authors doing similar research. Ms. Hollowgrass asked if anybody has done that. Mr. Kline said he has. Ms. Hollowgrass said they would like to hear stories like that, so she would ask him and others with similar experiences to contact them about them. Those were things they'd love to know about.

Ms. Geuy said that what the screen showed was a collage of some of the screens that students go to. Some of them were undergraduate focused, but they include a lot of places students go to in order to get basic stuff done. They include Tele-BEARS, BearFACTS, and CARS accounts. They had to figure out how to pay bills, and a lot of other extra things they had to do. Graduate students especially, if they're working on a dissertation or trying to get out of there in a short period of time, if they're in a one- or two-year program would also find this applicable.

Ms. Geuy said they recognize that there was something wrong with this picture. It was really a big mess and it didn't give students the courtesy of how to navigate through all the resources available to students

on campus. So the idea was consolidate some of the things students deal with into one place, a portal. So this was the scope of the project they were looking at at that time.

They're currently working towards a proof of concept through the summer and they hope to launch some basic components in August, with the help of student programmers. The things they're looking to develop over the summer are MyProfile, which would give students an opportunity to do academic networking; and MyCommunities, with ways to form groups. The portal will be based on Sakai 3, which was the replacement for bSpace. It's a much different environment from the bSpace that people were familiar

Presentation on the Student Portal (cont'd)

- 9 -

with. It has a built-in communal aspect to it and will allow students to more naturally find groups of people who have similar interests. And that will be the framework for the portal.

The other key thing they're working on developing through the summer was MyReminders, a consolidated list of reminders of important dates and tasks, so people don't miss anything. This especially applied to undergrads, with Pass/No Pass, drop deadlines, filing FAFSA to get financial aid, and graduation requirements. Ms. Geuy said that what the screen showed was sort of crude and wasn't nice screen shots, because those screens haven't been designed yet. But there will be three or four things in this category that they were aiming to deliver in the fall.

Ms. Hollowgrass said that an advantage of having a container was that instead of having to develop everything and roll it out in 2015, they hope that semester by semester, they'll be able to provide different apps so students will have input on them and so they'll see results, by the fall.

Ms. Geuy said they've talked about this and they've gone through a lot of work in the last six to nine months. They've had workshops, which some grad students attended. They got some funding from Harry LeGrande, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. They got a funding request out there through IS&T that was looking really good, and they have a proof of concept. So they're still working this as sort of a grassroots effort, with time spans for different people. They would like to come out of this session having found someone, potentially from the GA, who could help them with ideas from the graduate student perspective, especially someone working on a Ph.D., so the project could get that insight. The more input they could get from graduate students, the better. The solutions will be tailored to their needs, and not just those of undergrads. If anyone was interested, they should talk to them.

Ms. Hollowgrass said that was a big focus of this project, to be student centered. If students have fees or pay Reg Fees to the Registrar, or have class fees for laboratories, or class finds, the question was why students had to go to different places, to different administrative departments. That was not student centered and wasn't useful on the students' end. They now had to go to the Registrar's site, and then the library's site. So they're reaching across campus and looking at some existing initiatives that were going on, and integrating them. The reason was because the technology was available for them to connect the dots, which would provide a strong solution. They have depicted these pieces as fitting very well together. So the projects fit well together and departments were co-operating very well together. So this was an exciting time. And they're getting great feedback from funders in order to move forward with this.

Ms. Hollowgrass said that people might have heard about Operational Excellence on campus, a big initiative happening on campus. They were hoping to really increase the quality of services that students receive, and actually maybe have technology do the things that technology does best. So when they want to talk to a person, they do people stuff and don't have to look things up in a book. They could do that

online. But the real person stuff, was human stuff, is a big goal they have. She thought of that as Operational Excellence, doing things in a good way.

Ms. Geuy said that if they read the report, there are some areas they're particularly interested in, such as Student Affairs, that graduate students and undergraduates interacted with. On the top right-hand corner of page 98 of Operational Excellence, the student portal was featured as a top initiative. So they know that this was something that was important to students. On top of that, they're also doing a deep dive, looking at information technology and how that's done on campus. It's done by small little groups of programmers all across campus. With this initiative, they'll bring together a lot of disparate groups to help bring students with a single solution.

Presentation on the Student Portal (cont'd)

- 10 -

Ms. Hollowgrass said that page 98 of Operational Excellence, the reason they're on the top right is because students said this was important to them. The portal could have been about anything. So if students want a portal to do something, the people working on this initiative were the ones to talk to.

Ms. Geuy said the next screen showed a quick idea of what they do at meetings, which she wouldn't ask the GA to do. But if they go to the initiative's Web site, they could see ideas of what they were asking different groups on campus to do, or student services providers to do. They asked them to imagine a big Web site that had everything they needed. For instance, if they went to the Cal 1 site, it had tons of things for a student to do. But if they're a busy student, maybe they just want a little information to appear rolled up on to the portal screen. So they gave people post-it notes and said that for their screen, for their application, or Web site, what some key things they would want to happen on the portal. And then the student could take a deep dive and go back to the individual site and do something they really needed to do. For the Cal 1 Card, they asked about having the balance of funds and the last couple of transactions, as things students wanted to see on a day-to-day basis. So they're asking their partners across the campus to think about things like this. Their Web site is campuslife.berkeley.edu/myberkeleyproject. They'll e-mail this presentation to Mr. Daal. People could see some of the widgets they'll use, and see news and more information about the portal. People could contact them if they wanted to be involved, or if they had comments, or if they wanted to tell the project what they need. The project would really like to hear from them. They're going to be hiring some high school students to help them program through the summer. She called for any questions.

Mr. Rabkin said that in the past, the campus was very reluctant to have undergraduates and students writing code because if there was a security breach, which there will be, there would then be no one to hold accountable. Ms. Hollowgrass said that in this case, anyone who writes code for this project will be an employee and will be paid; so there will be an employee relationship. Mr. Rabkin said the idea was to have an outside contractor so they could be sued, if necessary. Every system ever built had security bugs, and this wouldn't be an exception. Ms. Hollowgrass said that they have staff who are committed to this. Ms. Geuy said they'll have students who can develop applications and deliver some kind of interesting solution. They'll work side-by-side with staff programmers. Security was something they were obviously concerned about, and data was something they had to be concerned about. Ms. Hollowgrass said that IS&T will have a small staff, and the project was in conversation with them about these issues. A strength was that they were not only trying to gather information from students, and finding out what people wanted for the project, but they were employing students to be as much a part of this project as possible.

Mr. Kohut said a bSpace replacement was mentioned, and asked if they had any idea what that would cover. Ms. Hollowgrass said it was pretty far along in development. bSpace is based on Sakai 2. Its

replacement will be Sakai 3, which was a complete re-write, with very different architect. It will probably still be called bSpace, or will include all bSpace people, but with non-access. It will be a completely different framework. They don't know a schedule for that, and it was a separate resource project.

Mr. Kohut said that in bSpace, each course has its own Web site, which wasn't very centralized. At the same time, people could go to the Web site and see what the lectures were. But now that was behind a password firewall. He asked if that was going to change at all. If he wanted to see what another class was about, he had to have a password. Ms. Geuy said that if he really wanted, he could look at a syllabus for a class. Mr. Kohut said it could be homework or anything. Ms. Geuy said she didn't know how that would be addressed. There's a course management information system that people were working on that

Presentation on the Student Portal (cont'd)

- 11 -

will be a whole process for shepherding new courses into the system. Different information might be made more public. But as far as she knew, a student would still have to be a member of a class in order to see the data for that class. One thing with bSpace that they know that students want was to see an aggregated view of that data. So if there's a paper due for one class or a presentation in another, and a final on the 30th, those due dates and other important information can get aggregated out so that a student didn't have to go deep dive into each class and figure out what was there and put it into their own calendar. bSpace will give them a calendar. That's what they're hoping for at the moment. Ms. Hollowgrass said the question about seeing a syllabus or assignments wasn't really a software issue as much as it was a security and privacy issue. It was more like a policy decision, not a software issue. Ms. Geuy said she wasn't sure about the issues around this. Ms. Hollowgrass said she would raise that question as a policy issue.

Mr. Ellsworth asked if that issue was addressed by what permissions people who own a particular bSpace entry put on their entry. Because in Linguistics, the practice has been to make basically all the courses open. That meant that anybody in the room, for instance, could join the sites. People had to have a bSpace password, but otherwise, they could join.

Ms. Geuy said there was an option in bSpace to be public, and she thought people could even have a public option. Ms. Hollowgrass said that one thing about the portal is that there will be a password, which will be a small barrier for entry. But the good thing was that the system will know the individual student, so the student won't have to answer questions again and again about what their degree program was or when they'll graduate. The portal will know that and give the student reminders about time-specific things that were personal to them.

Ms. Ng asked if they saw the project in competition with other academic networking sites, like the academia site. Ms. Hollowgrass said there were many off-campus sites. Some were great and some were not so great. But one problem was that students then face a cacophony of slightly different things. They're trying to avoid that with the portal by having a more central place and by involving students who want to continue to be part of this. Ms. Geuy said they have an obligation to serve up the best that Cal offers to students, with functionality, registration data, and classes. And there might be additional widgets that students or other people might want to write for this portal. Staff wasn't quite sure where that will go, but they want to provide as broad a possible set of basic solutions and information that could be done on the portal having to do with students' time at Cal.

Mr. Kline asked if any person or group would have access to any or all students' information on MyBerkeley, and how that would be controlled. Ms. Geuy said that that was a policy and a security issue. And

there are people thinking about and looking at that. Those will be aspects of the system. For instance, there is a profile of natural social or academic networking and there may be pieces in there that could be shared, such as Physics majors who wanted to network with people in Physics, or with somebody from South America who wanted to meet somebody from their home country. They had to work through some of those. When it first goes live it will be fairly simple. But she will not be able to look at a student's data. Mr. Kline asked if anybody will be able to do that. Ms. Geuy said they couldn't, at least nobody who couldn't do it at this time, such as a student's advisor, who has access. There are very strict rules about that. Ms. Hollowgrass said that before they came on to this project, the Sakai 3 project was having to deal with those issues of overlapping communities and private versus public information.

Mr. Rabkin asked who will be in charge of this in a year. Ms. Geuy and it will probably be owned under Student Affairs, David Scronce's organization, Student Systems Services, under Student Affairs. And it

Presentation on the Student Portal (cont'd)
GA Elections

- 12 -

will probably be hosted by IS&T. But there will be a collaborative group of people involved, including ETS and EGS.

Mr. Daal asked who will make the policy decisions regarding the Web site. Ms. Geuy said it will probably be a collaborative set because there were so many groups involved in its development, including IS&T and ETS. Ms. Hollowgrass said it was a new model. And that was a great question.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank the speakers for telling the GA about the student portal. Ms. Geuy said that if anyone wanted to participate, communicate, contribute, ask questions, or prod them, such as with issues of privacy or policy, she would ask them to please do so. Mr. Daal asked Delegates to thank their speakers. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said there would be a very brief introduction from Nanxi Liu, the new Executive Vice President of the ASUC. Ms. Liu introduced herself and said she just got elected as Executive Vice President of the ASUC. Essentially, her job was similar to Mr. Daal's. She's currently a sophomore studying Nuclear Engineering and Business. She's from Colorado. Before she came there she was doing a Chinese graduate program at the University of Colorado, Boulder. She was really looking forward to working with the Graduate Assembly and thought there were a lot of great projects that they could work on together. She looked forward to meeting them. She wanted to thank them. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank her for introducing herself.

GA ELECTIONS

Mr. Daal said that what has happened was that people the GA elected have resigned, and now the GA had to fill the positions again. They'd begin elections with the Campus Affairs Vice President. He asked if they needed to go through what the job entails. Seeing no requests, he said they would just open nominations, and called for any nominations.

Ms. Figueroa nominated Reikia Jibrin. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Daal said that nominations were closed. He asked if Ms. Jibrin would mind telling the GA a little about her interests and plans.

