

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 6, 2003

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- [Heard general announcements.](#)
- [Heard a report from AGSE/UAW](#)
- [Heard a presentation on a college newspaper readership program.](#)
- [Heard a presentation on various policy issues affecting grad students.](#)
- [Participated in a survey on UC student perspectives on nuclear weapons.](#)
- [Heard an update on revisions to the Code of Student Conduct.](#)
- [Heard a report from the Executive Board, including the result of funding appeals from student groups.](#)
- [Approved a recommendation from the Executive Board to transfer money to the budget of the Events Coordinator.](#)
- [Approved, as amended, the Resolution to Protect and Promote Academic Freedom, Civil Liberties, and Civil Rights Against the USA Patriot Act, and Related Directives and Executive Orders.](#)
- [Heard a report from the Funding Committee and approved the Committee's recommendations on Round 3 of Grad Events allocations.](#)
- [Approved the UC Student Association's three Action Agenda items.](#)
- [Elected Rishi Sharma as Chair of the Finance Committee.](#)
- [Approved a Draft of Procedures for the Appointment of Student Representatives to Administrative Committees Appointed by the Central Campus Administration.](#)
- [Approved the Resolution on Graduate Student Autonomy.](#)
- [Approved the Resolution on the Placement of the Graduate Assembly President on the Store Operations Board.](#)
- [Approved the Resolution In Support of Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations.](#)
- [Considered the Resolution In Support of UC Berkeley's Affiliation with the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab and referred it to an ad hoc committee. Elected Mr. Kearnes as Chair of the ad hoc committee.](#)
- [Heard a report and budget update from the GA Manager.](#)
- [Heard Officers' reports.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's representatives on the Graduate Council.](#)

-

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Jessica Quindel at 5:44 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Quindel said they were late because the doors were locked.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Quindel said she was asked to clarify this part of the agenda. Approving it means they approve the following agenda. If people have any objection to the agenda, such as if they'd like to add or remove something, they could object to approval in order to have further consideration.

Mr. Furmanski said he would like to add a Resolution, In Support of Academic Freedom Throughout the UC. It was similar in scope but separate in content from the last Resolution dealing with academic freedom at UC. The original bill had two separate ideas that the GA chose to divide into two Resolutions. Ms. Quindel asked if people needed more information, and said it would be added as item K) in New Business. They'd allot five minutes for it. The motion to add the Resolution to New Business passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to the agenda. THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approval of the minutes from the October meeting.

Mr. Akiba submitted a correction to the September minutes. A By-law change was recorded as saying that, "As long as a request for assignment to a committee had one to 15 people, everybody would get their first preference." That was recorded incorrectly, and in the October meeting, he tried to correct it to say, "As long as a request for assignment to a committee had five to 15 people, everybody would get their first preference. However, the attempted correction was recorded incorrectly and the minutes from the October meeting reads, "The minutes should read 'as long as a request for

assignment to a committee had one to five people..." Mr. Akiba said his motion was to correct both the September and October minutes, and record the September By-law change as saying that, "as well as a request for assignment to a committee had five to five people...."

THE MINUTES TO THE OCTOBER 2, 2003 MEETING, AS AMENDED,
WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Quindel said she wanted to welcome everybody to the November GA meeting. They have GA mugs that were left over that some Delegates might recall, and they'd like to give out. She would ask Delegates to take them, and to use them for the GA's coffee hour. They also had GA posters, and she'd like each person to take at least one for their department. She would ask them to post it in a very visible area. The poster includes information on GA funding opportunities, how to get involved, projects and services the GA provides, the new Grad Social Club Web site, which will go live any day now, and announces the monthly GA meeting. The GA wants to be more public and have more input, so she would ask them to please put the posters up and to take at least one on their way out. She would ask them to please put them up in their departments. Lastly, Ms. Quindel said she would like to announce that they have a new Graduate Women's Resource Guide, and she would ask them to please take them for women in their departments. The Guide is really neat, and has been updated for the 2003 version. She called for any other GA announcements.

Ms. Davis said that for anybody who's new, she's the Grad Support Services Project Coordinator. She would apologize for not being able to make it to the last GA meeting, but she was out of town. She wanted to draw people's attention to her staff report. They have another workshop that month. It addresses issues of depression and social isolation in grad school, and strategies to avoid depression, or deal with it if it's something they face. Unlike the other workshops, this is only offered once per year. She'll send out e-mail as they get closer to the date. She wanted to thank Delegates for sending the messages along.

Ms. Madon said they had a teach-in on fee increases and shifting funding in the State to education. They had a great attendance, about 45 people, and she also wanted to alert Delegates to a sign-up sheet going around for the UCSA's action at the Regents meeting next Wednesday, November 19, at UCLA. There are two goals for the action. The first is to call on the UC Regents to support full funding of the University of California budget, and to refrain from proposing measures such as fee increase or enrollment attacks. The second goal is to join a large coalition of groups interested in education, and launching a petition to reduce incarceration and shift funds from the Corrections Department to the Department of Education. Delegates will get more explanation when

the UCSA Action Agenda is presented later. If people want, they could wait to sign until after the presentation.

Mr. Valleé said the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture will occur on Thursday, November 20. The Lecture is sponsored by the GA and it will take place in Pauley Ballroom. The speaker is Amy Goodman, host of KPFA's "Democracy Now." Mr. Valleé said he's in charge of outreach for the campus, and one thing he needed help with is getting the word out to departments. He would pass around a sign-up sheet so if people could let him know if they're willing to help with outreach. He'd pass around fliers.

Ms. Madon said the latest version of the "Electric Grad Newsletter" was out and has links to the Lecture and details about the depression workshop. It's online at GA.Berkeley.edu. "The Electric Grad."

A Delegate said the Grad Social Club doesn't have a large event that month. They're going for smaller stuff, like dancing, pool hall nights, and perhaps a karaoke night. As a general aside, if people don't get notice of these events in their departments, it would be great if they could let the Social Club know so they can figure out other ways to get information out to departments. Ms. Quindel called for any general announcements.

Mr. Akiba said there's a report on committees in their packet. He asked how many there were actually assigned to a committee. The GA has 11 committees and not that many people are assigned. They have a shortage, and as they know, many committees have not been able to convene yet. One requirement is for each department to have at least one member on a committee. So if Delegates' departments don't have such a person, he would ask them to please contact Chris Cantor. Mr. Akiba said that also applied to his Committee, the Organization and Rules Committee. They only have four or five members, and they need at least four members to take any action. So they're at the bare minimum to just operate. If anybody could help out, he would ask them to please contact him.

Mr. Astoria said the GSI Committee was actively soliciting ideas for projects. So if Delegates had anything they'd like to call to the Committee's attention, they should talk to him after.

Mr. Cantor said that to round this out, it was a specific call for people who haven't been put on a committee. To quickly explain their responsibility as a Delegate, every department is responsible for having one person sit on a committee, to be a representative of a department, and they need to know who in their department was on which committee. He had the sign-up sheet. Mr. Cantor said one thing they're supposed to do when they come in is to mark that they're present. So he would send the sign-up sheet around, if they didn't do that. There's a call for people to join a committee, and there were instructions on the sheet. So they just had to follow those instructions and write down their committee, or the name of the person in their department who's on a committee, or their preference for a committee, as per what's included in their agenda packets. They can look at the descriptions of the committees and specify what they'd like

to be assigned to. Also, he would ask them to pick up their name tag if they haven't done so.

A Delegate said that on last month's sign-up sheet they were given committees, and asked if that meant they're assigned to a committee. Mr. Cantor said that people were assigned committees as per the By-laws, but some people can't make their committee times, and there was no way to force people to be members. So if they couldn't make their committee, or didn't show up, they should assume they're not on the committee and should re-assign themselves. Ms. Quindel said people should write their preference on the sheet.

Ms. Quindel said each committee will submit a couple of sentences each month to report what they're doing. Mr. Akiba will solicit that from committee chairs.

AGSE/UAW REPORT

Raj introduced himself and said he was on the bargaining team and would like to thank Ms. Quindel for giving money time to give an update on the bargaining. Both sides have agreed to voluntary impasse mediation, which will begin next week. There will be a mediator who will hopefully hash out a solution. If both sides agree to it, that would be great, and if not, they're back to where they started. Delegates should have been getting e-mails about updates of the situation, and if they haven't, they should let the Union know. They've received responses about unfair labor practices, with people asking what they are. Part of the problem is that e-mails are heavily edited. The Union filed an unfair labor practice charge for surface bargaining, where the Union wastes its time at the table because UC says they'll think about something a little more. Or the campus will talk about talking about bargaining issues, or make regressive proposals, where they offer something and then at the next session come back and say they're not offering those things any more. There was also a refusal to bargain in general, sending people to the table who lack the authority to bargain. This has happened in several instances, where people across the table say they don't have the authority to make a decision on the topic being bargained. Those are the general unfair labor practice charges. There have been 64 filed before the strike, and more since the strike. Another speaker said there were upwards of 100 at that point.