Ms. Jibrin said she's a fourth-year graduate student in the Graduate School of Education. She's happy to be there and finally see everything that happens at a GA Delegates meeting. She was interested in being Campus Affairs Vice President and wanted to work on student affairs on campus in a more structured way. She's had experience working in a variety of universities and university-level positions in the past, advocating for students, advocating for and for academic achievement. Her work goes back to Boston. She worked at Harvard University running student affairs programs on campus, specifically summer and year-long academic programs for underrepresented groups on campus, and also from groups beyond campus. It involved integrating high school students, minority recruitment, and sort of keeping up standards of academic excellence and academic support to students who needed that for their academic achievement. She's worked in advocacy on a variety of levels and saw the Campus Affairs position as both an advocacy position and one in where there was a lot of coordination with committees and projects in the GA.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 13 -

Ms. Jibrin said her advocacy also dated back to college and her public health work. Before coming to grad school she ran a public health program in Boston for Partners in Health at Harvard Medical School, advocating for underrepresented groups in the greater Boston area to get access to resources, and for students' educational achievements from a public health perspective around the issue of violence. She's doing much of her educational research in grad school, and advocating, on a variety of levels for community and educational resources within the Oakland Unified School District, with the City Council, which has been a great experience.

On campus she's attended the Empowering Women of Color Conference that Ms. Figueroa has worked on in past years, and Ms. Jibrin said it's been a crucial event. She's gone as a minority graduate student on campus she thought it's kept her going and has been inspirational. And she really cared about what was going on on campus at that time. She hoped she could hear student voices and act as a student voice and a representative student voice within the GA. If people had questions, she would ask them to please direct them to her. Mr. Daal called for any questions.

Ms. Ng asked if she anticipated having a lot of commitments next year besides the GA. Ms. Jibrin said she was done with her coursework so she'll just be tying up the loose ends. She'll do work that summer on her dissertation, which she was kind of happy about. So she'll be pretty available.

Mr. Kline asked if she was graduating next year. Ms. Jibrin said she'll begin to write her dissertation. Mr. Kline asked if she planned to be a student for one or two more years. Ms. Jibrin said it would be two more years, and she didn't want to rush it. She's also been pretty involved in the Summer Bridge Program on campus, serving underrepresented undergraduates coming in. She's been focused on getting tutorial services for students who need that for their academic achievement. In addition, she's also been supporting informally undergrad and high school students coming there for academic achievement programs throughout the past three years.

Ms. Wun said she would like to thank the GA for electing her previously, but her advisor told her to drop the position. She wanted to humbly apologize for having to resign. It was probably because she was a second-year that she got pumped.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no further questions, he would ask Ms. Jibrin to leave the room for a discussion off the record on her candidacy. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Daal asked to have Ms. Jibrin brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate her for being elected. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said the next election was for the Project Coordinator Liaison. He asked if people needed a description of the position. He called for any nominations. Seeing no nominations, Mr. Daal said they won't have a Project Coordinator Liaison and the position will be re-opened for election at the next meeting, next year. The Executive Board may appoint someone to fulfill the duties of the position during the summer, but that appointment would have to be confirmed by the Delegate body itself.

Ms. Figueroa said the current Project Coordinator Liaison had an exam that evening and couldn't attend.

Mr. Marchand asked if she was saying that the person who ran last time wanted to run again but couldn't, because she was taking an exam. Ms. Figueroa said that was correct. Mr. Marchand said that if people wanted, it would be possible to nominate and vote on her in absentia, if they trusted that she would accept

GA Elections (cont'd)
Reports

- 14 -

the position. Mr. Daal said he was sure people would nominate her and that she would accept. But the Executive Board could appoint her to do the duties.

Mr. Daal said they would return to the agenda, and hear from speakers. The next speaker, Jeff Deutsch, wasn't present, so the GA would continue with the agenda and hear reports.

REPORTS

Mr. Daal, GA President, reported. He said the Lower Sproul Referendum passed. (Applause) It passed with a sizable margin of victory. The GA a year or two ago created an Action Agenda Item for Lower Sproul, to bring about the Referendum. And they've succeeded in approving the student fee to finance Lower Sproul. It certainly was not a done project until the buildings are open and people have moved back into them. But he felt confident that has all been set in motion and will be successful without the GA maintaining this as an Action Agenda Item. The Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item Chair, Dan Work, has resigned in an e-mail and the Action Agenda Item is dissolved if there was no one else who wanted to be the chair, or if the Delegates vote to cancel the Action Agenda Item. If there was no one there who would like to be the Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item chair, then it was dissolved. He asked if anybody wanted to serve as chair.

Mr. Mikulin said that if they do dissolve the Action Agenda Item, he asked if the Initiative that was voted on would still go forward. Mr. Daal said it would. The GA's Action Agenda Item was to bring about a positive vote to bring about Lower Sproul. Mr. Mikulin asked if, then, from here on out, campus Administration will be responsible for overseeing the Lower Sproul project and that there will be no designated liaison. Mr. Daal said there is a designated liaison, and student involvement. That was mandated by a Memorandum of Understanding that students negotiated with the campus. There are three committees that will oversee Lower Sproul development. A Fee Committee, made up with mostly students, will look after the uses of the Fee and the level of the Fee. The Program Committee is the executive committee that will make all the high-level decisions. If they're short \$10 million, e.g., it might decide to do without the top floor of a building, things like that. There will be six students on Program Committee, appointed by students. There's also a working group that was very intimately involved with the Program Committee

which does the work of coming up with the student vision for the Lower Sproul buildings construction project, and what a building should contain, what programs should go where, etc. That subcommittee will be mostly students, 50% plus one, as per the MOU. So this will be a joint oversight body between students and the Administration.

Mr. Daal said that if there was nobody willing to take the chair on, they would dissolve the Committee. It was actually kind of opportune in that the GA will consider that evening approving another Action Agenda Item, and by their rules, the GA could only have three Action Agenda Items.

Mr. Daal said that seeing nobody interested in the Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item, it was dissolved.

Mr. Daal said the GA now has two Action Agenda Items, Mental Health and Environmental Sustainability.

Reports (cont'd)

- 15 -

Mr. Tahir reported, Budget Committee Chair. He said people might have had a chance to see some of the documents he sent out a couple of weeks back. There's been some new information since then about the budget. He put up a version of the budget on the Web site a week and a half ago. This was a presentation to tell the GA how they got to where they are in the budget-building process.

Mr. Tahir said he would start with revenues to give an idea of how they find themselves with their proposed budget. The GA's main source of revenue was from student fees, about \$420,000 a year, for about 9,500 graduate students. From each graduate student, \$27.50 comes to the GA from their fees. The GA also has money from a beverage contract with Coca-Cola, but that will end soon. It might be renegotiated, but for budget planning purposes, Mr. Tahir said was taking a conservative stance, where they wouldn't get that income renewed, \$50,000.

In the past the GA has had \$50,000 come in from commercial revenues, but that wasn't being projected in the future. They also get occasional grants from outside entities, like the Graduate Division, the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion, and other such campus departments, occasionally, to enact things that those units were in favor of. But again, it was very hard to plan around that, so for budgeting purposes, they tried to only use stable sources of revenue, i.e., student fees.

Mr. Tahir said there are other one-time sources of funds and there are restricted funds, as they're called. They're not shown on any budgets thus far, but they exist. He believed Mr. Marchand will make it a priority or at least have direction to make that a priority to more accurately tabulate that for next year. This includes revenue that goes directly to a unit. For instance, if he could use the Women of Color Initiative, it can charge entry fees or conference attendance fees. Those fees go to support that unit, and are managed separately by the unit. The Budget Committee doesn't necessarily look into that money when doing budgeting because it wasn't really the scope of the Committee. People might disagree, but in the past, it has never been the scope of the Budget Committee to try to control fees or income that each individual unit raises for its own purpose. And the Committee has other things to worry about. So this type of income has not been a main issue. But maybe going forward, they'll see a more complete picture of the budget. But the main point of the slide was to show their main income source, student fees, at around \$420,000 a year.

As for reserves, they have a Student Fee Reserve of \$100,000. They built that up fortuitously in the last few years. One year they set aside \$50,000 as an emergency fund. And by mistake, \$50,000 was set aside the next year because somebody forgot to change that line item in the following year. This money was invested in the UC Berkeley Foundation, so hopefully it will provide high returns for the GA, more so than the Bank of America.

Mr. Tahir said they have Commercial Reserves, about \$322,000 or so. They're still working on that. It comes mostly from Coca-Cola money and has been squirreled away over time because as commercial revenue, it could be used for all kinds of wonderful things, such as for alcohol or to sue the University, if they needed to. It was nice to just keep around as a nuclear option, if they will. They do spend a little of it every so often on alcohol that was bought for meetings and what not. That money came from these reserves.

The GA also has a carryforward, which people could think about as the GA's liquid savings account, of about \$104,000. It's just undesignated student funds that sit around in an account. This number has only become very clear to the GA in that past year, and they're still getting some clarity about it. That was part of the challenges of the entire budget.

Reports (cont'd)

- 16 -

Mr. Tahir said the main challenge of the budget was the notion that they always spend more than they take in. That didn't mean that they were always operating in the red per se, but they're always budgeting more than they bring in. They really only bring in \$420,000, plus \$30,000 or so. At least that was what they knew about when they started budgeting. But they always allocate a large amount. For instance, last year they allocated about \$530,000, with the extra money coming from savings. So they were just going through their savings.

Mr. Tahir said that when he first got there, further back than he cared to admit, he didn't know where the revenues came from. But back then, the Graduate Division supported the GA more. But the GA's expenses went through the roof. So the GA has always spent a little more than it had, and they would like to stop that at least for the next couple of years so they can get to a nice standard state. That has been the goal of the Budget Committee in successive years, and they were getting pretty close.

Mr. Rajan said that in doing that, they have successively cut the GA budget every year in the order of about 10%. He thought the GA budget was pretty lean. There still may be some sort of flexibility in it, and they'll talk about that a little bit more. But it was getting closer and closer to being lean enough to grow in the future, sort of like starving the beast, if they will, and making it leaner and hopefully ready to arise to whatever challenge comes before the GA in the next couple of years.

Mr. Rajan said there are two layers of cuts, and that was the plan for the projected budget.

Mr. Ellsworth said that even though they have to consider the Coca-Cola contract, he asked if they were essentially in balance for that coming year. Mr. Rajan said that that wasn't exactly the case. The reason was because every time they get Coca-Cola money, they tend not to spend it, and tend to swap it out with the carryforward slush fund in order to keep commercial money separate. So they use more student money to balance it out. So it's sort of a re-allocation between savings and commercial reserves. This year there really wasn't that much left, and there's no more opportunity to do a swap. They could spend commercial money, but for some reason, they're not doing it. He would guess that was an executive decision by somebody, maybe even himself. But he hasn't put it in the budget.

As for potential sources of future revenue, they have some invested reserves, about \$450,000. The idea was to have interest on those funds provide some sort of growth and help the GA deal with inflation. But it's a long-term plan. The GA has other sources of long-term revenue. They have a revenue-sharing agreement with the ASUC, was also primarily the undergraduate student government. So with the passage of the BEARS Referendum, it was possible that commercial areas in Lower Sproul will start paying gobs of rent, of which the GA would eventually get a one-third share, in five or six years.

Mr. Rajan said that in the GA's strategic plan were ideas for fundraising. Some of that apparatus has already been put in place. There was a lot of interest in doing things like that. So there are sources of revenue coming in, but these sources of revenue were three to eight years in the future, which wouldn't help the GA over the next couple of years. For the next couple of years, the GA has \$104,000 to balance the budget, which was about \$100,000 more than what they bring in. That was basically the issue. They have \$104,000 to bridge a \$100,000 gap between revenues and expenses. And Coca-Cola revenue has been directly invested and the assumption was that it wouldn't be paid out in the future. They basically need to bridge this gap slowly. So there were successive cuts, trying to borrow about \$50,000 from the budget every year to get it to balance. That was two years, at \$50,000 each year. That was the idea. And then budget was balanced with two successive cuts of about \$15,000 each year, equivalent to about a 13% cut this year.

Reports (cont'd)

- 17 -

Mr. Rajan said the problem with this is that the demand for services continues to increase. In the interests of full disclosure, they had about \$104,000 in this slush fund at the beginning of last year. This year's budget spent \$530,000. Of that, about \$65,000 or so came from this \$104,000. So if they spend everything that they budget, they would spend \$65,000 of that \$104,000. If they also swap out from commercial reserves, like they already have, they would have spent \$105,000 of that \$104,000 budget. So they're already a negative \$1,000, in the red, if they actually spend everything they budgeted this year. Thankfully, they seem to be doing wonderfully this year because as of now, they've only spent \$350,000 of about a \$530,000 budget. That was great, and was wonderful news, because somehow it seemed to say that there was some slack in this budget that he didn't know existed. Next year they'll try to identify where those efficiencies are and see if they can leverage them better. But as long as they don't spend \$35,000 a month, they'll be all right. Basically that meant they'll still have \$104,000 in two years.

Mr. Rajan said this was the major plan, to take the hit now, early, and hopefully, when they emerge out from the other side with a balanced budget, in two years, they'll be lean and mean and ready to grow. That was generally the motivation behind what they were going to try and do for the next couple of years, or at least what they're trying to do this year.

Mr. Rajan said the rest of the presentation was all nice visuals and boring numbers. So if there were questions, Delegate should feel free to ask them whenever they get them. The proposed solution was for this year to have a 13% cut to every unit in the GA, and a flat cut across all line items. In the past, they kept stipends constant because they would like to acknowledge that it was getting harder and harder to get by on whatever fixed salary they pay. But unfortunately, this year that wasn't an option. They're also cutting their budget at that time when every major aspect of the GA seemed to be clamoring for more, rather than less. So it was very hard to know how this was good for the programming the GA does. That will be a challenge next year that they'll try to face and try to come up with a strategy to see if they could do these cuts in a better way than a flat cut. Unfortunately, because he didn't have that \$104,000 number resolved until very recently, they'll actually spend \$71,000 of the \$104,000 reserve. He said he was hoping to spend \$15,000 of the \$104K, but to balance this budget in the short amount of time they had, and because he didn't have enough time to re-budget the whole thing, they'll have to borrow \$71,000. He

hoped that was okay because ideally, maybe next year, they won't spend everything that they budget this year either, predicting for this year. But that was no guarantee. It could be quite possible that next year he was leaving the Budget Chair with a very unenviable task of trying to balance the budget with only a \$30,000 buffer. But he hoped that wasn't that case. It was dangerous, but hopefully it will be manageable.

Mr. Rabkin asked what happens if they get to the last month of next year and they don't have as much money as they expected, and couldn't make payroll. Mr. Rajan said they should at least have \$30,000. They should never spend more than they budget in a given year because the Auxiliary will watch out for that. Mr. Daal said that well before any one of their current budget accounts hits a deficit, they'd get a warning. Mr. Rajan said the GA would then have to start spending their investment reserves.

Mr. Rajan said the worst-case scenario with the budget that year is that next year they'll have \$30,000 left for the year after. So next year was not really a problem, and it was just the year that where that was a problem. And of course, the year after that, and so on and so forth.

Mr. Zachritz said the if the GA spends \$350,000 out of its budget of \$530,000, there are savings that would increase their buffer. Mr. Rajan said that was correct. He just had to find out where that was.

Reports (cont'd)

- 18 -

Mr. Zachritz asked if there are account balances the GA could look at. He didn't get how that would happen. Mr. Rajan said he didn't get it as well. It will take some time to compile something that was easy to look that would allow them to say that this was the savings of a particular group. Mr. Zachritz asked if their buffer, then, might be bigger. Mr. Daal said balances were not easy to look at because the accounts they look in a ledger were just grouped funds together, so it was one number, \$400,000, for instance. Mr. Zachritz asked if there was any way they could do multiple accounts that were linked. Mr. Rajan said they could, but the thing was, it was a matter of changing the accounting structure of the ASUC Auxiliary. The way they do it is that each line item is given its own account number. So when they spend out of a line item, each line item could be tracked. But the line items weren't necessarily aggregated the way they were in the GA's budget. Instead, they're aggregated for however was convenient for the accounting branch of the ASUC Auxiliary to do it. So when it came back to the GA, it required an effort to re-aggregate it the way that would allow him to tell the GA that this section did so and so and that section did so and so. And it was just a matter of time and manpower to get that done. And to be honest, he hasn't had the time or the manpower to be able to do that.

Mr. Zachritz said he respected the amount of manpower that Mr. Rajan put into this.

Mr. Peters asked if the \$70,000 the GA hasn't spent will go into GA reserves from this year. Mr. Daal said it was more than \$70,000. But that was the \$70,000 that the GA has still has not spent. They'll probably spend a little bit of it in the next two months, and for whatever was left over, he hoped will go into the reserves. And in that sense, that was also an answer to Mr. Zachritz's question. Hopefully there will be something going into the reserves, which hopefully makes Mr. Nicholas' job as Budget Officer not too bad next year.

Mr. Marchand said that one big problem in looking at that for multiple years was that if they look at expenses and graph them with the current year, some things get spent or get done at some point. But the ASUC Auxiliary pays for the GA, and the GA learns about it at the end of the year. And the number at the end of the year might not be as accurate as it might be during the year. The most predictable expense

was salaries. But anything beyond that was a bit hard to get. Mr. Daal said that number was about \$30,000. Mr. Rajan said it was actually, then, about \$303,000. They projected \$50,000 that came in. Everything he was telling the GA was really conservative and was hopefully making things seem much worse than they actually were.

Mr. Tuchman said that what people were asking about the budget details, they could get them from Ms. Hsueh or the Business Office. They keep track of all GA expenses. It's surprising to hear people say information wasn't available. Mr. Rajan said he didn't mean to say that the information wasn't available, but it was just putting it in a format that wasn't a ledger. Mr. Tuchman said the Business Office does that differently than the Auxiliary; and the Business Office spends a lot of time doing that. People can ask in budget reports to have people's expenses printed out, and what they were spending on. Mr. Rajan said he would guess that he should have tried a little harder.

Mr. Rajan said that as for what he saw as the main weaknesses of the budget, that was really what will happen to student group funding. He'd go through that a little more. They'd see that in the budget that student group funding has fallen from about \$142,000 which was they spent this year, as opposed to \$150,000 they spent last year, to around \$119,000 next year. That sucks because Mr. Tahir will tell them that the normal cuts they've had to make were ridiculous. People already know cuts were about 50% or so. There's no chance that won't go higher with this new model. They'll have to find a way to fix it.

Reports (cont'd)

- 19 -

As for what sort of creative ways they use to fix it, unfortunately it wasn't a problem that could be solved at that time; at least he didn't think it could be solved at that point. But hopefully they'll have a good strategic plan to solve this next year.

Mr. Rajan said this wasn't only limited to funding and it was just illustrative of what was going on with funding. Every unit in the GA was taking these cuts. But funding was the one area where the cuts were the starkest.

Mr. Rajan said that to give Delegates an idea of what the whole thing looked like, for major expenses, they spend \$31,000 on dues and agreements, mostly with the UCSA and with ASUC elections costs. The Executive Board budget was about \$70,000, about 15% of the total. IT overhead, if they will, and the Business Office, were about 15% of the total. It was closer to about 21% of the total, about \$97,500. That wasn't so bad as far as overhead went. Student group funding was \$119,000. There's about 25% for both projects and student groups, at about 25% of the GA budget. He thought it was nice that they spend about equal amounts on programming aspects of the GA.

As for the Executive Board, it was broken up as the screen showed. The Project Coordinate Liaison totaled about \$15,000 and the President and two Vice Presidents were about even. The Academic Vice President was a little bit more because of travel. For the Budget and Rules Officer budgets, most of food for Committee meetings comes from these line items. The rest of it is was the main advocacy function of the GA. The total was about \$70,000.

For IT and the Business Office, as far as their infrastructure goes, a lot of it went to payroll. Ideally, they'd like to see this paid for by the ASUC Auxiliary. But the GA right now doesn't have a service-level agreement or MOU with the Auxiliary that would allow the Auxiliary to pay for the kind of quality that the GA needed to get things done. So the GA itself supplements some of the payroll that would normally

be funded by the ASUC Auxiliary. And that took up a lot. Most of everything else was just supplies. And the rest of was infrastructure needed for all the programming the GA does.

Mr. Rajan said that as for student group funding, it's about \$120,000. In the past it's been targeting at 33% of the budget. Mr. Rajan said he hasn't hit that mark recently, and it was becoming harder and harder. And he didn't know if 33% of the budget to student group funding was even a reliable target any more. They'll need to really analyze that next year. Mr. Tahir will talk more about that. But it was also the case that it was hard to develop metrics to figure out what to spend money on. This becomes a problem every time they try to do a non-across-the-board sort of flat cut. They had to think about what the best return on investment was; and there were very few kinds of metrics for return on investment for funding. They send the money out into the ether and hope student groups spend it in a wise way. He was sure most groups do, but it was very hard to know what the entire return to graduate student is. Hopefully, next year and in the future, they'll have better metrics for that, now that they have some resolution on the budget.

As for Projects, Mr. Rajan said he didn't have too much more to say about the projects, about what they are and who they serve. They are targeted services. There are seven Projects and they take about equal portions of the pot. They are the main sources of the GA's direct programming.

Mr. Mikulin said that regarding student funding, in terms of the percentage goal, if that wasn't a sustainable ratio, he asked what a more reasonable proposal would be next year in terms of the percentage of the

Reports (cont'd)

- 20 -

GA budget that went to student group budgets. He asked if they've talked about that, or if there was a ballpark idea. Mr. Tahir said it's been going down every year, from \$150K, to \$140K, to \$120K next year. At the same time, two years ago they had 30 applications, and now it's 60. So in terms of demand, more and more student groups are aware of funding available from the GA. And that results in larger budget cuts. They found a couple of ways to deal with that.

Mr. Rajan said he thought it was hard to have that very big picture of what portion of the GA budget should go towards that 33%. The previous dichotomy was that when they had the Executive Board funding the projects, they tried to split it 33%. They were somewhat successful, but didn't quite account for overhead properly. They could say that overhead may be split equally among the three, but they haven't done that metric.

Mr. Daal said the reason why they set it at 33% was because they sat down and they thought about it. They thought projects were important, so thought they should get 33%. Funding for student groups was important, so that should get a third. Everything else was also important, and would get a third. It was just a visioning question.

Mr. Rajan said it was a very cost-related visioning, but they see about 25-25-25, and then overhead, which was split equally among the three. Mr. Rajan said they'll hopefully work on those kinds of metrics next year.

Mr. Mikulin said that it seemed to make sense that the number of funding applicants were increasing, and that the percentage of overall allocations, the cost, and percentages were going in the opposite direction. He asked how they would adjust for that. It was obvious that they've been pretty generous to most student groups in the past in terms of if a group submitted a full application, they tended to get some fund-

ing. He didn't know if the application process should be more competitive so that the GA could fund more meaningful projects and so people wouldn't assume that when they send in an application that they'll get something in return. He didn't know how much that may go towards reducing their costs over time. He definitely wanted the GA to be equitable when they distribute funds, and it was great that every student group knew that if they sent in something to the GA, they'd get something back. He would love for that to continue, but he didn't know if they could continue to do that.

Mr. Rajan said it's not economically sustainable. They're getting to a point where if a group applied for funding from the GA and asked for \$1,000, they'd get \$1.00. He didn't know how useful that was for any student group. But it was absolutely correct that it was important for the GA to stay relevant in the scope of student group funding. How exactly they do that will be a challenge. It's the same challenge that was exported to the entire GA budget as well, which has resulted in successive across-the-board cuts. That wasn't necessarily the smartest way to do things either. There are probably economies within the budget that need to be maximized and there are certain areas that need funding and certain areas that don't need it. His hope was that once they have a quote "vision" for the entire GA budget, they'll have the ability to say they could guarantee a certain amount to funding every year. At that point, the Funding Committee's job will be easier, knowing how to fund that visioning within the group as well. There was no reason it had to be sequential and it's going on in parallel. But just basically, as it stood, it was a challenge.