AGSE/UAW Report

(cont'd)

5 -

A Delegate asked if they could clarify examples of unfair labor practices that were not related to bargaining in bad faith. A speaker said all of the unfair labor practices the Union filed have been related to bargaining, all of them. Unfair labor practices on the

part of the University would include prohibiting access to units, such as a department refusing to allow the Union to speak to GSIs, readers, and tutors. That's an unfair labor practice, but it's not something the Union has filed about. All the ones they filed have been around bargaining. That's what the Union is concerned about, bargaining, and finishing this contract so they can work under a contract.

A Delegate asked about the main issues on the table. Raj said they can't go into the details of the issues, but one thing that became an issue, and is the reason the talks broke down before the contract was signed, is a change University proposed to the contract language, the no-strike clause. It was supposed to be for business, and would prohibit going on strike in sympathy with other unions. That happened a year ago, when CUE, AFT, and the lecturers went on strike. The Union supported that strike and requested that people in their Union not cross the picket line, and the University is trying to prevent that from happening. The implied idea is to keep the unions isolated from each other and to allow the University to have its way. That's something the Union very strongly opposes because it would prevent them from being able to support other unions on campus. Another speaker said they're also fighting for full fee remissions for international students which is very discriminatory right now. International students can't get that because they can't get in-State tuition. The Union is also fighting for increases in wages. The University cheated them out of 6% increases it said they would give the last time around. Economics are hard to fight for right now, but the Union was trying.

One of the most important things they need to win is workload arbitration. Right now, in every area, except for workload, they have independent arbitration they can go to if the grievance procedure fails. So they can get an outside arbitrator to make decisions that are legally binding. Right now the University is refusing to allow arbitration in the case of workload because they say that it's an academic judgment issue, and only professors have authority. But in some cases, it's the professors who are exploiting their workers, and are the ones who make that judgment. That's something the Union obviously doesn't agree with. She didn't mean to imply that all professors exploit their workers because that's obviously not the case. But that's really an important issue for the Union.

Mr. Barnes asked if there was a place to get information on the contract to let their constituents know what their rights are. Raj said it's on the UAW Web site, uaw2865. People could also call the Union if they have questions. He would encourage Delegates to call people in their departments and get back to the Union if they have questions. The phone number is 549-3863. Another speaker said she would ask them to please call if they have any questions.

PRESENTATIONS

-

-

College Readership Program

Ms. Quindel said they have a presentation from USA Today. Ms. Savage asked if anybody was familiar with the Collegiate Readership Conference. Her objective was to give them an overview of that program. They're looking to come to campus and do a pilot program that wouldn't cost the school anything. The newspapers absorb the cost and were just looking for support. The program started at Penn State in 1997, and there are now 250 college campuses involved. It started in res halls and expanded to campus-wide programs. The idea is to give students the ability to pick up a variety of newspapers on campus at no cost. There are open-air displays near res halls, or secure buildings or lock boxes on campus that students can open with their ID, so students don't have to pay anything at the moment. The school picks what newspapers participate. The program is coordinated by USA Today, which can handle any number of publications at the same time. There's one source of contact and distribution and the paper puts the copies in and takes them out on a daily basis. The idea is to break that bubble for college and university students and bring the real world into the classroom, with what they're studying, to show how those same situations happen in the real world. It's hard to get students locked in, especially when they're so busy. USA Today surveys regularly at the beginning of a project and annually asks questions about usage of papers, how students utilize newspapers in classroom participation, whether or not they vote, etc. The paper does all kinds of things with these studies. They're seeing a greater engagement of civil responsibility, greater participation in classrooms, and a greater comfort in general in having a newspaper. As the program expands across campus, in res halls and campus-wide programs, they get a lot more input from professors and instructors about using newspapers as a textbook and incorporating them their curriculum.

Ms. Savage they find that when newspapers are available and the choices are right, students will read them. Their surveys say that the vast majority of students feel it's important to their education. Having a newspaper available contributes to students reading it.

Ms. Savage said the next slide shows what some of the displays look like. The bins are approved by the Fire Marshall and papers that are removed are put in recycling bins. USA.college.com is a component open to anybody right now, and gives lots of case studies that were put together. It has in-depth studies in the first years' experiences and dealing with politics, science and health. The Web site presents articles in a format that's accessible and easy to use. First-year experience might be such topics as credit cards, binge drinking, or date rape in res halls, or leadership.

As for funding, right now the campus-wide programs cost \$5 per semester per student, and they like to put in three papers. So it costs \$10 a year for students. As to where schools find the money, it usually comes from a combination of sources, different people to chip in a little bit. Once they're at that point on campus they help to help find the funds. Money can come from the Chancellor's office or the Athletic Department. Ms. Quindel called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about some of the typical papers that are offered. Ms. Savage said they recommend a newspaper like USA Today, a regional paper, and a local paper. In this

case it could be the Chronicle and the New York Times. They'd include the Daily Cal in all displays. The school chooses the papers. The only paper that has refused to participate in the program is the Wall Street Journal. With the operation the paper has, it can't make it work.

A Delegate asked if the USA Today could not be a choice. Ms. Savage said they could choose to not use USA Today, although she thought that would be a serious mistake. USA Today is the only newspaper that can handle this. Other papers don't have the technology. The New York Times doesn't have a distribution system and has local distribution done for it, so people end up with two bills and two separate sets of things. USA Today's technology allows them to do this efficiently. A Delegate moved to extend speaking time by three minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Stagi said it seemed like there's a generic quality to USA Today, and as grads, they need more incisive commentary. He asked if it was possible to get an alternative to USA Today. Ms. Savage said it was possible, to give some information, they're only 22 years old and it's the number one newspaper in the US. Their circulation is double the circulation of anybody else. Businesspeople read the paper. The slide shows a list of some of the exclusives the paper has had in the last month. The USA Today is the newspaper of choice of businesspeople, and if one is interested in what's happening in business, USA Today is the number one choice. They know who they're talking to, and know who their audience is. They're not the paper they were 22 years ago. The paper has worked really hard to gain respect. People have to read the paper on a regular basis and they can see the difference. A reason that's why, for the program, they believe there should be three newspapers.

Ms. Pedersen asked if it was possible to do a subscription service such as for the gym, or if it has to be University-wide. Ms. Savage said they could do distribution anywhere. The problem with subscriptions is that it costs \$100 a year, or more. This readership program covers the campus at \$10 per student per year. The paper discounts this heavily.

A Delegate asked if there was a demand for this. Ms. Savage said that's why they'd like to do a pilot program, after which they'd know. The Delegate said it seemed more people get news online.

Ms. Quindel said the question was whether grads generally like the idea and are interested in the pilot program possibly at least interested in a pilot program, and then possibly the program. She said they would take a straw poll of general opinion. She asked if people liked the pilot program, and noted that it was free. She asked people to raise their hands if they were interested in the GA committing any money to research this program. A straw poll was taken. Ms. Quindel said that was just a straw poll and wasn't official. She said Ms. Savage asked her this question and she suggested asking the Delegates. Ms. Quindel said that people want to hear what happens with the pilot program and after that they'll look at the proposal again.

Update on Policy Issues Concerning Grad Students

Ms. Madon said she would distribute a copy of the slides that would be shown. This was an update of what was happening and was provided by grads on campus-wide committees. As many of them know, there was a furor over admissions stirred up by Chairman Morres, who attacked comprehensive review. A Delegate said he pretends he's in favor of it. Ms. Madon said he's accusing the University of using back door affirmative action by use of comprehensive review. As they know, since Prop. 209, affirmative action was no longer legal for the UC System. Other concerns related to admissions at UC, involve cuts to the UC budget. That budget situation has resulted in some Regents considering Systemwide enrollment caps, or cuts. This is problematic because the Master Plan from the State Legislature dictates how many people are granted admission to UC. In response to all of these problems, the UC Office of the President had a working group on admissions. Ironically, even though it should be under the jurisdiction of the faculty, it only has two Academic Senate members, out of 17 total, along with administrators and Regents. While this is all for undergrad admission, it hits all of them because it impacts on diversity on campus and in the courses grads teach, and in their own student populations, eventually, since this is a pool for the grad student community on campus. There is a task force on campus looking at the balance between grad and undergrad enrollment and whether or not they have enough grads. They're mandated to have 25% grads and 75% undergrads. Some University considered on a par for research have as much as 50% grads. A lot of faculty would like to see more grads.

Ms. Madon said that regarding new research initiatives on campus, it's important for grads to know about new programs because grads do the research and make these programs into undergrad majors and sustainable programs. These new areas include computational biology and nanosciences and nanoengineering, an interdisciplinary effort. Berkeley lags on this point and most major research universities are far ahead of them. Others new research initiatives include regional and metropolitan studies, looking at the political boundaries of human populations and geographic boundaries; new media; an integrated and comprehensive approach to solve environmental problems on the scale of the entire earth. If grads are interested in these new initiatives getting implemented on the Berkeley campus, the Oversight Committee will address them.