Mr. Rajan said that in summary, what he's told them was actually a pretty dire scenario. He's been trying to make it as dire as possible to make sure that when they come out the other end, they come out okay. But for the most part, just so it wasn't all gloom and doom, it was true that the GA spends most of its

Reports (cont'd)

- 21 -

money wisely, regardless of what he's been telling them for the last few months. It is the case that they are at least aware of these issues and they're trying their best to stay on top of them. But the budgetary challenges they face at that time weren't necessarily things within their control, or things that have been forgotten in their institutional history. There was a time before he got there where they had a transition between Ms. Hsueh and her predecessor where there was no one in the role of Business Manager. He knew there was a funding or budget officer at that point who had to do the entire work of the GA Manager, and he couldn't imagine that was a time when people were thinking very hard about whether they were spending correctly as much as just trying to stay afloat. So it was possible the GA got stuck on this because of some shock beyond their control. He didn't think it was true that in the last few years they've been purposefully profligate. They've been trying to cut down to a steady state. They're almost there. They're getting to the culmination of a long-term strategy, and in a couple of years, he hoped they will be smaller and stronger.

Mr. Rajan said that in his report, he made the actual budget available, and there were copies available at the door. It's a whole bunch of numbers. He could highlight a few, but he'd open up the floor to questions, if people had any, before calling for a vote on the budget.

Mr. Rajan said that on page 3, at the very bottom, they could see the numbers for the GA's operating revenues and operating expenses. It was mostly the information he's told them. He was also hoping that most of the budget wasn't spent. He called for any questions. He asked if there was anything in the presentation that they wanted expanded upon.

Mr. Ellsworth said that this was a point Mr. Rajan already raised, and it was sort of ridiculous to raise this point at that time, because they have all the stuff there. But Mr. Ellsworth said that it seemed to him that

the GA really had to put more into funding student groups. He didn't think the GA was doing its job correctly if they only spend 25% on that. If he understood it, overhead contributes to all the groups. But he thought the GA could fairly say that it doesn't really contribute in the same way to funding student groups.

Mr. Rajan said that most of the overhead was to make sure that the reimbursement process was fast. Mr. Ellsworth said he understood. But his only point was that while they may not be able to resolve this now, they really should be finding other cuts in order to be able to fund student groups better. The reason he felt so bad raising this point at that time was because he didn't have any great suggestions about what else to cut, and he just wanted to throw this out there, just in case somebody else did have a great idea about what else to cut. Mr. Rajan said he could offer Mr. Ellsworth empathy and offer him that both Mr. Nicholas and Ms. Zohar will note his objection, and hopefully next year, this will be something they're on top of much quicker. Ideally, it would have been something they were on top of much quicker, but they spent a lot of this year investing their reserves and trying to get resolution on these numbers so they could present this as clearly as they have.

Mr. Kline said that before they pass this, he asked if they could make a motion to amend the budget, and asked if he could propose a cut if he wanted. It wasn't that he wanted to do that, but asked if he could do so if he wanted to. He was asking if that would be the appropriate time to do that. Mr. Rajan said it was. Mr. Kline said the budget, then, was a recommendation and Delegates could vote to change it. Mr. Rajan said that was correct.

Mr. Rabkin asked if there's been serious consideration of consolidating any projects or cutting any other functions. Mr. Daal said there has been consideration of those suggestions, more one than the other. But

Reports (cont'd)

- 22 -

the challenge has been to come up with a constant way that was justifiable and to back up the reason for that consolidation. And the lack of metrics in some sense has been a major challenge. That has been a major challenge. There's an Action Agenda Item on the agenda that they'll talk about that hopefully Ms. Zohar was planning to head up, which will hopefully address this question next year. So when people are there next May, they shouldn't have to ask these same questions.

Ms. Figueroa said she wanted to speak to her concern about student funding and money for that. She thought there was also concern about more applicants coming in, with much less money given out by the GA. She thought they see that across the board. She felt that one of the GA's missions was to give money to student funding. There were a lot of other offices on campus that give money, so the GA shouldn't take so much of the burden to give. They can't do as much of that as possible, especially when there are other sources of funding on campus, for undergraduates as well as graduate programs. She only said that from the experience of organizing EWOCC. That got a limited amount of money from the GA, and the rest was raised on its own, 50%, which they have to fundraise from other sources. She knew this budget was really important for the GA. And running branches of the GA was important. So while they don't give out as much funding as needed, there are a lot of other sources on campus that give out money.

Mr. Mikulin said he noticed that a lot of their committees have pretty significant programs and events budgets. He asked how much of that money could be done with joint events through GA committees and student groups. Mr. Rajan asked if he was thinking about the International Student Affairs Committee and the Environmental Sustainability Committee. Mr. Mikulin said International Student Affairs, Environmental Sustainability, and Communications, or just the first two if they had budgets.

Mr. Rajan said that some of that was just inertia in the budget. It was a fair question. He just hasn't looked at it deeply, and it was very hard to look at that in isolation. The International Student Affairs Committee a few years ago was created around a fall and spring social. And that was the whole thing, where they invited everybody to an event. The Environmental Sustainability Chairs that year came to him and asked if they were getting this much, and so why didn't their Committee get that amount. And Mr. Rajan said okay, fine. So that's what happened there. So the GA has a pretty large programming and events budget for those two Committees. He thought now the focus of the International Student Affairs Committee was slightly different, but he wasn't really sure and should talk about it more. It was hard to get input at appropriate times from them. He wasn't sure how much of that program and event money was being used for the fall and spring socials. He hasn't seen them be a big component of the Committee last year, and maybe not so much the year before. He knew Danny Kramer has good ideas about spending the Environmental Sustainability money, but a part of it was saying that they don't get stipends, so the GA will give them more money to use however they saw fit. But that might not be the maximum return on the GA's investment.

Mr. Mikulin said he wasn't saying the money should be taken away, but the GA might want to publicize it more and do joint events with GA policy committees like International Students and Environmental Sustainability, which somebody will take over next year. So people know on campus that there is an avenue to pursue group funding, but they might want to co-host an event with a GA committee. And there might be additional money there for them.

Mr. Daal said they've finished with the time allocated for this, but the GA could decide if they want to continue. Mr. Ellsworth moved to extend time by five minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Reports (cont'd)

- 23 -

Mr. Marchand said he wanted to make a quick amendment to the budget. It seems that in the CAVP line item they put a negative \$2,500. Mr. Rajan said that was income. Mr. Marchand said that an anonymous donor gave them \$2,500, but they're still going to spend it. So there was a plus \$2,500, and there's also a minus \$2,500. He wasn't sure the \$2,500 was being expended there. Mr. Rajan said he thought he only subtracted it once. But if he made a mistake, he hoped a good faith amendment would be okay. Mr. Marchand said they're actually going to spend the money, so the net effect on the CAVP will be zero. If someone gives them money, they swap funds. So one thing they could do next year is to put \$2,500 into reserves for the future.

Mr. Rajan said he could have had that zeroed out, and maybe he should have, as that would have reduced confusion. The main thing he wanted to point out was that it didn't contribute to the \$71,000 drop. That's all he cared about because he wasn't looking at how restricted funds were being used. But it wouldn't be a draw from GA reserves. If he made that mistake, he'd fix it afterwards. He just wanted to put it out there that the GA got a donation.

Mr. Peters said a lot of people don't know about the GA and don't know what the GA does. As they become more public and have make more demands on GA resources, they were cutting back on the budget. He thought was something to consider. As they become a lot more transparent and public, they'll face an even bigger avalanche of demands in the upcoming year. That just struck him that day as people were talking about the budget, and he thought it was something to consider.

Ms. Ng said it looked like there were two levels of stipends, around \$10,000 and then around \$1,000. She was curious about the Grad Social Club stipend, at \$2,000. Mr. Rajan said there are two of them, so they each get \$1,000.

Mr. Kline asked if people would hold the positions if they weren't paid, because he thought it was fun. Mr. Daal said the Chairs of the GSC have a lot more stuff to do than people on Committees. They have a lot more responsibility. So for people on the Committee, it was fun. Mr. Kline asked if it was easier to be a Funding Chair than an Environmental Sustainability Chair. Mr. Daal said it wasn't easier to be Funding Chair. He didn't know about Environmental Sustainability, but the Funding Committee requires a lot more time, more than the Budget Officer. It was hard to have a clear answer. It seemed to be the case that the stipend incentivized people. However little, it tends to keep people responsible, at least who worked for him.

Ms. Figueroa asked if there's a reason for the disparity, and why some people only got paid a \$1,000 stipend. Mr. Rajan said it originally started as a thank you and it has become institutionalized as a salary. Back when the GA was spending \$750,000, it started out as a thank you. Mr. Daal said it somewhat makes sense because they ask the Grad Social Club Chairs to support events the GA throws. So it wasn't just Grad Social Club events, but other things, like Delegate socials and things like that.

Mr. Rajan said he would like to have a motion to approve the budget. It was so moved and seconded by Ms. Figueroa and Mr. Zachritz. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2010-11 GA BUDGET PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.** (Applause)

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Mr. Rajan.

Presentation by Jeff Deutsch, Cal Student Store Director

- 24 -

Mr. Daal said they would move back to the presentation from Jeff Deutsch, the Cal Student Store Director.

PRESENTATION BY JEFF DEUTSCH, CAL STUDENT STORE DIRECTOR

Jeff Deutsch said he would like to thank Pres. Daal and the GA for allowing him to speak to them. He introduced himself and said he was the Store Director of the Cal Student Store. It was their bookstore, literally. He wasn't just saying that, and the students actually own it. So students own the Bookstore. Student government, the ASUC and the GA, received almost \$2 million last year. So Mr. Deutsch said he appreciated that.

Mr. Deutsch said that not only was the Bookstore the students' store in terms of the money they get and the fact that students own it, but Mr. Deutsch said he wanted to be really clear that they want as much student feedback as possible.

Mr. Rabkin asked if that came from selling books and other things. Mr. Deutsch said it was everything they sell, not just books. Mr. Daal said it included apparel and computers.

Mr. Deutsch said that part of what they were trying to do, and something he was committed to doing even better, particularly with this group, was to get as much feedback as possible, and as many ideas as possible. One idea that came from students about two years ago, actually from the current ASUC Executive Vice President of the ASUC now, Tu Tran, who was a Senator at the time, was to work together on textbook affordability. They've done a lot of work with students and with the Administration to get input to really try to keep the cost of textbooks down. Obviously, as they knew, it was a tough battle. So what the Store wanted to do was to create as many options as possible.

Mr. Deutsch said the best way to keep textbook prices down was to get early adoptions and to have as many used books as possible. But they have also been exploring digital strategies, and they now have rent-a-text, textbook rental, which they were really excited about. It will come out in the fall of 2010.

The screen showed the Web site they have at that time. The way the program will work, textbook rentals will be 50-55% off the cover price of the new book. People could rent a book for the semester and would also have the option to keep it. They can make highlights and take notes on the book. It's like a regular, used book. So it shouldn't impact any of the academic uses that students might have for it.

Mr. Deutsch said that rental wasn't always going to be the cheapest option. If a student bought a used book and sold it back, and the Bookstore knew it was being used the next semester, the student would receive 37.5% of the cover price. But rental was the least risky option, and the Store was really excited to have it as something they offer.

In addition, just so people knew, the Store wasn't going to be doing every book in the Store. The books that will be rented will be based on a national wholesale market, so the books were viable to be used again year after year. Mr. Deutsch said another thing he was really excited about was that the Store will be able to localize rentals. If a department or a professor committed to using a book for four semesters, the Store would make it rental eligible. That was a really good way to localize the Berkeley campus, and customize it.

Presentation by Jeff Deutsch, Cal Student Store Director

- 25 -

Mr. Deutsch said he wanted to talk about the Web site, as part of their pilot. They've done this elsewhere, and tried it at Sacramento State. One complaint was that it took too long for each transaction, and during the beginning of classes, it made the wait in line a little bit longer. So they've done a lot better in terms of the cashier, and that part of it was a lot quicker than it used to be. But they also have the Web site, where students can sign up. And once they register, they're good for life in terms of making contracts. They're trying to get as many people on to the Web site now so they don't have to deal with it in August, when students start class.

Lastly, Mr. Deutsch said he wanted to talk about the sweepstakes they're doing. They have a \$10,000 sweepstakes where anyone who signs up is entered and could win \$10,000. If they refer a friend and that friend wins, they both get \$10,000. The other sweepstakes was actually very achievable, where every time a student registers, they take a quiz. The school with the highest quiz scores gets 100 \$100 gift cards for the Store, to random people who entered from that school. Right now, Cal is ahead of University of Nebraska, Lincoln. So Cal was in good shape and they should be able to win. Mr. Deutsch asked Delegates to please let their peers and constituencies know that this was going on, and to get as many graduate students signed up as possible. He called for any questions about textbook rental or the Bookstore.

Mr. Daal asked about the plan for the future with respect to electronic textbooks. Mr. Deutsch said they have a number of options. It was a really dynamic market. They've been stocking digital books for about

three years now, although they represent less than one-half a percent of their total textbook sales. However, they're broadening their selection in partnership with both the publishers as well as a program, Café Scribe, which was created at Haas by a student who graduated there about two years ago. Follett, who Bookstore management works for, bought the company, and not only does it deliver digital content, but there's a social media aspect where people can share notes with anyone in the country who uses the same book. They don't have to be at the same school. It was really a cool program, but hasn't gotten off the ground just yet. They're still exploring that, and trying to work with as many publishers that they can to get titles in.

Mr. Rabkin asked if there's been any discussion about trying to sell textbooks at cost and asked what the current profit margin was on textbooks. Mr. Deutsch said he couldn't comment on the current profit margin, but Dr. Permaul, of the ASUC Auxiliary, could. There has not been a discussion about selling books at cost. He wasn't sure about the question, and asked if a little more context could be given. Mr. Rabkin said he thought it was unethical to profit from students. It was a very regressive way of raising money. Mr. Deutsch said that what he could say was that they do a lot better on clothing than on textbooks. There wasn't a lot of money in textbooks. He could show them, and he'd love to come back, maybe next semester, and talk about where the textbook dollar goes. It honestly was the students' store. It's not about making money off of students' backs, but was about getting them what they need and covering the costs. That really was the basis behind it. He could see the perspective, as a student, when they come in and see a \$200 book; and Cal students probably have the most expensive books of anyone. And he thought a \$200 book was ridiculous and totally commiserated with that. But he could talk to them offline, or talk when he had more time about the economics behind textbooks, including where the money goes, and give them more context. But there's not any conversation about selling at cost. The Store wouldn't be able to operate.

Mr. Rabkin said he didn't mean just at cost, but the cost of books plus the necessities. Mr. Deutsch said that was essentially what they were doing. And it's really clothing and other such things that generate revenue.

Presentation by Jeff Deutsch, Cal Student Store Director
Reports (cont'd)

- 26 -

Ms. Ng said that the Store seemed to stock a significant number of sustainable office items. She asked if they planned to increase that. Mr. Deutsch said he would like to thank her for noticing that. They're looking for not only sustainable office items, but sustainable everything. He was just in contact yesterday with someone and they're having conversations about organic T-shirts. The Store piloted some, but nobody bought them. Part of the reason was that they're expensive. It's like going to the grocery store and wanting organic spinach. It's more expensive. But the Store was looking at everything they do. And to be honest, they looked at rental and used books as sustainable products as well, and they're continuing to do that. He meets with and was actually part of the Auxiliary Sustainability Team. They work with co-ops and things like that, to get feedback. But if anybody had ideas, he would ask them to please contact him. He would love to hear about anything that people see out there that they want the Store to carry.

Mr. Daal said speaker's time had expired. Mr. Deutsch said he would like to thank them very much for their time. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Mr. Deutsch for attending. (Applause) Mr. Deutsch said he would leave some cards at the front, and if people wanted to contact him, he would ask them to please not hesitate to do so.

REPORTS (cont'd)

Mr. Marchand, Campus Affairs Vice President, reported. He said the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey was distributed. He's presented the results. They got 2,100 respondents, which was really good. That was partially because they had incentives to participate. He broke it down by departments or schools. 53 out of the 68 departments or schools had at least 10% participation, of at least 9 students. This wasn't done by departments because at some point, departments become too small. They actually had a large number of departments represented with over 30% participation. He thought the largest Department that knew they had a GA Delegate was Astronomy, at 25%, where 89 people knew that they had a GA Delegate. That was more than other Delegate departments. Interestingly, 25% of departments who don't have a GA Delegate said they had one. So the GA had some shadow Delegates.

They also had a substantial sample size for both Masters, Ph.D., and professional degree students. For Ph.D. students, they could break it down per year, for the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Engineering. So they had good results to do this analysis.

Mr. Marchand said one question asked how students would recommend their program of study to a prospective applicant who was their friend, from 1 to 10. As they could see from the screen, the average among programs was about 7-8. This metric is used for customer satisfaction and is called a promoter score. They take 9 and 10 minus 1 to 6, and get a percentage, which hopefully is positive. And it's positive for all programs, from plus 15% to plus 27%. But the next slide breaks it down by year, and satisfaction goes down for year of study. The promote score goes from plus 40% to minus 5%, over seven years. It was kind of flat after the fifth year. That was interesting to consider, students becoming less happy. They found a direct correlation to being less likely to give back to Berkeley after they graduate. That might be an argument for graduate student support.

As for mentorship, on the academic side, Mr. Marchand said they asked people to rate mentors in different areas, with a scale of 1 to 4. All the results were about 3.0. The aggregate data didn't tell them that much. Maybe by breaking down it down by department they could learn about some problems.

Reports (cont'd)

- 27 -

Maybe more useful data was the over 600 open comments on how to improve mentoring or support of graduate students. That was one question with the most comments. People want the GA to advocate for that, to support graduate students going to graduate programs.

Mr. Marchand said the funding data was very complex. He tried to ask about sources of academic funding and see how many students were totally funded, and what students were using who were not totally funded, such as loans, off-campus work, or savings. Apart from this quantitative aspect, there were also more problems with information in the sense that over 25% of all respondents said they had unclear information about funding. And there was some detail as to who the funders were. Fifteen percent of all respondents reported problems receiving promised funding. People said it was very easy to get a GSI, but it was actually difficult to get funding. There were more details in the report.

Mr. Marchand said that if they look at how budget cuts have affected the quality of their student experience at Berkeley, it was very interesting in that it varied a lot by department. The Natural Sciences and Engineering were largely shielded from that, maybe because they have their own funding, and 40% said they weren't affected by budget cuts. In the professional schools, it was almost the reverse, and one-third

were been highly affected. They had Professional Degree Fee increases on top of the Ed Fee. That might be one factor. He goes more in detail about the factors raised by students in the report.

As for student services, Mr. Marchand said they asked people about their perception of student services. Health Services got an average to good grade. What got a very bad rating from students was support available for student parents. That didn't apply to 91% of the population, but of the 9% who are parents, actually half of them gave the lowest possible rating. Mr. Marchand said they know that affordable housing for student families, childcare services, are not abundant or affordable, because they're mostly designed for faculty who can afford expensive childcare. So this was something they'll bring up with Student Affairs. Graduate student housing and childcare were not priorities, but that was mostly because they surveyed the whole population, and not the population specifically affected by that process. So they might add that to discussions.

Mr. Marchand said he would like to take questions, if there was any time.

A Delegate asked who the survey will go to, and asked what the next step was for it. Mr. Marchand said he sent a report by e-mail. He finished it that day and posted a version online. They'll send it to key people the GA works within the Administration and make it public to the Daily Cal. Hopefully the paper will have an article about it, and they can get some visibility for these issues. Also, one thing he might look at in the future, and discuss this with next year's CAVP, were future surveys. This was the first time they did it. Maybe they don't need to do a survey of this magnitude every year, because students would get survey fatigue. But in going forward, he thought they could look at these results and maybe make better questions for future surveys, and maybe have questions that were more standardized, like whether students would recommend their programs. Those kinds of questions they could ask year after year and see how it evolved. He was sure people in the Administration could look at these results for students versus year of study and say new students were happier because they got more. That was one interpretation, but they couldn't interpret that much from just only one year.

Ms. Whelan asked anybody has talked to the UAW about the student-parent issue, because if they had hard data to describe how unhappy parents were, that would really help in their bargaining. Mr. Marchand said they did share some key data with people they work with, including people in the UAW

Reports (cont'd)

- 28 -

and people in the Administration. There were some issues with GSIs' work code and some departments swapping GSI money for fellowships, where department don't pay for a GSI when a student gets a fellowship. That was an interesting issue the Union might be better equipped to deal with. But they will share information. He hoped that next year they could have more combination with the GSI Union now that they're trying to build a membership base and do grassroots, and the GA should invite them to meetings to give updates.

Ms. Whelan said dependent care was also something they were discussing with the University, and with the Regents as well.

A Delegate said the survey was fantastic and she wanted to thank Mr. Marchand for doing it. (Applause) He mentioned that some departments didn't know who their Delegates were. Maybe he could send that information out to each Delegate, that only 20% of their department knew they exist. Mr. Marchand said that 50% of students in Anthropology think they have a Delegate.

A Delegate said that was an issue to take up with the GA, and perhaps to go after departments that don't have a delegate. Mr. Marchand said there were two different ways to increase outreach, by better representation in departments where they're already represented, and then getting to new departments.

A Delegate asked how he was going to specifically use the data itself, with 600 comments on how to make student services better. He asked if there was a common theme, or if Mr. Marchand will push themes. Mr. Marchand said there was one section that asked what they wanted the GA to advocate for, and he broke that down by a number of comments. He couldn't do that for every question, but this was one area where they could see that advocacy was aligned with graduate student priorities, which was good. But 70% couldn't rate advocacy efforts. As far as the GA, there was very much a lack of awareness among the general student population, and 70% of graduate students don't know what the GA does, down to about 50% for people in the fifth year of Ph.D. programs. So there's some improvement and better awareness, but not as much as they think. So that was something the GA needed to think about, on both sides. They need to provide more information to Delegates and need to help Delegates provide better ideas to increase communication with their programs, especially with large programs, which was really challenging.

Alberto Ortega, External Affairs Vice President, reported. He said he had an update on what the External Affairs Committee has been up to. There was a lot more to cover than what he could talk about in eight minutes and time for questions. He wanted to go through to three main areas where they advocate with the UC Student Association and the UC Office of the President. That's their State-level advocacy. He'd end by taking about federal advocacy, and give an example of why what they did mattered. That was a question that has been raised. While External Affairs does a lot in a lot, many Delegates and the graduate population doesn't really know what they're up to. There were long-term consequences and advantages impacting a lot of the functions the GA does.

Mr. Ortega said that starting with the Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan, they were actually already using some survey data on the Systemwide GSHIP group that was part of UCOP. Part of what External Affairs does was to represent their students in a Systemwide coalition of all UC student governments. This year, one priority was graduate student health insurance. They've been really active in trying to get the most benefits possible for all students and making sure they have dependent care, and that all of this

Reports (cont'd)

- 29 -

was done in a way that was affordable. They have been able to get one representative from every campus to be on this Systemwide committee. That was in addition to two UCSA representatives. In total that ends up being about one-third of the whole committee, which was also composed of campus administrators and a couple of people from UCOP. They're finishing up those negotiations. He couldn't really go into the details because of confidentiality agreements, but it was going really well. Whether Berkeley will be part of that group will be decided in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Ortega said another thing they're doing through their access to the Office of the President and with their involvement in the UCSA was to work on the Professional Degree Fee, which he was sure Delegates have heard about that past semester. They were planning to change some of the provisions, but that was postponed until further notice. One thing they're doing was to work with the Provost to make sure that there are certain caps and certain measures taken within that policy so the PDF couldn't be raised as much as it has been, especially for programs that currently have no limits.