Third, regarding free speech, the UC Berkeley Chancellor froze student fee money, \$35,000, to prevent spending by student governments for student education. This is the reason for the UC free speech working group. Ms. Quindel is on that committee, and if grads were interested, work is underway to protest the Chancellor's freezing those funds, to protect free speech for the University, for students, and for student governments nationwide. Also grads have a monthly meeting, the Grad Salon, to talk about these topics. It will next be held on November 19. Hopefully a bunch of alums from the original Free Speech Movement in the '60s have been invited. As for mental health, some statistics were interesting. There's been a 300% increase in demand by students for

psychiatric visits for health services, and students are having problems of greater severity and that are more acute. Eighty-five percent of mental health units report increases in student problems and severity of those problems. Suicide is the third leading cause of death for people their age, 19 to 24. There's a lot of depression and suicide, especially at UC Berkeley. Last year their rate of suicide was twice the national average for their age group, and they need a strategic plan to protect mental health. If Delegates were interested, there's a mental health task force, through the GA, addressing some of these issues. They're also trying to get the Academic Senate involved in encouraging the faculty to reach out to grads when they see or recognize a problem.

Ms. Madon start the fifth slide deals with sexual harassment. There's a new UC policy that might impact GSIs, dealing with consensual relationships between GSIs and students. They have to remove themselves from any supervisory role or responsibility over that individual. Faculty, took an online tutorial on sexual harassment on these issues and a similar thing will be implemented for grads.

Ms. Madon said that last week there were a bunch of activities against the Patriot Act. If people were interested in exploring how grads are impacted by the Patriot Act, particularly how international students have to deal with some of the new relationships, she would encourage them to join the Foreign Student Affairs Committee, through the GA, and stand up for international students' rights, even if they're not American, since they all benefit from having international students. Ms. Madon said Delegates could read the other policy issue updates. Mr. Vallée moved to extend speaking time by three minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Madon said that regarding faculty mentoring of grad researchers, there was an initiative on the Berkeley campus to get faculty to better mentor their GSIs. This was born out of a proposal by the GA, through the Academic Senate, to have some language that faculty and students can use to describe expectations, and how grads can get what they need to succeed in their research career. The GA is also sponsoring an award for mentoring. Regarding student fees, Delegates may have read the article in the Daily Cal that day about the technology fee. They just had 40% in fee hikes over the last year, and fees are always being proposed. Fee issues are very complex, and sometimes there's a compelling need for new fees on campus. One problem is that increasing fees limits access to international students, because out-of-State student fees are exorbitant and limit access to lower-income students and families. Non-resident fees at UC Berkeley have increased 54% in the last five years, and resident fees have climbed 37%. So there's a disproportionate penalty for being from out-of-State, which is the case for all international students. The argument is that Berkeley is a world-class University, but if they can't have the world's scholars working there at the University, they lose that status. Another issue is that academic journal rates are very extortionary. Their library used to be fourth best in the nation and they're on a decline. One idea is to look at alternative publishing mechanism, with free, open access, online pushing, and creating their own peer-reviewed distribution systems, possibly like PLoS. They need to create new alternatives for publishing academic work because otherwise it's not free and not as accessible to the entire academic community and beyond. These journal subscriptions

are ridiculous expenses Systemwide. The UC spends \$8 million for electronic access, and there are three major publishing houses that sort of have a monopoly. This is a problem and as future faculty, it's something for the GA to think about, and how they can contribute.

UC Student Perspectives on Nuclear Weapons

Mr. Valleé said he distributed a survey to get a sense of people's knowledge of nuclear weapons. Taking the survey has been allotted five minutes at the meeting, but he didn't think it would take that long. Ms. Quindel asked Delegates to fill it out, and said Mr. Valleé would collect them later.

Mr. Valleé said the survey was being done to get an idea of what grads know about nuclear weapons issues. It's being done by a coalition of students and training groups, the Western States Legal Foundation, and the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

Update on the Code of Student Conduct Revisions.

Mr. Akiba said he would give some background. This is a process undertaken by the University about every seven years, to review the Code of Student Conduct revisions. This is the Code under which grads and undergrads are charged with breaches of the Code of Conduct, and brought into a special review process. This process is usually convened by a committee of administrators, faculty, and students. This year there was a little concern when the revisions were undertaken because a report was drafted on the committee's findings, and recommendations were made without the committee actually approving that report. So there was some student concern there wouldn't be adequate student representation. The committee is reforming that semester. They're looking at academic dishonesty in the digital age, plagiarism that talks about computer code, not just language, and other aspects of plagiarism. The second stage will look civil disobedience, and create a code of student conduct that accommodates acts of civil disobedience and treats them accordingly.

Mr. Akiba said he distributed a hand out explaining the content of the revision. It's drastic, and such change hasn't taken place for 40 years. The main change is to alter the whole principle of the Code of Student Conduct from legal and adversarial, something that looks like a trial. Students have lawyers represent them, and can confront witnesses, and prosecutors. The committee in charge of revising the Code of Conduct doesn't like that idea, that students legally can test the proceedings. So they're changing the principle from legal to educational, and will now call this an "educational" process. The practical consequences of this would deprive a lot of due process rights that students used to have. One of the more serious changes is that students will no longer have representation by lawyers, nor by the ASUC Student Advocate. Hearings would be generally closed unless the University agreed otherwise. So all controversial cases would probably be

closed to the public. UC Berkeley has the tradition of civil disobedience, and groups tend to be charged for trespass or disturbing the peace. The other issue is whether or not they'd be able to maintain that tradition of free speech with this revision. There was language included in the packet from 1964, by a scholar at Boalt Hall, who pointed out to the University that it was dangerous for the University to restrict free speech since it's difficult to decide what speech should be restricted, and because the University doesn't have a strict procedure to ensure that the regulations are not abused. The current Code was written in response to that, to ensure a lot of due process rights and to keep University regulations from being abused. What they're seeing now is a possible reversal of that.

Mr. Akiba said he wanted to point out one thing. The committee will specifically discuss civil disobedience, and the GA needs to keep an attentive eye on how such issues will be dealt with. A representative was present from the ASUC Student Advocate Office, if she wanted to talk about the office.

Lanie introduced herself and said she was from the Student Advocate Office, one of the Executive Offices of the ASUC. They're involved in this process. Dave Madon, the Student Advocate, sat on the committee that is looking at the Student Code of Conduct. They're trying to be active in ensuring that some things are cut out of the new Codes, so that representation is allowed. That's one goal of the office, to provide representation to students. Mr. Akiba called for a quorum.

Mr. Cruz asked if this would need approval from the Academic Senate and asked if there was a timeline. Ms. Madon said the process would go on for the entire year. This has occurred in three phases, and last year was the third phase. A motion to extend speaking time by three minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Madon said the question will be reviewed by committees in the Academic Senate, on which grads and undergrads have input. The new Code will have to be approved by the Administration, via the Chancellor, who has to sign off on it. A lot more work has to be done in committee in terms of addressing these concerns.

Mr. Cruz asked if there a vote of the Academic Senate was required. Ms. Madon said all that's formally required is the Chancellor's signature. Mr. Akiba said there's a problem with the Chancellor signing off on it, so the GA needs to monitor the process. The final report came out without a vote of the committee, and they need to make sure that that doesn't occur again. Ms. Quindel called for any other questions.

NEW BUSINESS

-

-
Report from the Executive Board

Ms. Day said she would report on appeals regarding the Funding Committee. There were two appeals as a result of the last round of funding allocations. Appeals were from the Students for Justice in Palestine and the Berkeley New Music Project. The groups didn't feel they received enough funding. The Executive Board allocated \$250 to the SJP as a result of that appeal, as long as the group follows guidelines. The Board did not allocate any money to the Berkeley New Music Project on the basis that the event won't be held until next semester, and the group has more opportunities to apply for future funding rounds, for both grants and events.

Ms. Molina said the GA office has been involved in conversation with different units of the University, including the Academic Senate and the Grad Division, units with which they collaborate. It's especially important because the Grad Division funds two projects, the Graduate Minority Students Project and the Graduate Women's Project. When funding is involved, the GA has to clarify what management relationships exist, and what definition they had for student-initiated projects. The GA has had conversations with Dean Mason and Dean Kim, from the Grad Division, to lay out and codify this structure. Even though there is good will, they want to make sure they're clear as to who has jurisdiction on projects and how to manage them.

Ms. Madon said the Academic Affairs Committee reviews University policy. One item was the academic calendar, with next year's calendar to be just a little longer than this year's. The Fall Semester will be extended by three days, which means the campus cut dead days, the reading period between the last day of classes and the first day of exams. That action was very problematic for unions. The Academic Affairs Committee looked at this as grads and the Executive Board approved a letter. There was a recommendation that dead days not be cut. The final response to the letter from the Administration is they are cut dead days by one day, in spite of student concerns. A committee will be convened, including grads, undergrads, administrators, and faculty, to look at the best way to do this, without hurting students and their grades.

A Delegate said the GA allocated money at the last meeting to a speakers budget and discussed spending some of that for Michael Moore and Jackson Katz. There was money left over. The Event Coordinator had a much smaller budget than what was required, so the Executive Board decided to take those remaining funds they didn't need and take \$4,150 for the Events Coordinator, for her film and speakers budget, instead of having this as discretionary funds without having the machinery in place to allocate it. That, and a little more than \$8,900 from carry-forward will be given to the Events Coordinator to carry out all events that were granted in her budget.

Ms. Quindel called for any questions. The Executive Board was basically asking for approval. The Board deliberated on this a long time. She called for any objection to approval.

Mr. Sharma asked if this was a transfer. Ms. Quindel said \$8,997 was from carry-forward to the Event Coordinator's budget, for events for grads. This allocation also comes from \$4,150 from the speakers fund.