Mr. Ortega said there were a number of things that External Affairs was also doing with the UCSA, and moving on to what was happening in the State, they had a number of really big events in Sacramento. The last one was that past Tuesday, where, during one of the meetings with him, the Governor announced that he would veto any budget that didn't meet what he set out in January. And the January budget essentially gave schools most of that they asked for. It's still not back to two years ago, when they had significantly more funding, but at least it was halfway between then and what they had last year. So that was a really positive feedback and a big achievement from all the advocacy efforts that were done in collaboration with the Administration and the other two systems.

Mr. Ortega said the other thing they've been working on was Cal Grants. A lot of grad students think this doesn't affect them, but Cal Grants are part of a lump sum of money that goes to the University. If the State took out funding for undergraduates and Cal Grants, that was money that wouldn't be available for other resources, such as other programs and grad students.

Mr. Ortega said the last thing he wanted to touch on was Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE). He works with SAGE, a new student government the GA helped to create about a year and a half ago. It's a coalition of the top public universities in the nation. They've been advocating on three main issues. The first was a tax exemption for scholarships and fellowships. Currently, only the part that goes towards what was considered tuition was tax exempt, but everything else was subject to being taxed. SAGE was working to restore the way that definition works so that it would include room and board. Mr. Ortega said he would come back to this issue. The second issue SAGE was advocating for was immigration reform, and how that was changing in coming years. They want input from graduate students and how do they want this to change so graduate students have better access to public universities. The last issue SAGE was advocating for was indebtedness. Mr. Ortega said there were a number of loan forgiveness programs at the federal level, some of which have never been appropriated. That meant that even though they exist, nobody has benefitted from them. There's a program to forgive debt after about ten years if the student goes into public service. However, when one's debt is forgiven and the student still owes \$50,000, that counts as income for that year; and all that income was taxable. So SAGE was trying change that. Otherwise, even if a student's debt was forgiven, they could still owe \$10,000 in taxes or so, which was pretty ridiculous.

Mr. Ortega said that going back into why what they did mattered and how they have an impact, a lot of this was more than just these specific issues, but rather, the relationships they're building and the way they

Reports (cont'd)

- 30 -

could be a voice in policy that was being created and changed at both the federal and State levels. So for example, when they were in Washington, D.C., they brought up the issue of immigration. It's something that they're just barely getting traction on in DC, and they're engaged in assessing what they want to let representatives know what they like in the bill, or if there was anything they didn't like, or that they'd like to see. Those are the things the GA can achieve as being part of a large coalition and currently don't have a voice than this national coalition of public universities.

They've been very active with some other groups that represent universities, such as the Association of American Universities and the American Public Land Grant Universities. Another way these kinds of relations help them, through being involved with them, the GA was able to know about things very quickly. For example, with the tax issue, the GA was notified within an hour or two of the bill being introduced, which was great, because they were in DC when that happened and they were able to tell their legislators about a bill that was just introduced that morning, saying that students would like to support it

and asking them to be a co-sponsor. It's something that even though Congress often times works very slowly, there are issues that were very pressed for time; and having that information made a big difference.

Mr. Ortega said he wanted to leave some time for questions.

Asad Tahir, Funding Committee Chair, reported. Mr. Tahir said he was leaving, and this was his last year. He introduced Mary Whelan, who was the new Funding Chair, who will be taking this on for next year. The Funding Committee and the Ad Hoc Funding Committee met last month and looked at a couple of ways to restructure how they currently allocate funds to student groups. The big problem they faced over the last year, and the past many years, was that global budget cuts, the standard budget cut that all student groups receive, has been increasing steadily over time. Last year it was 47%, but that was only because of an emergency infusion of contingency funds from the GA budget. But before that, it was 55%; and before that, it was 60%. So that essentially meant that a student group asking for \$1,000 would get a maximum of about \$400.

At the same time, Mr. Tahir said the budget cuts have been made less because they have a decreasing budget given to the Funding Committee every year. There are concerns about equity as it stood. When student groups apply, the Committee doesn't look at which particular departments they're from, and they don't have caps on particular departments. So, for example, the Law School gets twice the amount of funding that it should get, according to its population. The Public Policy School gets roughly more than twice the amount of funding it would get, according to the population. The same went for the Education School and a few other schools. This wouldn't be a problem other than the fact that there are fewer funds available for other student groups, and there's a larger global budget cut as a result of those extra applications from those particular schools. And of course, the last problem is that they have unused funds each round and they can't allocate those in time because the Funding report needed to be approved by the Delegates. There's a Resolution that addresses that which the GA will talk about later on.

Mr. Tahir said the main constraint that the office is not a full-time position. So they can't set up a huge training system for how funds the Funding Committee allocates were actually spent, and have a proper metric system to judge what was the best way to spend each dollar. They don't have the manpower or the funds to actually set up that metric system.

Reports (cont'd)

- 31 -

Ms. Whelan said that before they talk about what they want to change in this structure, they need to describe the old structure and how they have been doing things. As for how they're going to allocate different amounts of funding to different groupings, they currently have different groupings such as Grad Events, Grants, the Travel Award, which is a lottery, and Group Resources, for paper and pens and stuff. This year, that was how the allocations looked, and this was how it looked before.

Ms. Whelan said that what they're going to describe was trying to shuffle this around a bit in order for it to be more efficient. It was 55%, 32%, 8%, and 4%, for Grad Events, projects, travel, and group resources. Group resources wasn't necessarily locked in with events, at \$5,500. To make this more efficient, they'll address that. And also, they have to address the fact that their total will go down.

Mr. Tahir said the other main problem student groups have is that if they want to apply for an event in either semester, they had four times in a year to do it. So if they had their act together, all they had to do was apply twice a year for funding from the GA. Ms. Whelan said that in the new structure, they'll lump meeting resources and events together. They'll have grants and they'll still have the travel award. And then they'll have a discretionary/contingency fund. When one applies for funding, they had to apply four months in advance. If an earthquake happened and a student wanted to hold a fundraiser to raise funds for the area, or if there's a fiscal crisis and people wanted to hold a panel discussion or get working groups together to solve a problem that was happening in a very timely manner, they could apply to the discretionary fund, at \$12,000. So people could respond to things quickly and didn't necessarily have to foresee everything that will happen that semester in order to respond.

Mr. Tahir said the first thing they'll change is that if a student group wanted to hold an event in the Fall Semester, they could apply for Round 1, and the event timeline was structurally the entire duration of the semester. If a group didn't have its act together, it could still apply for a second round within the same semester, which had a later event timeline, October 9 to December 3. That will cut down on paperwork and decrease frustration for student groups.

Ms. Whelan said they're also decreasing the cap on the amount of money people could apply for, since the number of applications has been rising over time. For example, that last semester, the global budget cut was over 50%. The Funding Committee just dropped the cap down to a maximum of \$500 per group per semester. That will help to prevent people from over-estimating the money they want in anticipation of a cut. The Funding Committee also lumped group resources with meetings and events, so it was less complicated. Funding will be available for the entire semester.

Ms. Whelan said there's also an interesting aspect that they're introducing, to try to make a more equitable application of funding between student groups that represent different associated disciplines. The idea was that in each large group, students might actually go another discipline's event, say if someone in Astronomy going to a Physics event. They're going to guarantee that all of these super groups get a minimum amount of money. Beyond that, they'll allocate it in an equitable way according to their population. Super groups would include Physical Sciences, Public Policy, Law, Business, Education, Engineering, Math, Public Policy, Biological Sciences, Professional Schools, and the Humanities. On average, each super group has about 1,000 students.

The way this would work was to have caps of minimum, guaranteed funding, \$2,000 for each super group. Once each super group reached its limit, that's where it would stop, from the moment after that. Any unused funds would be distributed according to population among all the other different super

Reports (cont'd)

- 32 -

groups. The Business Schools, e.g., almost never applies for any funding. So unused funds from the Business super group would be re-distributed.

Mr. Rajan asked if they would still keep the requirement that a group had to have a Delegate to get funding for a super group. Mr. Tahir said they would.

Mr. Rajan asked who the Business School Delegate was, because he didn't think there was one. Mr. Tahir said that if they actually have a Delegate and a student group, the GA will keep them as a super group.

Mr. Marchand asked if they'd have super groups by Delegates or by dividing the total student population. Mr. Tahir said that right now, those groups will be done by the total number of graduate students overall on campus, not by Delegates to the GA.

Mr. Daal said they were out of time for this topic. Mr. Rajan moved to extend time by five minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate said that if one was in the Biologic Science super group and didn't talk to other groups, she asked how this would work. She asked if money from Round 1 wasn't used up, and some other departments didn't have money left, if that would be available. She didn't understand the logistics of how they'd work with super groups if they didn't talk to other departments. Ms. Whelan said it was just about global cuts and making them more equitable among the super groups. The idea was to somehow represent it by student population because the number of students was how they actually determine how much funding they have. And so they came up with the idea of super groups because if one is in Forestry, say, and they only have two people, and the GA was trying to make this an equitable distribution related to the number of students in a program, then it would get \$2. In order to address that concern, they tried to solve that by making associated super groups. If one is in ESPM and applies and Public Policy also applies, it's just the idea that they'll both experience the same global cut.

Ms. Zohar said that the super groups, then, were indeed super. It seemed kind of taken for granted that you'd bring up a population, which was completely reasonable. She asked if the Funding Committee considered breaking it up by the needs of the GA instead, and prioritizing. If groups in different disciplines produced a publication, maybe they could think of also subsidizing that, or having another grouping category that took that into consideration, and also take into consideration that the GA wanted 10% of money going towards minority initiatives, 10% towards generals, 10% for community building, or something like that. She asked if that has been considered at all.

Mr. Kline asked if this was only for Graduate Events. Mr. Tahir said that super groups only apply to Graduate Events. There are about 60 applications for Grad Events each round. The Funding Committee simply didn't have enough time or resources to go through every single application in super detail and ask if one social event was truly better than another. This was only to allocate funds for events and resources. As for grants, they can now fully fund grants or completely deny grants based on solely their merit.

Ms. Zohar asked about categories, such as women or minorities. Ms. Whelan said she didn't want to tell a group their speaker was poor. Ms. Zohar asked if, in applying for grants, it fit into one of six categories, women, minorities, other, if that would be easier to look at them and see at the end of the year that, say, 50% of their budget was going towards "others." That was just an idea. Ms. Berkeley said she didn't know if that would be practical in the sense of categorizing events.

Reports (cont'd)
Resolution Referral

- 33 -

Mr. Ellsworth moved to extend time by two minutes. Mr. Daal asked if the Funding Committee was going to request a vote on this. Mr. Tahir said they weren't, and this was just going to be a funding guide. The motion to extend was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Tahir said the super group idea was just a formula for making the whole allocation process more fair and equitable, and he thought it worked great in that regard. That's how events, meetings, and resources funds will be distributed from now on. For grants, the Funding Committee will take much more time to

go in depth into the nitty-gritty of each and every grant project and will exercise more judgment in deciding which was a better grant project than the other. The travel award will be done the same way it has been, with a random draw among all people who apply. Ideally, they will look into which students will go to a better conference or present a better paper. The amount for travel awards was \$300. The rest was contingency, discretionary, which catered to any category that has not been covered in any of the other categories. So if something came up on an emergency basis or anything else, it would fall under contingency discretionary.

Mr. Daal said these were changes to the funding guide, and asked if Delegates didn't vote on that. Mr. Tahir said these will be formalized in the funding guide, which will be prepared over the summer. And then the Executive Board, acting as the Delegate Assembly over the summer, will approve it, once all application and other forms were ready for this.

Mr. Daal said they would move on to general questions for Officers. Seeing none, they'd move to Resolution Referral.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Ms. Whelan said they wanted to fast track 1005a, By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review. Mr. Daal said that would require a two-thirds majority approval. The motion to fast track was seconded by Mr. Tahir.

Mr. Kline said the bill needed to be fast tracked because the timeline to present it in the Funding report was dependent upon passing the Resolution. They should decide to pass it or not before they make the new procedures for next year.