Hearing no other speakers, Ms. Quindel said the question was automatically called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE EXECUTIVE BOARD'S DECISION TO TRANSFER MONEY TO THE EVENT COORDINATOR'S BUDGET PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution

Resolution to Protect and Promote Academic Freedom, Civil Liberties, and Civil Rights
- 12 -
Against the USA Patriot Act, and Related Directives and Executive Orders

Mr. Akiba said Jeff Coates, a co-author of a Resolution, had to leave, and asked if the GA could consider the Resolution at that time, so the GA could hear the speaker. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

The following Resolution was co-authored by the Berkeley ACLU and was co-authored and sponsored by Mr. Akiba:

RESOLUTION TO PROTECT AND PROMOTE ACADEMIC FREEDOM, CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND CIVIL RIGHTS AGAINST THE USA PATRIOT ACT, AND RELATED DIRECTIVES AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS

WHEREAS, the University of California, Berkeley has a diverse population, including non-citizens, whose contributions to the campus are vital to its character and function; and

WHEREAS, the University of California, Berkeley and all of its members, including non-citizens, are governed and protected by the United States Constitution, its Bill of Rights, and the California State Constitution; and

WHEREAS, fundamental rights granted by the United States Constitution are threatened by passage of sections of the USA Patriot Act, the Homeland Security Act and several Executive Orders which allegedly, among other things:

- Violate the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution through the expansion of the government's ability to wiretap telephones, monitor e-mail communications, survey medical, financial and student records, and secretly enter homes and offices without customary administrative oversight or without showing of probable cause;

- Violate the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting the freedom of association and assembly;
- Give law enforcement expanded authority to obtain library records, and prohibits librarians from informing patrons of monitoring or information requests;
- Violate the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution in establishing secret military tribunals, and in subjecting citizens and non-citizens to indefinite detention even while depriving them of right to counsel and right to trial;
- Authorize eavesdropping on communications between lawyers and their clients; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley opposes discrimination against any person solely on the basis of ancestry, race, ethnic or national origin, color, age, sexual orientation, gender, religion, physical or mental disability; and

WHEREAS, full protection of academic freedom, civil liberties and civil rights, and an atmosphere respectful of the dignity of all members in the community, are essential to academic inquiry

RESOLUTION TO PROTECT AND PROMOTE ACADEMIC FREEDOM, CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND CIVIL RIGHTS AGAINST THE USA PATRIOT ACT, AND RELATED DIRECTIVES AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS (cont'd)

(including all research and education) as well as civic engagement, which constitute the core missions of our University; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Berdahl has established several administrative committees (such as the joint Administrative/SISS Task Force on the USA Patriot Act) to oversee the campus's response to the Act and related legislation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley that it has been, and remains, firmly committed to the protection of academic freedom, civil liberties and civil rights.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Graduate Assembly work proactively with the campus administration to protect and promote students' freedom of speech, assembly, and association, the right to privacy, the right to counsel and due process in judicial and administrative proceedings, and protection from unreasonable searches and seizures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly and the UC administration plan, promote, and participate in community dialogue on academic freedom, civil liberties and civil rights;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Graduate Assembly urge our federal legislative delegation to carefully monitor the implementation of the USA Patriot Act, related Directives and Executive Orders, and work actively toward the repeal of those portions that diminish the protection of academic freedom, civil liberties or civil rights;

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Graduate Assembly President, Jessica Quindel, shall mail this Resolution to the UC President, the Chancellor and all Vice Chancellors, members of campus committees and administrative units in charge of USA Patriot Act compliance, the Governor's office, and the California federal legislative delegation.

Mr. Akiba said this is the GA's response to the USA Patriot Act. There were a whole bunch the things involved in that Act, but as an example, he'd raise the concern about library records. The Act would allow the government to search people's library records and punish librarians if they notify people of the search. So the search had to be secret and librarians had to keep that secret. It concerns grads' freedom to read whatever they need without being second-guessed about their motives. And the Patriot Act was full of such provisions. He would have Mr. Coates explain.

Mr. Akiba said the Resolution lists possible violations of the Constitution and resolves that the GA is committed to civil rights, civil liberties, and academic freedom. In concrete terms, it asks for the GA to promote community dialogue on this issue and would also have the GA President write a letter to various administrators and policy makers expressing the GA's concern.

Mr. Coates introduced himself and said he was President of USA Patriot Act United. The Patriot Act passed in the Senate 98-1 and was signed into law on October 26, 2001. It was initially proposed as a very narrow act and in the morning of October 24, 2001, was replaced with a much broader, 350-page version, and was voted on that same morning, and approved, just a few hours later. Afterwards, some Congresspeople showed regret for having passed it in that manner, including Don Young, conservative representative from Alaska, said it was stupid, emotional voting because they didn't follow through or study it.

As for what's bad about the Patriot Act, Mr. Coates said it allows for indefinite detention of non-citizens. It minimizes judicial oversight of surveillance, allows for secret searches, and doesn't require residents there has been a physical search of their home. Domestic groups can be designated as terrorist organizations and non-citizens can be deported. Any records can be searched. It can lead to the investigation of American citizens for intelligence purposes. There have been 208 communities that have resolved to oppose the Patriot Act, spanning 35 states, including Statewide representatives

representing 26.2 million people, including North Carolina and Missouri. The ASUC passed a Resolution 18-0-1 to against the Patriot Act. Mr. Coates said he would like to mention the Student Code of Conduct, because they are very concerned about a provision in the code that allows audio tapes of hearings to be kept for five years. Under the Patriot Act, Section 215, the federal government can subpoena information without probable cause, including student records. That has the potential for being abused and allowing hearsay evidence. He was they upset about this personally. That's one reason to resolve against the Patriot Act. Not only that, it's also been used for non-terrorist investigations. A man was recently charged under the Patriot Act for manufacturing methamphetamine under a chemical weapons provision. A man making a pipe bomb was charged under the weapons of mass destruction provision, and on Wednesday some people were indicted as possible terrorists.

Mr. Hsu asked if an amendment would be accepted, for the GA to suggest to the City Council of Berkeley to pass a Resolution to make it illegal for City officials to comply with the Patriot Act. Mr. Coates said they helped the City draft a Resolution that was passed in opposition to the Patriot Act, and he didn't know if there was a non-compliance provision. Ms. Quindel asked if he wanted to write an amendment.

A Delegate said he would like to amend the bill, to add a Further Resolved, to read, "Resolved, that the GA calls upon the Academic Senate to support the GA's opposition to the Patriot Act." Mr. Akiba moved to extend speaking time by three minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate said the Academic Senate has already resolved to do that. Ms. Madon said the Academic Senate did pass a Resolution last Spring Semester in opposition to the Patriot Act and in support of academic freedom. But the ASUC just passed a Resolution that fall. So conceivably, the Academic Senate to re-pass its Resolution against the Patriot Act.

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

Ms. Ahn said that under the Patriot Act, citizens can be prosecuted for engaging in First Amendment activity and it's part of the reason it has to be partially motivated by non-First Amendment activity, which is 99% First activity and 1% non-First Amendment activity, while non-citizens can be prosecuted solely for First Amendment activity. So this has large consequences on the international student community and on grads engaging in political activity in general.

Resolution to Protect and Promote Academic Freedom, Civil Liberties, and Civil Rights

- 15 -

Against the USA Patriot Act, and Related Directives and Executive Orders (cont'd)

A Delegate asked if the GA has passed anything in relation to the Patriot Act in past years. Ms. Quindel said only that year's GA counts. They had a Resolution related to international students last year. Ms. Ahn said there has been a GA Resolution about the Patriot Act. Ms. Quindel said they could get back to that question via e-mail.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO PROTECT AND PROMOTE ACADEMIC FREEDOM, CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND CIVIL RIGHTS AGAINST THE USA PATRIOT ACT, AND RELATED DIRECTIVES AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Report from the Funding Committee

Ms. Day introduced herself and said she was the Funding Committee Chair. The Funding Committee was allocated \$15,000 at the last Delegates meeting and the Committee decided to split it, allocating \$7,500 that semester and \$7,500 next semester. They put all that \$7,500 into events because there was still a real lack of funds to student group projects. She wanted to ask Delegates to make sure that applications they submit are complete. The Funding Committee needs crucial information in order to make decisions that are based on a per activity limit. Another crucial element is that there's no retroactive funding, so if their events fall within a specified timeline, she would ask them to please make a note of that, since people depend on funding. Lastly, she would note to any representative present from the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, that there was a typo in the report in the agenda packet. In the report, the comment should say that \$1,000 was the maximum the Funding Committee allocated for travel to make sure they don't spend more than that. She called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about the funding period for this round. Ms. Day said it's November 7 to December 12.

Mr. Sharma asked if forms and information online can be updated. Ms. Quindel said it was a difficult process to get a Web site up. It will be up any day now, and they'll send out an e-mail. Ms. Day said the dates are listed on the forms that people pick up at the GA. So they should try to pick up new forms rather than using forms from last year.

Mr. Stagi said there was a question about applying at the initial round. Ms. Day said Projects and Services has a second round. Mr. Stagi said C&RP wanted to do a project in their student lounge and didn't anticipate having a lot of time, three weeks into the semester. They really would have liked to do it within the first several weeks, and asked if there was a provision for that. Ms. Day said that for the first few weeks of the semester they have round one, which is for events and special events. A group could apply at the beginning of August for this funding. They don't have Projects and Services grants offered in the first round because not many people apply. Mr. Stagi said he was referring

to the second semester, and projects that don't apply until the 7th. Ms. Quindel said he could probably take that up later. She said the time for the report had elapsed, so they'd call the question approval of the report. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FUNDING COMMITTEE FOR ROUND THREE OF GRADUATE EVENTS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

UCSA Action Agenda and
Budget

- 16 -

UCSA Action Agenda & Budget

Ms. Quindel said they weren't going to approve the UCSA budget until next month, and would look at the Action Agenda items only. The budget was not yet online. It will be up next month, and there will be a lot of notice.

Ms. Molina said the UCSA's Action Agenda was included in the packet. The UCSA is composed of grad and undergrad representatives from the nine UC campus student governments, with 18 bodies constituting the UCSA as an organization. Each campus sends representatives to the UCSA's Board of Directors. From Berkeley, their representatives are the External Affairs Vice President, the Legislative Liaison, and the Campus Organizing Director. The UCSA Board is very important because it's officially recognized by the University of California, the UC Office of the President, the Regents, and the State. It serves as the official voice of the students across California, which means it can be on legislative committees related to higher education. They have a Lobbying Director and is recognized, so it has a lot of power. They have a staff of four people dealing with legislative, University, and campus affairs. So the UCSA has staff actively working full-time for the agenda of the Board, and representing the larger body. So it's an extremely important organization and one that she felt the GA should be as involved in as possible. Next weekend they're hosting the next UCSA Board meeting. Meetings are open and will be held in the Senate Chamber all day, on Saturday and on Sunday. So if people want to step in and see what the UCSA is all about, she would welcome them coming.

Ms. Molina said that another good thing about the UCSA is that it upholds the autonomy of grads and undergrads. They're equally represented, even though grads have proportionately fewer numbers. Undergrads have a higher volunteer level so grads benefit from undergrads' volunteerism. The Action Agenda was arrived at from a Congress held that year at UC Davis. The GA sent an unprecedented number of Officers and members of the graduate body at-large, proposed Action Agenda items, hashed them out, argued over them, and tried to come to a consensus, and then voted for them.

Ms. Molina said the three Action Agenda items for this year were listed. The first is "Prioritize Education: Freeze Fee Increases -- a.k.a. Education Not Incarceration." This was really important. The 1992 "Berkeley Graduate" had a front-page article on this issue, and back then, education and the Department of Corrections had equal funding. But at this point the budget for incarceration has increased by more than 300%, while only about 30% for education. Back then it was equal, and now it's more of an issue. By 2000, it fell under the radar. She would pass around an information sheet. The proposal is, for this budget cycle, to really take a hard look at the Department of Corrections' budget and how it's increased year after year, while education has received cut. The UCSA calls upon the State Legislature to look at that and try to take some steps that other states have taken, to decrease funding for corrections and decrease incarceration, and shift that funding to education. Ms. Molina said she was trying to educate people about this. If grads were interested, they should give her a call.

The second UCSA Action Agenda item was a real success, "UC Unites for Sustainability." The California Student Sustainability Coalition got the UC Regents to pass a code mandating that 25% of energy resources used on campuses are renewable and that all new buildings follow green building practices. So right now it's about making sure that gets implemented.

The third UCSA Action Agenda item is "Racial Justice: Focus on Proposition 54 and Funding for Student-Initiated Outreach." Ms. Molina said this Action Agenda item is continued from last year. They organized around No on 54 and they were very concerned about the 50% cut made to funding that is allocated to student-initiated outreach, the Recruitment and Retention Centers on campus. This cut targets the underrepresented population and undermines efforts that increase diversity on campus through outreach.

Ms. Molina said those were the Action Agenda items determined by the UCSA. Delegates are encouraged to become involved in External Affairs committees to work on these areas directly and help strategize on them. Ms. Quindel called for any questions, or debate. Hearing none, she said the question was automatically called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE The 2003-2004 UCSA ACTION AGENDA ITEMS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Election of the Finance Committee Chair

Ms. Quindel called for any candidates for the position of Chair of the Finance Committee, and said there was one candidate. She called for any other nominations. Rishi Sharma introduced himself and said he's a student at the Law School and a Delegate. He ran because they have a lot of money and really need to organize as a committee and to take some leadership and make sure that money equates to what grads' needs are, and to increase money available to grad events. This budget cycle had requests from groups that were double the amount the GA could give. Mr. Sharma he was an undergrad at Berkeley and was familiar with the ways things work there, and had

general experience in financial matters. He served as treasurer for two organizations at Boalt, so he deals with these number issues all the time.

Ms. Quindel called for any questions. Mr. Hsu asked what organizations he referred to. Mr. Sharma said they were the Asian Pacific American Law Students Association and the Coalition for Diversity. Mr. Hsu The speaker asked if there was any conflict between being chair of the Finance Committee and Treasurer of two groups. Ms. Quindel said the Finance Committee only looks at the GA budget in its entirety and makes line item allocations to things like Grad Events, but not to particular student groups. The Finance Committee deals with the entire, four-page budget that Delegates have seen, not with the budgets of student groups.

Ms. Madon said that most groups that receive funding are in the humanities, and asked what he would do to encourage science and engineering grad groups to get involved in spending GA money. Mr. Sharma said that was more the Funding Committee's responsibility insofar as the Finance Committee is involved in having money available, which is an important part of funding. It's very discouraging to groups when they make an honest effort to apply for \$1,000 and the GA can only give them \$150. That doesn't encourage groups to apply.

Mr. Akiba said the GA has a budget of \$800,000. He asked Mr. Sharma if he had any ideas about how they could restructure it or which areas to emphasize for the process of financing. Mr. Sharma said he didn't have any radical ideas about a restructure. He would like to see the extent that the GA can maintain its other obligations and increase the amount of money available to groups. For all the good work the GA as an assembly does, it pales compared to what happens on campus by individual groups. The more money they could get to groups, the better the GA would be.

A Delegate asked if his top priority, then, was to use extra money to fund groups. Mr. Sharma said that was correct. The Delegate asked about his next two priorities. Ms. Quindel said the position he was running for was just chair of a committee that makes decisions and then comes back to the Delegates. One of its main tasks is doing the budget for next year. Mr. Sharma said he thought the GA was pretty well established and had its own goals. He was trying to think of another compelling need, and couldn't think of one, and generally supported the GA's mission to the extent that was possible.

Ms. Quindel called for any other questions and seeing none, would ask the candidate, as they usually do, to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. Mr. Cantor would pass out paper ballots. Mr. Cantor said he would give each Delegate a piece of paper if they had a name tag. Ms. Dugas noted that the role of the Finance Committee was not to create programming or to seek where money should go, which was up to specific departments within the GA, to present their cases to the Finance Committee. So it would be up to Ms. Day to say there needs to be more money to groups. The Finance Committee chair was really an administrative position to help administer the budget. All programs in the office and adjuncts to the office make their cases to the Finance Committee, and if Ms. Day feels there's a need for more funding for groups, she would

make that presentation. It's really not the role of any chair to present the case for student groups. The chair of the Finance Committee is an unbiased position to facilitate the process.

A discussion on the election was held off the record.

-

Graduate Student Representation on Campus-wide Committees

Ms. Quindel said grad representation has been done in a hazy way, where if it's thought of, a request will be made for grad representatives, and if that wasn't considered, then grads aren't included. These are major policy-making bodies, so it's important for grads to be represented. There was a draft in the agenda packet of a memorandum of understanding made among the ASUC, the GA, and the Executive Vice Chancellor, describing how students should be appointed. They're looking for approval from Delegates for this document. She believed the Executive Board endorsed it.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE DRAFT OF PROCEDURES FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CENTRAL CAMPUS ADMINISTRATION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolutions

-

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Furmanski and Ms. Ahn and was submitted by Graduate Assembly Ad Hoc Committee on Autonomy:

RESOLUTION ON GRADUATE STUDENT AUTONOMY

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly (GA) is currently chartered under the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) Constitution to represent the concerns of graduate students and act on their behalf; and

Resolution on Graduate Student Autonomy
(cont'd)

- 19 -

RESOLUTION ON GRADUATE STUDENT AUTONOMY (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the relationship between the GA and the ASUC is ambiguous and significantly less autonomous than that existing between undergraduate and graduate student assemblies similar in charter to those at UC Berkeley, e.g. UC Davis and UT; and

WHEREAS, the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly is the only graduate government that is subordinate to their undergraduate counterpart in the UC System; and

WHEREAS, graduate student needs are qualitatively different from those of undergraduates and it is not fair nor appropriate to expect undergraduates to understand and represent these issues; and

WHEREAS, the current relationship between the GA and ASUC implicitly puts the GA in a subordinate role, making it subject to a veto on its decisions and beholden to the ASUC for delivery of funds guaranteed it by legal agreements; and

WHEREAS, the current relationship between the GA and ASUC significantly hampers the GA's ability to fulfill its chartered purpose to advocate for and act on behalf of graduate students, due to the subordination of its concerns to a body which historically does not consider the needs of graduate students equally with those of undergraduates, and which at times has actually sought to curtail the power and purview of the GA even in violation of its own legal contracts; and

WHEREAS, the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that grants the Graduate Assembly a diminished level of power and fiscal autonomy has been repeatedly breached by the ASUC this year, despite its legal obligations to comply with the law and its own agreements (e.g. the right to guaranteed use of Anthony Hall and the placement of the GA President on the Store Operations Board);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA take action to achieve permanent fiscal and legislative independence from the ASUC as a representative governing body, constituted to solely represent the interests of graduate students, without necessarily dissolving the relationship with the ASUC Auxiliary as an administrative apparatus.