Mr. Rabkin said he thought this was a big enough change to their current procedure that it was worth discussing, and it was getting late. So he didn't want to do it that evening. He asked why they couldn't continue with the current system until September and then switch. Mr. Kline said the reason was because of the first two dates, and they wanted to be able to distribute funding before the first Delegates meeting. Mr. Tahir said it would be actually the second Delegates meeting, since they won't have a Funding Committee until after the first meeting. That's why the event timeline got pushed forward.

Mr. Kohut asked what happened in the past. Mr. Tahir said the Executive Board over the summer approves funding for these categories. For the Funding Committee to do that, they need to meet before the Delegates meeting.

Resolution Referral (cont'd)

- 34 -

Mr. Kline said that he would argue that this was a substantial change to the By-laws, but not a substantial change to the practice of the GA.

Mr. Tahir said that in the past three years he's been there, he didn't think there's been single objection to any Funding Committee report that's been presented to the GA. There is a contingency in discretionary funds for appeals, in case there are appeals. So this change wouldn't take away from the Delegate Assembly.

Mr. Rajan said he didn't disagree, and said it was better to have By-laws that follow what they do rather than what they would like to do. On the other hand, it seemed like a big enough change to the By-laws to go to committee. It seemed, at least the way he read it, to disadvantage the Delegate Assembly in a certain way. He was wondering if the Funding Committee, or the Funding Ad Hoc Committee, or the authors of the bill, would be okay if they just let the Exec Board do what it's been doing for the last few years over the summer, and then they could actually have a full debate on this at the first meeting next year.

Ms. Berkeley said it was easy to change the By-laws. It was better to experiment with this change in the By-laws, and then, if there was a problem, to switch it back. Otherwise, they'll keep putting this off year after year. If they were thinking of a change, she would ask why they didn't make the change.

Mr. Rabkin said the reason he was squeamish about doing this that evening was because they'd be making two big changes to funding. One was to hand this off to the Funding Committee, and then to change the way they do allocations. One reason this has been uncontroversial in the past was that funding was basically on auto pilot, and having global cuts. If people wanted to have more discretion, they should tell that to the Funding Committee, and delegate a lot of power. He thought these changes should be done separately.

Ms. Whelan said that if he wanted to be involved in the funding process, he could come to Funding Committee meetings. Mr. Rabkin said they couldn't both say that they were going to do it in committee and say anyone who was interested should show up. There are people not currently in the GA who might want to have a say on something that would give lots more discretion to the Funding Committee than it used to have.

Mr. Rajan asked if people had serious reservations with letting the Exec Board approve this, because they knew they'd get a rubberstamp from the Exec Board to approve allocations, at least for stuff people had to do at the beginning of the year, and then they could really have the Delegates discuss this at the beginning of the year. He thought this was an important enough change to go through the Rules Committee to get some feedback. It seemed a little sudden.

Mr. Kline asked if he was saying the GA could continue without passing this and that the Exec Board could pass a Funding report before the Delegates meeting. Mr. Rajan said that was correct, because the Exec Board would act as the Delegate body before the Assembly convened. Mr. Kline said they wouldn't have a Funding Committee. Mr. Rajan said the Exec Board would be the Funding Committee until a Funding Committee exists.

Mr. Marchand said that in September, about half of the Assembly will be new, so that was a downside of waiting. There will be more time, but there will be a lot more new people. This was their last meeting, and a good time to pass this.

Resolution Referral (cont'd)
Resolutions

- 35 -

Mr. Rabkin said that in the past, the Delegate Assembly has approved funding rules. He asked if they would be doing that under this new system. Mr. Kline said the Exec Board would do that over the summer. Mr. Rabkin said that would mean the Delegate body would have no vote on funding rules. Mr. Kline said this Resolution had nothing to do with funding rules or procedures. Mr. Rabkin said they would hand out money over the summer. Mr. Kline said the Resolution would remove the requirement

that the Delegate Assembly approves the Funding report. It does not remove the requirement that the Delegate Assembly approves the funding procedures and guidelines. Mr. Rabkin asked if they'd have to do that in September. Mr. Kline said that would be done over the summer by the Exec Board. Mr. Daal said it would then be re-approved by the Delegates. Mr. Tahir said that's how it's been done for the last two years.

Ms. Zohar said that if the Executive Board could do all these things, the concern would be to delay having the Assembly do it. Then there wouldn't be a time constraint because nothing would hold them back time wise. So she asked what the time constraint was for fast tracking this. Ms. Whelan said that if something terrible happened, like a natural disaster, and somebody wanted to do something with relief, they would need to have a month or six weeks' notice to get funding. She didn't really consider the Funding Committee having a lot of discretion. It's not like they're arbitrating things, and there will be rules on how they can allocate funding. It just seemed a little silly to wait for four to six weeks to have this meeting convene when everyone agreed this was a good idea, and when in the past two years, people haven't disagreed with funding allocations. It seemed like an odd delay.

Ms. Zohar said that maybe they could just have the Contingency Fund apply. Mr. Kline said that wasn't the only timeline. It might be worth withdrawing the request to fast track the bill if the Executive Board can approve this over the summer. Then they could still allocate the funding and simply discuss this in the fall.

Mr. Rajan said that as long as the Funding Committee doesn't exist, the Exec Board will do what needed to get done. Mr. Daal said that didn't address Mr. Marchand's point.

Mr. Kline asked if they could withdraw the Resolution from being fast tracked and refer it to committee.

Mr. Daal said Mr. Marchand's point was that there would be new people in the fall when the GA would consider this. A Delegate said there would still be old Delegates present.

Mr. Daal said they need a two-thirds vote to carry the motion to fast track the Resolution. The motion to fast track Resolution 1005a failed by hand-vote 6-15-0. Mr. Daal said the bill would not be fast tracked.

Mr. Daal said that if there were no objections, the Chair would refer to the Budget, Rules, and Funding Committees Resolution 1005a, By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review.

RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolution, 1004a, was authored by Hagar Zohar:

Resolution 1104a, To Create an Action Agenda Item on Restructuring the GA Budget (cont'd) - 36 -

RESOLUTION TO CREATE AN ACTION AGENDA ITEM FOCUSED ON RESTRUCTURING THE GA BUDGET

WHEREAS, for the past several years the Graduate Assembly budget has been operating unsustainably by spending more than its revenues and drawing from its reserves; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly will no longer have the liquid reserves to maintain its current annual expenditures after 2010-2011; and

WHEREAS, applying uniform cuts to balance the budget makes the Graduate Assembly less effective in fulfilling its mission statement; and

WHEREAS, the budget of the Graduate Assembly therefore needs to be restructured in a more thoughtful and holistic way; and

WHEREAS, the scope required for such a restructuring would overwhelm the Budget Committee; and

WHEREAS, an independent body working closely with the Budget Committee, Executive Board, and other stakeholders could expedite the necessary budget restructuring;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Sustainable Budget Restructuring will be an Action Agenda Item for the 2010-2011 academic year. Hagar Zohar will be the action agenda item chair. The goal of Sustainable Budget Restructuring is to provide recommendations to the Budget chair that will inform the creation of a sustainable budget, one that does not draw from reserves, starting in the 2011-2012 academic year. In doing so, the chair will coordinate dialogues across the Graduate Assembly and synthesize current information from the Delegates, Officers, and the graduate community regarding effective fulfillment of the Graduate Assembly's mission with limited funds relative to previous years.

Ms. Zohar said she's been a Delegate from the Chemical Engineering Department for the past three years. During that time she's served on various GA committees. She was now on the Budget Committee. What she was bringing forward that evening was a new Action Agenda Item to replace the Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item. It would be a Sustainable Budget Restructuring Action Agenda Item. Mr. Rajan explained very eloquently and in great detail the state of the budget. Ms. Zohar said she basically wanted to say the point Mr. Rajan made was that the Assembly was trying to do today, with \$500,000, what the Assembly did in the past with \$750,000. That didn't make a lot of sense and it wasn't working well.

As a thought experiment, if the GA's entire budget was \$100, \$50 would go to operations, which meant running everything, and \$50 would go to programming, with money for events and food and stuff. If they started with \$100, they've been doing cuts in a certain manner. They say the total budget needed to be cut by 20% every year, so they'll stop drawing from their reserves. But they didn't want to touch overhead, like stipends. So the only thing the Budget Committee, which has been great, could do was to cut programming. So what they've been doing was to shrink the whole budget by 20% each year, which was all taken out by programming. So programming would shrink and shrink. At the beginning they had \$1 of operations budget to administrator \$1 of money to do things. But now they have \$4 to administer \$1 of events. So that meant they needed to look at how they do things in a holistic way.

Ms. Zohar said that what they see on the floor that year was that budget decisions were made point-wise. People bring up a Resolution for money and depending on the GA's mood and what the budget was it gets money, or not. Whether or not that was the best way to do things, was what motivated the Action Agenda Item. It would just be one year in scope and will look at synthesizing all the data points from

Delegates. They've had high goals, and they've all had great ideas. She's seen that discussion happening in three or four places and there needed to be somebody synthesizing that dialogue into recommendations to give to the Budget Committee and maybe get Resolutions to the GA as needed, to close the shortfall in a more holistic way that made more sense.

Mr. Daal called for discussion.

Mr. Kohut asked if she was just trying to provide oversight on how to balance the budget specifically or to determine what the GA's priorities were. Ms. Zohar said her contribution was to take all the ideas that came up that evening on whether they're using their money in the best way and provide recommendations, and say this was out of whack, or maybe there were ways to save money. Ms. Zohar said she would be completely neutral. The philosophy was that this year, nothing was on the table and next year, they'd investigate this and everything would be on the table, and they'd look at everything equally. The reason this would be an Action Agenda Item was because it was time sensitive. The GA was going through reserves and couldn't afford to do that anymore. Also, this was a big deal, and it should be an Action Agenda Item. It needed a lot of attention and needed somebody accountable to push it through.

Mr. Marchand said that maybe they should approve the Resolution and then just have an election. Mr. Daal said they would just vote on that, and the motion was to strike the wording that would have Ms. Zohar as the Chair, to delete "Hagar Zohar will be the action agenda item chair." If the Resolution was approved, the GA would elect a Chair. They don't elect such positions in a Resolution, and they have an election for that. The motion to amend was seconded. **THE MOTION TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION BY STRIKING MS. ZOHAR AS CHAIR, IN THE RESOLVED CLAUSE, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Daal called for any other discussion, and said he had a question. One thing that could give insight into a sustainable budget, looking into the future, was to become familiar with how the Auxiliary's budget worked. Because whenever that gets cut, those cuts come out of the GA's overhead. So if the Auxiliary chose to cut a position in the Business Office, and the position had to do with funding, and they needed it to operate, the GA would actually take money out of funding and put it into the position, so funding could operate. So if you knew what was happening at the Auxiliary level, then they'd know a little bit more about what would happen at the GA level. He didn't know if people wanted to expand the scope of the Resolution, or if that was appropriate. But that was just something he would like to raise.

Mr. Daal said that if there was no other discussion they would proceed to a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1004A, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO CREATE AN ACTION AGENDA ITEM FOCUSED ON RESTRUCTURING THE GA BUDGET.

Mr. Daal said they would next consider the election of the Sustainable Budget Restructuring Chair. Nominations were open.

Resolution 1104a, To Create an Action Agenda Item on Restructuring the GA Budget (cont'd) - 38 -
Resolution 1004b, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement

Mr. Rajan nominated Ms. Zohar. Mr. Daal said that seeing no other nominations, nominations were closed. A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE HAGAR ZOHAR AS THE CHAIR OF THE ADVOCACY AGENDA ITEM COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE BUDGET RESTRUCTURING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. (Applause)

The following Resolution, 1004b, was authored by Bradley Froehle:

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN AMENDED GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MISSION STATEMENT

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has not updated its mission statement in a considerable length of time; and

WHEREAS, budget shortfalls are causing the Graduate Assembly to reconsider its core goals; and

WHEREAS, an updated and agreed upon mission statement will help focus the Graduate Assembly's efforts in the future;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly adopt the following text as its mission statement:

The Graduate Assembly engages and empowers graduate students to advocate for positive academic, political, and social change and protect the quality of graduate student life. As an elected student government, we represent graduate students within and beyond the campus. As a diverse and collegial group, we support under-served student communities and provide financial resources and infrastructure for graduate students to build community directly. As an historic Berkeley organization, we are dedicated to enacting positive change on behalf of our diverse graduate student community.