Ms. Ahn said the Resolution was drafted and approved by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Autonomy for the GA. It states the GA's resolve and recommitment to the issue of making sure that the GA has fiscal, legislative, and representational independence from other bodies, including the ASUC. Currently, the GA is structurally subordinate to the ASUC. The ASUC has tried to assert its authority in the GA's fiscal management and its ability to represent grads. Basically the Resolution just asserts that the GA speaks for grads, and that that is how it should be, and is what the GA was working towards. The Subcommittee on Autonomy is working on more hands-on, practical ways to achieve

that, including restructuring financial arrangements to rewording legal documents that structure both the GA and the ASUC, including the ASUC Constitution and the GA's By-laws. The bill just reasserts the GA's position. Ms. Quindel called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about the last portion of the Resolved Clause, and not necessarily dissolving their relationship with the ASUC. Ms. Ahn said the ASUC Auxiliary is like the GA's fiscal agent or banker, with the Auxiliary taking care of some matters for the GA. The ASUC Auxiliary is their fiscal agent, except the GA has a special position because it's housed within the ASUC. For convenience issues and other purposes, the GA wanted to reiterate that keeping the ASUC Auxiliary as their fiscal agent is something they're seriously considering, and that just because they're considering separating from the ASUC doesn't mean the GA was no longer interested in using the Auxiliary as its fiscal agent.

Mr. Hsu asked if the Resolution would support any future actions the Subcommittee on Autonomy deems as necessary, such as asking Chancellor Berdahl to formally separate the GA from the ASUC, or if the GA would have to vote again on that. Ms. Ahn said the Subcommittee discussed that in some detail and it's possible that the Chancellor, with the stroke of a pen, could have the GA no longer be part of the ASUC, where they could create their own Constitution, and not have the ASUC Constitution matter. Currently, the ASUC Constitution has the GA listed as a subordinate body. So theoretically, that was possible. Whether or not that would really hold water in any court was questionable. The precedent that would set was also questionable, as to whether or not they really want to advocate a precedent where the Chancellor significantly restructured student government. That was not necessarily the best situation to be in. She thought that's what the Committee thought about. A motion to extend speaking time by three minutes was made and tied by hand-vote 15-15. Ms. Quindel said that for the sake of time, she'd vote against the extension. The motion to extend debate failed by hand-vote 15-16-0. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION ON GRADUATE STUDENT AUTONOMY PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Quindel said the results of the vote were counted and Mr. Sharma was the new Finance Committee Chair. He is also a member of the Executive Board. (Applause)

The following Resolution was authored by Ms. Ahn and was submitted by the GA Ad Hoc Committee on Autonomy:

RESOLUTION ON THE PLACEMENT OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY PRESIDENT ON THE STORE OPERATIONS BOARD

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly Ad Hoc Committee on Autonomy has duly considered the question of support for the Graduate Assembly President's unfettered placement on the ASUC Store Operations Board as per the

ASUC-GA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and past practices of the Graduate Assembly and;

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly Ad Hoc Committee on Autonomy rightfully considers the MOU a valid legal contract recognized by both bodies and the UC Berkeley Administration as a binding agreement on the current rights of the Graduate Assembly to at least a part of the representation we have a right to;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly reaffirms its support of the placement of the Graduate Assembly President on the Store Operations Board as per the legal agreement between ASUC and GA in the Memorandum of Understanding and the duly ratified By-laws of the Graduate Assembly.

RESOLUTION ON THE PLACEMENT OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY PRESIDENT ON THE STORE OPERATIONS BOARD (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly demands that that ASUC recognize the right of the Graduate Assembly to have its President on the Store Operations Board as per the By-laws of the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly.

Ms. Ahn said this Resolution was written because last month there was a question raised before the GA as whole about supporting the presence of the GA President on the Store Operations Board, as per the legal contract, the MOU, between the ASUC and the GA, and also in compliance with the ASUC By-laws and GA By-laws. ASUC By-laws state that the GA President is supposed to be on the SOB, and that's also in the contract between the GA and the ASUC. But it hasn't happened. So last month the question was raised as to whether or not the GA as a whole would vote to have the presence of the GA President on the SOB. By a motion from a Delegate, it was deferred to the Subcommittee on Autonomy, which considered the question and voted to support the GA's presence on the SOB and brought forth the Resolution.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed by hand-vote 14-7-10. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION ON THE PLACEMENT OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY PRESIDENT ON THE STORE OPERATIONS BOARD PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Cantor said that as for their voting procedure, if people were not wearing a nametag, he would ask them to not vote, and to wear their nametag if have it. Mr. Furmanski asked if people were notified prior to the meeting about bringing them, and said he didn't bring his. Mr. Cantor said tags were printed again.

The following Resolution was submitted by Ms. Madon, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS

WHEREAS, the GA Academic Affairs Committee is charged with commenting on University policy and making recommendations on matters of importance to graduate students, including graduate education, research, well being, and funding; and

WHEREAS, the UC Regents have expressed interest in further increasing non-resident fees for UC students, to compensate for recent cuts to the UC budget by the State Legislature; and

WHEREAS, members of the AAC believe that recent increases in non-resident fees for UC graduate students are problematic for graduate departments, as they limit the ability of the UC to compete for top-quality candidates and reduce the diversity of our graduate community; and

WHEREAS, faculty instructional workloads UC-wide do not currently account for faculty hours spent mentoring graduate students; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, members of the AAC believe that, to maintain the pre-eminence of UC Berkeley's graduate school, it is essential that graduate student mentoring be recognized and valued by the University Administration, the UC Regents, and the State legislature; and

WHEREAS, the UC Berkeley Administration is currently considering the regularization of the summer session, which would increase the number of core courses offered to undergraduate students each summer; and

WHEREAS, members of the AAC believe that the proposed plan for regularization of the summer sessions at UC Berkeley may compromise the excellence of graduate education and research, by increasing workload of GSIs and by limiting graduate student participation in summer conferences and research with faculty, outside researchers, and outside institutions; and

WHEREAS, the UC libraries have experienced major budget cuts in the wake of cuts to the UC system, limiting the access of graduate student researchers to essential academic materials; and

WHEREAS, members of the AAC believe that access to academic journals and scholarly publications must be maintained by the UC, through University-wide endorsement of "open access" digital publications like PLoS;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Executive Officers of the Graduate Assembly at UC Berkeley express the concerns and recommendations of the GA Academic Affairs Committee to the Berkeley Administration, UC Office of the President, UC Regents, and other relevant parties, by sending letters on behalf of the Graduate Assembly addressing each of the issues outlined above.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these letters be made publicly available, on the Internet, for review by Berkeley graduate students, members of the press, and other members of the University community.

Ms. Madon said the Academic Affairs Committee met that month and took a look at some policy issues, and these are the Committee's recommendations. The Regents expressed interest in increasing non-resident fees further. Members of the Committee believe that's problematic for grads because they limit the ability to get top students. Also, faculty and instructional workloads do not account for mentoring. The Affirmative Action Committee believes that to maintain the pre-eminence, they must have top candidates, which higher fees limit. The third point is that the Berkeley Administration is considering regularization of summer session, which means more large, gateway courses for undergrads, which will require GSIs. The Committee believes the proposed plan for the regularization of summer session may compromise grad research and limit grads in summer conferences and outside activities they can participate in, because they're teaching. The final policy they looked at was the UC Library, which has experienced major budget cuts, limiting access of grads and researchers. The Committee proposes that access to academic journals and publications be maintained through University-wide endorsement of an open access, digital library, public library. The GA can send letters under the imprimatur of the GA to appropriate legislators to tell them what grads think about their policies. Ms. Quindel called for any questions.

Mr. Hsu said it has been discussed publishing in an alternative journal can require \$1,500 to be paid on the part of the researcher, which would impact researchers. Ms. Madon said the letters they send can strike that language. They would like to endorse alternative publishing media and forms. The Resolution doesn't necessarily have to mean researchers bear the brunt of publishing, but that the GA embraces alternative mechanisms for research.

A motion was made to strike the second and third Whereas, Clauses, which relate to non-resident fees. The motion to amend was seconded.

A Delegate said international students are never entitled to pay State fees, so Ph.D. students paying out-of-State fees every semester makes it quite difficult for departments to bring students in. A lot of people aren't aware of that. Also, if they marry a US citizen or become a resident during their time there, they're still not entitled to pay in-State fees. A motion to extend speaking time by three minutes was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

A Delegate said he understood for foreign students it's an issue, but thought this will mainly affect out-of-State undergrads. Many grads in certain academic programs have their fees taken care of through scholarship and the like, and for undergrads, if they want an Ivy League education, they should probably pay Ivy League fees, and if they're from California, they have a right to a quality education in California. But if they're from another State and want the quality education of Berkeley, they should pay for that. It would be great if they paid nothing, but his Department is under a budget crunch. They've had to make faculty cuts and have put faculty searches on hold because of budget limitations. There's not enough money to go around, and the best place to get from is from out-of-State tuition, so they don't have to sacrifice quality for their education.

Mr. Akiba said he didn't think they were necessarily taking resources away from in-State citizens and redistributing it to out-of-State students. They're not sure if that limitation was there. They can ask. All the Resolution asks is for the University to look to support both in-State and out-of-State citizens. The concern is that out-of-State tuition might end up excluding a lot of people. This wasn't mutually exclusive and they shouldn't strike out either.

A Delegate said she was somewhat familiar with the situation, and there are a lot of bad options UC is looking at. One option was to cut enrollment by tens of thousands of students. The budget crisis is that bad. She felt the Resolution takes a solution off the table and might cause them to end up with a worse solution. A Delegate moved to extend speaking time by three minutes. The motion was seconded and passed by hand-vote 22-4-7.

Ms. Madon said fees have been increased 54% over the last five years, and resident fees have increased by 37%. So there's a huge disparity in the increases for non-residents. The letter that the Academic Affairs committee drafted only talks about grad fees and not undergrad fees, and not whether undergrad non-resident fees should be charged the rate of an Ivy League education. It specifically relates to grad non-resident fees. If they put themselves on the same level as Princeton, Harvard, Yale, or Stanford, the big ten schools Cal is compared with on a grad level, they have to get those students from the East Coast and from major universities across the nation. If students can't pay non-resident tuition because their departments can't afford them, then the school loses the best students and is compromised.

A Delegate said there are programs that are Masters level only, for which there is no funding, with tuition at nearly \$20,000.

Ms. Ahn said the way the budget situation has been framed, it's as if they want an education, they have to pay for it themselves. And in reality, they don't get a private school education. She pays for her transcripts and for every point of access to the University. At Princeton, in the Public Policy program, when there were issues with the computer lab, the Department chipped in \$2,000 for each student to buy a laptop. They would never get that at Berkeley because it's a public university. So the idea that students need to pay this increased private school fees was, to her, pretending they're getting services a private school can offer, and making students pay for them. In reality, they make compromises by being part of a public institution in terms of the quality of their access, because they believe in public education. But she didn't think they should perpetuate the myth that everything is the same and therefore Berkeley students should tax themselves the same level as private schools. Ms. Ahn said she had a lot of sympathy for the amount and the disparity between non-resident and resident tuition, especially after hearing about the situation of international students, which she hadn't realized. They need to force the UC Administration and the State to look for other sources of funding than taxing students, who are the least able to pay, most of the time. Ms. Quindel said speaking time had expired on the amendment.

A Delegate asked about the text of the letter that would be sent, and said that would affect how people vote. Ms. Madon said it could be found online.

The motion to approve the amendment, to strike the second and third Whereas Clauses failed by voice-vote.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed by hand-vote 22-6-6. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was submitted by Kai Wang, GA Delegate, Chemical Engineering, and Ms. Madon:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF UC BERKELEY'S AFFILIATION WITH THE LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LAB

WHEREAS, the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) seeks understanding of the nation's most challenging environmental, biological, and scientific questions; and

WHEREAS, researchers at LBNL and other Department of Energy labs have advanced our country's expertise in energy efficiency, environmental quality, particle physics, medicine, and biology; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley faculty and graduate students benefit immeasurably from collaborations with LBNL researchers, access to LBNL equipment (such as the Advanced Light Source), and the internationally recognized academic reputation of the Lab; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF UC BERKELEY'S AFFILIATION WITH THE LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LAB (cont'd)

WHEREAS, according to the graduate student publication Berkeley Science Review (2003), "nuclear scientists like those [at LBNL], their title notwithstanding, do not design nuclear weapons or nuclear reactors... they explore the fundamental properties of atomic nuclei... to] learn about the laws that govern nature"; and

WHEREAS, according to UC Berkeley Chancellor Robert Berdahl, LBNL generates approximately \$500 million annually in research grants and funding; and

WHEREAS, uninformed criticism of the UC's involvement with the DOE'S National Labs undermines morale, productivity, academic freedom, funding, and initiative of Berkeley researchers; and

WHEREAS, continued involvement of the UC in oversight of the National Labs is a complex issue, deserving of careful consideration of the role of university expertise in overseeing the nation's research goals and the role of federal funds in enabling the UC's academic freedom;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the President of the Graduate Assembly at UC Berkeley will acknowledge the value and importance of the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab within our academic research community, by expressing support of the Lab in a letter to the Chancellor, UCOP, and other public officials.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly will work to educate graduate students on the complexity of UC affiliation with the DOE National Labs, by holding a forum, lecture, or seminar evaluating the history, politics, and academic value of UC involvement in the National Labs.

Mr. Wang said he distributed a separate sheet containing the Resolution he wanted submitted, rather than the one that was included in the agenda packet. He would like to amend the Resolution, by striking out mention of the DOE, and to only mention affiliation of Berkeley with the LBL. Ms. Quindel said this would be an amendment by substitution. In order to allow Delegates a chance to read both Resolutions, a motion to recess for three minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Valleé said there will be a lot of proposed changes, and he would recommend referring this to the External Affairs Committee in order to save Delegates' time. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Sharma asked why Whereas Clauses were omitted in the substitute Resolution. Ms. Madon said the idea was to limit the scope of the Resolution and to just look at support of research at LBL, and not look at academic freedom and whether to extend that freedom to other members of the academic community. Also, they added the word "evaluated" in the final Resolved Clause. Ms. Quindel called for any other questions. The motion to approve the amendment by substitution of the Resolution passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Valleé moved to refer the Resolution to the External Affairs Committee, to be presented at the next GA meeting. They'd work on language and take in different perspectives. Ms. Madon asked if it was possible to debate that and talk about the Resolution. Ms. Quindel said the motion supersedes debate. The motion to refer the bill to committee was seconded. Ms. Quindel said that with no objection they would limit speaking time to 30 seconds, with no repeat speakers.

Mr. Astoria said he supported sending the bill back to committee. He agreed with the spirit of the bill, but not with the language, because of the association with the labs with the campus and the DOE labs more generally. The GA needs to divide these up, and otherwise he'd have to vote no.

Ms. Madon said it's important to engage this issue with this language and start talking about this, since there's a lot of uninformed criticism of UC affiliation with LBNL, with which they're engaged, in a national lab that does a lot of unclassified research. A motion to extend speaking time by three minutes and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Ettlinger said the GA can refer this to committee and still debate it at their next meeting. There was a second Resolution created to deal with the Department of Energy, but language in the current Resolution did not reflect the separate wording of two Resolutions.

Mr. Barnes said he didn't see any point in referring this to committee and thought the language seemed fine. It talks about UC involvement so it's not a general statement saying everything was great, and deals with UC involvement with the DOE, saying it's good and was good for students.

Mr. Akiba said the Resolution does more than just educate and it's a complex Resolution that asks for certain actions, including the writing of letters. They need to work more on this and can work together and come up with better language. So he supported referring this to committee.

Mr. Hsu said he was against referring this to be debated at the next GA meeting because there's been a trend to rush through any debate on a Resolution at both meetings he's

attended. If the GA agrees to allow debate to continue on the Resolution, which is the important written output of the GA, he'd agree they could debate it at the next GA meeting. Otherwise he didn't think they should pile on to what is already very limited time at the next meeting.

A Delegate said that in addition to debate, she thought they also need to address the purpose of the Resolution. There are points of information that could be addressed if they defer this to a subcommittee. Ms. Quindel said the time for debate had elapsed. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate said she was happy with the changes and would like to consider the bill at that time.

Mr. Valleé said further research was needed on some issues. He didn't believe there would be enough information to make a decision at that time, and by referring it, they could come back with a more solid document.

A Delegate said that Delegates had three minutes to read this Resolution, which is more time than they've given any other Resolution. So the GA could vote on it at that point.

Mr. Kashmiri said that one point in the Resolution was against uninformed criticism, and it would be hypocritical to rush through this without having all the facts. The GA should send this to committee to make informed criticism or support.

Mr. Furmanski said the purpose of relegating something to a subcommittee was to have a more in-depth discussion. That committee meeting would just be held at the GA, since people are not on the committee. If people want input, they should do that at that point. And if they run out of time, they could table the bill and finish it next month. Most people are not on the committee.

Mr. Akiba moved to create an ad hoc committee that any Delegate could join. Ms. Ahn said that people can go to the External Affairs Committee meeting. The motion to amend was seconded. Ms. Quindel said they were considering the amendment to refer this to an ad hoc committee. **THE MOTION TO AMEND WAS ADOPTED BY THE AUTHOR.** Ms. Quindel said the question on the amendment was whether the Resolution would be referred to an ad hoc committee. A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO REFER THE RESOLUTION TO AN AD HOC COMMITTEE PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 21-12-0. Ms. Quindel said the Resolution was referred to an ad hoc committee. She would ask people to please contact Mr. Akiba if they were interested in serving on this committee. They'd send around a sign-up sheet. A chair had to be elected for the ad hoc committee to research this issue with regard to LBL and the Department of Energy.