Mr. Daal said that Brad Froehle was not present and asked if there was anybody else to speak on behalf of the Resolution.

Mr. Rajan said that he, Mr. Froehle, and Mr. Ortega sat down after the all GA retreat in January to try and craft a mission statement that better reflects what the GA does. He thought the general agreement was that perhaps the old mission statement focused a little on advocacy. That was still a huge part of what the GA does. But before, the projects had a much more activist, advocacy-type function, whereas now they seemed to have a little more of a programming function, and more of a support function for students. That wasn't to say the projects didn't do any advocacy, but he thought the current mission statement ignored a significant portion of what the GA does, which was student group funding, which was only mentioned in sort of a sideways manner. He didn't know if the new mission statement necessarily resolved all those issues, but it was an attempt to try and get down to three or four lines, trying to encapsulate what the GA does. This was actually a far-reaching goal, because ideally, this will be their vision,

Resolution 1004b, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement (cont'd)

- 39 -

and this will be what drove budget decisions, what would drive a lot of things. But this was the first step, and that's what motivated the mission statement they came up with.

Ms. Berkeley asked if the analysis of the Rules Committee was done before or after the Technology Committee's analysis. Mr. Daal said he could only assume it was done independently.

A Delegate said that two meetings ago, in the feedback form, there was a question about suggestions for the mission statement. She asked if that was incorporated. Mr. Daal said it was, and said Mr. Froehle had the task of going through the feedback forms and trying to craft a mission statement based on them. He said he had great difficulty.

The Delegate asked if the mission statement was more advocacy focused and in some way the GA stopped advocating as much as doing programming. Mr. Rajan said they haven't stopped doing any think thing and started to do more of other things. They wanted the mission statement to reflect that. The Delegate asked if this was usual that the GA could change its mission statement if they do something more and something less. Mr. Rajan said maybe the mission statement was crafted after a great deal of thought, and it was supposed to anchor the GA throughout time, and perhaps now the GA has changed. They're not sure if that change is good or bad, but the current GA is the GA it is. They think of the mission statement proposed to better reflect what the GA does. The Rules Committee might agree, but it's an open question that was not addressed until now, whether it should reflect what they do now or if they should go back to what the original mission statement was.

The Delegate asked about moving forward and what they'd want to do more of. Mr. Daal said that some people might argue that the mission statement should be consistent with the amount of funding the GA allocates for the things they do.

On a point of clarification, Ms. Ng said the Rules Committee was not aware of the Technology Committee's revisions when Rules made its feedback statement.

Mr. Haddad said that a line does not really create any sort of logical imperative for the following statement. He moved to strike "as an historic Berkeley organization." And "Berkeley" was too vague, and could be the town or UC Berkeley.

Ms. Zohar moved to table the Resolution until the October GA meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zachritz. Mr. Daal said that with no objection, they would come to a vote on the motion.

Mr. Kline asked if they could have people look at this some more before it comes up again. Mr. Daal said they could, and said that would be up to Mr. Marchand. Mr. Kline said he thought this should be taken seriously, with the time taken to actually craft it well. Mr. Daal said that if the motion to table passes, Mr. Marchand would have to respond.

The motion to table Resolution 1004b until the October GA meeting, passed by voice-vote, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement.

The following Resolution, 1004c, was authored by Jonathan Stein:

Resolution 1004c, To Affirm GA Support for Replacing California's Super majority Requirement - 40 - on the Budget with a Simple Majority (cont'd)

RESOLUTION TO AFFIRM THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S SUPPORT FOR REPLACING CALIFORNIA'S SUPERMAJORITY REQUIREMENT ON THE BUDGET WITH A SIMPLE MAJORITY

WHEREAS, the State of California requires every budget be passed with two-thirds support in both houses of its legislature; and

WHEREAS, the two-thirds supermajority requirement forces the legislative majority to compromise its vision every year in order to court votes from the minority; and

WHEREAS, this means that funding for public higher education is frequently cut or traded away; and

WHEREAS, in negotiations over the 2009-2010 budget, California's legislative majority sought to put \$1.2 billion toward higher education and social services, but was forced to put that money towards prisons in order to convince members of the minority to vote for the budget; and

WHEREAS, due to examples such as this one, funding for public higher education has gone from 16% of the General Fund in 1985 to 11% today, while funding for prisons has gone from 6% to 14% over the same timeframe; and

WHEREAS, there are multiple initiatives seeking to get on the November 2010 ballot that would replace the two-thirds supermajority with a 50% simple majority, effectively reinstating the majority's voice in California and likely leading to better treatment for the UC System; and

WHEREAS, the Coalition for a Strong UC is a student group started by UC Berkeley graduate students that is seeking to educate UC students about California's pernicious supermajority requirement and how it hurts public higher education;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly is in support of changing California's supermajority rule on budget to a simple majority.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly endorses the work of the Coalition for a Strong UC.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President and the External Affairs Vice President will send a letter to the Governor and the nine legislators who are within the UC Berkeley constituency stating these positions.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice President will partner a similar Resolution for the UCSA's support.

Jonathan Stein introduced himself and said he spoke to the GA at the last Delegates meeting about the Restore the Majority campaign. The last time he said that \$1.2 billion could have gone to public higher education in California. In the last budget cycle, Democrats cut \$1.2 billion from the prison budget and

put it towards public higher education and social services. But because Democrats were about 62%, both the Assembly and the Senate, they weren't able to pass the budget on their own because they had to get 66% in both the Assembly and the Senate, and had to go groveling to the minority to begin the process of negotiating and making cuts and so on. The process of securing just a few Republican votes, they had to cut that \$1.2 billion that could have gone towards higher education and social services and put it back towards prisons.

Mr. Stein said he could cite example after example of instances in which the two-thirds simple majority requirement on the budget has hurt the University of California and public higher education in the State of California. They are a student-led campaign supporting efforts to eliminate the two-thirds simple majority requirement and replace it with a 50% simple majority requirement. The Restore the Majority campaign has been endorsed by the ASUC as well as by the Cal Dems, the Young Democrats of California, and the College Democrats of California. They had campaigns going on there at Berkeley as well as multiple other UCs, and they have begun the process in the last few weeks of branching out to various campuses in the CSU System. They've had at that point an op-ed. in the *Washington Post* and were aiming for the *LA Times*. The process was ongoing and they're partnering with groups like the Teachers Union, the Nurses Union, the Firefighters Union, all of whom are behind this.

Mr. Stein said the Resolution would put graduate students at UC Berkeley behind this as well.

Mr. Haddad said there's another initiative that would restore raising revenues, and he asked why they shouldn't support that instead of the Resolution. Mr. Stein said that very early in the process there were three initiatives that tried to eliminate the simple majority requirement in California. One was written and led by a Berkeley professor, George Lakoff. That initiative did not get the signatures it needed to get on the November ballot and thus, that campaign was tabled until a later date. He thought they intended to get their initiative or some version on the 2011 ballot, but that can't be said for certain. Another one of the three faded away. It didn't have the financial support to get on the ballot. And in effect, there is now one. The one initiative will announce on Friday it has 1 million signatures, more than enough to make it on the November 2010 ballot. Originally, they were waiting to do an education campaign for all three initiatives, since all three had the power to help the UC System. Because there was now only one initiative, they'll more than likely to do a get out the vote campaign on behalf of that one issue.

Mr. Marchand said that was the objection. The goal of the External Affairs Committee they should just and support this one initiative that will make it on the ballot. External Affairs Committee submitted an amendment.

Mr. Daal asked if he was proposing that they approve the two amendments that they're calling for. Mr. Stein said that was correct. That was the motion and it was seconded. The motion to amend was to delete the current wording of the sixth Whereas Clause and replace that wording to have the sixth Whereas Clause read as follows:

“Whereas, the Majority Vote Budget Initiative, authored by Sen. Loni Hancock, is seeking to get on the November 2010 ballot, and would replace the two-thirds supermajority with a 50% simple majority, reinstating the majority’s voice in California and likely leading to better treatment for the UC System.”

Part of the amendment was to delete the word “pernicious” in the last Whereas Clause, to read as follows:

“Whereas, the Coalition for a Strong UC is a student group started by UC Berkeley graduate students that is seeking to educate UC students about California's supermajority requirement and how it hurts public higher education;”

Mr. Daal called for any objections to the amendments. THE AMENDMENTS WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Seeing no discussion, Mr. Daal said the question was automatically called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1004C, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO AFFIRM THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S SUPPORT FOR REPLACING CALIFORNIA'S SUPERMAJORITY REQUIREMENT ON THE BUDGET WITH A SIMPLE MAJORITY.

Mr. Daal said there was nothing left on their agenda and the meeting was adjourned. He would ask people to please fill out their feedback forms.

This meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

The following Resolution, 1104a, was approved by the GA as amended to read as follows:

Resolution to Create an Action Agenda Item Focused on Restructuring the GA Budget

Whereas, for the past several years the Graduate Assembly budget has been operating unsustainably by spending more than its revenues and drawing from its reserves; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly will no longer have the liquid reserves to maintain its current annual expenditures after 2010-2011; and

Whereas, applying uniform cuts to balance the budget makes the Graduate Assembly less effective in fulfilling its mission statement; and

Whereas, the budget of the Graduate Assembly therefore needs to be restructured in a more thoughtful and holistic way; and

Whereas, the scope required for such a restructuring would overwhelm the Budget Committee; and

Whereas, an independent body working closely with the Budget Committee, Executive Board, and other stakeholders could expedite the necessary budget restructuring;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that Sustainable Budget Restructuring will be an Action Agenda Item for the 2010-2011 academic year. The goal of Sustainable Budget Restructuring is to provide recommendations to the Budget chair that will inform the creation of a sustainable budget, one that does not draw from reserves, starting in the 2011-2012 academic year. In doing so, the chair will coordinate dialogues across the Graduate Assembly and synthesize current information from the Delegates, Officers, and the graduate community regarding effective fulfillment of the Graduate Assembly's mission with limited funds relative to previous years.

The following Resolution, 1104c, was approved by the GA as amended to read as follows:

To Affirm GA Support for Replacing California's Super majority Requirement on the Budget with a Simple Majority

Whereas, the State of California requires every budget be passed with two-thirds support in both houses of its legislature; and

Whereas, the two-thirds supermajority requirement forces the legislative majority to compromise its vision every year in order to court votes from the minority; and

Whereas, this means that funding for public higher education is frequently cut or traded away; and

Whereas, in negotiations over the 2009-2010 budget, California's legislative majority sought to put \$1.2 billion toward higher education and social services, but was forced to put that money towards prisons in order to convince members of the minority to vote for the budget; and

Whereas, due to examples such as this one, funding for public higher education has gone from 16% of the General Fund in 1985 to 11% today, while funding for prisons has gone from 6% to 14% over the same timeframe; and

Whereas, the Majority Vote Budget Initiative, authored by Sen. Loni Hancock, is seeking to get on the November 2010 ballot, and would replace the two-thirds supermajority with a 50% simple majority, reinstating the majority's voice in California and likely leading to better treatment for the UC System.

Whereas, the Coalition for a Strong UC is a student group started by UC Berkeley graduate students that is seeking to educate UC students about California's supermajority requirement and how it hurts public higher education;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly is in support of changing California's supermajority rule on budget to a simple majority.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly endorses the work of the Coalition for a Strong UC.

Be It Further Resolved, that the President and the External Affairs Vice President will send a letter to the Governor and the nine legislators who are within the UC Berkeley constituency stating these positions.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the External Affairs Vice President will partner a similar Resolution for the UCSA's support.