Mr. Sharma asked if power would reside in the GA Chair to appoint the chair of any subcommittee, giving Ms. Quindel that power. Ms. Quindel said she would agree. She called for any nominations for chair. Mr. Akiba nominated Mr. Valleé. A Delegate nominated Mr. Wang. Mr. Furmanski nominated himself. Ms. Quindel said one couldn't sit on the Executive Board and also serve as chair of a committee, since Delegates can't hold two elected positions at the same time. Mr. Wang was already Chair of the Foreign Student Affairs. Mr. Furmanski said the chair isn't elected by the Delegates. Mr. Sharma moved to suspend the rules to allow any Delegate to serve as chair of the ad hoc committee. Ms. Quindel said they could suspend the By-laws with a two-thirds vote. The motion was seconded. A Delegate said that suspending the By-laws would be for that meeting, and after, the person would no longer be chair. Ms. Quindel said the appointment would stand for this particular issue. Ms. Quindel said they need to recess to research this issue. Mr. Sharma said he would withdraw his motion. Mr. Valleé nominated Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Furmanski moved to suspend the rules to allow any Delegate to chair the committee. Ms. Quindel said they would have to research whether or not they can overrule the By-laws. Mr. Furmanski moved to recess for four minutes. Ms. Ahn moved to call the question on the nomination of the chair. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote. Ms. Quindel said they would move to the election process.

Ms. Quindel said there are two nominees, Mr. Valleé and Mr. Kearns. Mr. Valleé said he'd withdraw his nomination. Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approval of Mr. Kearns as Chair. Mr. Kearns said people could send him an e-mail and they'd have coffee and talk about this. Mr. Furmanski asked if they need to allot time for this, and moved to allot five minutes to elect the chair of the ad hoc committee. The motion was seconded and passed by hand-vote 18-9-0. Ms. Quindel said that time was extended.

Ms. Quindel called for any questions for the nominee. Mr. Furmanski asked if he was prepared to take an unbiased, balanced approach. Mr. Kearns said he was.

Ms. Madon asked if he had a personal position on the Resolution, and asked if he would pass the Resolution as presented, and if not, why. Mr. Kearns said he wouldn't, because he thought there are some issues of vague language that they need to work out.

A Delegate asked if he was aware to the extent the science departments depend on the LBL and its facilities, and of faculty having dual appointments there, and if he knew what percentage of the research for these departments occurs at LBL, as opposed to in actual departments. Mr. Kearns said he couldn't cite the numbers.

A motion to call the question on the nomination was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. KEARNS AS CHAIR OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Furmanski moved to send Resolution In Support of Academic Freedom to the ad hoc committee. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Sharma said that since the Resolution wasn't made available to Delegates, he asked if the GA was in violation of advance notice requirements. Ms. Quindel said that's why they approved the agenda at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Furmanski said he wrote the Resolution and felt the GA should talk about it even if they talk about it in committee. Mr. Stagi said that since these issues seem to be joined at the hip, they should be coordinated before they come back with this. Otherwise they'd spin their wheels.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO REFER THE RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC FREE SPEECH AND RESEARCH THROUGHOUT THE UC TO THE AD HOC COMMITTEE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

REPORTS

Report from the GA Manager

Ms. Dugas said she would give an overview of the budget. As per the By-laws, Delegates have to hear a report on the budget in November, February, and in April, when they vote on it. This will give Delegates a sense of where they stand. She'd explain the balance sheet. One thing about the budget is that they have a fiscal agent, the ASUC Auxiliary, that provides reports to the GA. The GA has also created a shadow system, since the Auxiliary's items may not match the GA's, due to monthly transfers or items that are incorrect.

Ms. Dugas said she wanted to give Delegates a sense of how much revenue income has been brought in and where they are. This is found on page 1-of-5. Projected student fees for the fall, summer, and spring, according to Admissions, are \$399,380.75. If admissions changes next semester, which is possible, that number may go down. This is projected based on the numbers that came in around March and April. Additional income comes from the beverage contract with Coca-Cola that the GA, the ASUC, and Rec Sports Facility have. From that, the GA gets \$50,000, and there's a projection at a higher amount depending on when that contract first started. They're still working that out in terms of when the actual date first began. GA revenue also includes carryforward plus interest income, which is \$312,000-plus. The projection and the actual are the same because they have running balances of those numbers.

Revenue also comes from the Special Matching Travel Allocation from the Graduate Division, \$12,500. The GA matches that in its own budget. There's also another amount they get for the Women's Project and the GMSP. The GA has not received that money, and the projection, \$68,000, is what the GA was told it would probably be given. But that amount is not in their account. The GA will bill the Grad Division for that. As Ms. Molina explained, the GA is in the process of working out relationships. If the GA spends everything it said it would in the budget, which is unlikely, given a set aside of \$50,000 for cases of emergency, they'd have a carryforward next year of about \$66,000. That will probably be higher because they have to add the \$50,000 they set aside and any unspent monies from projects over the course of the year. And student groups tend to be the biggest area that doesn't spend all its funding, and there's usually a large surplus from groups. The GA's actual balance is based on current revenue that they have, as shown. There are also a few projects that aren't operating, like the GMSP and the Graduate Women's Project. The GA hasn't paid for them until they get reimbursed. But the GA is in the process of hiring people for those projects, so they'll be close in terms of getting funding and actually paying that money. There are also other projects the GA is in the process of hiring for, and Delegates will see a bigger amount in terms of expenditures. There are no really big items. This gives a sense of where they are and where the spending is. She called for any questions.

Mr. Barnes asked about the \$312,000 in carryover from last year, and asked if that was mostly from student groups not spending. Ms. Dugas that's from all areas of the GA over the course of eight or nine years. Mr. Barnes said she was projecting that carryover could be much larger if it followed the pattern from years past. Ms. Dugas said that if they spend everything they budgeted, within a timely basis, then they shouldn't have that high a surplus. But more than likely, it will probably still be more than \$175,000.

A Delegate asked what happened to the other \$50,000 in beverage income. Ms. Dugas said they're trying to work that out. The GA believes the contract started at a certain date, but when that was something Ms. Quindel has to work out with the Director of the ASUC Auxiliary. If it started at the day the GA understood it did, then the GA would be owed about \$50,000. Ms. Quindel said they haven't gotten that money yet and they don't want to count on something until they have the money in their account.

A Delegate asked if the GA fixed the money from No on 54 question. Ms. Dugas said that was still up in the air. The GA was audited by the University's internal auditors and handed in the last document requested. The preliminary audit didn't have concerns about how things occurred, but there are other things the GA needs to make sure they do, in terms of having things done within existing policies and procedures, and making people aware of them. But the GA is waiting on that opinion.

Mr. Sharma asked how much was left from carryforward after allocations from this month and last month. Ms. Dugas said this did not include October allocations since it's a reconciliation process. So they still have to factor in \$48,000 that the GA allocated from the October meeting, for Grad Events and the speaker series. She didn't like that amount to be outstanding after they reconcile October, which they're doing at that time,

so she'll bring another report next month so Delegates can see some real figures, and see what they just passed, since almost \$60,000 was hanging out there, and it might be misleading. So she'll present another budget in December. Ms. Quindel called for any other questions.

Officers' Reports

Ms. Madon said she wanted to alert people to the fact that the Legislative Liaison position for the External Affairs Office was still open. If Delegates know of anybody with policy analysis experience or lobbying experience, she would ask them to please contact her. She also wanted to remind Delegates of the November 19 action and the UCSA Board meeting that weekend.

Ms. Molina said she wanted to remind people of the Monday coffee hour, from 9 a.m. to 11:00. They have free Peet's coffee, and it's great. November 19 is the Free Speech Movement grad salon, with free beer, wine, and snacks. They'll discuss free speech issues grads face today. Hopefully, alumni from the original Free Speech Movement in the '60s will be present. Also, depression screening day is November 18. If Delegates or a colleague, partner, or friend, are concerned about depression, they could go to the Student Union for free depression screening, from University Health Services. There are also lots of committees that still need representation. They deal with issues as vast as nanotechnology to enrollment and student fees. If Delegates are interested, they could learn more at the GA Web site. There are descriptions of committees online, as well as application forms and information on how to get involved. There are faculty committees and administrative committees, which means there a balance of faculty and administrators, such as deans.

Ms. Quindel said they really want grad feedback on campus community initiatives. There will be a survey and she would send out an e-mail. She would ask people to please respond to the survey.

Report from the GA's Grad Council Representatives

Mr. Ettliger said there wasn't much finished business in the Grad Council, and he couldn't report on unfinished business. Dean Mason gave them some reports. One item is that a lot of minor recruitment initiatives have been successful, as far as with enrollment in grad and undergrad schools. With the newest initiatives, currently 45% of the people offered slots there come, and with the latest initiatives, they'll try to increase that percent. If there's anything they would like him or any of the other Grad Council representatives to bring up, he would ask them to please let him know.

Ms. Quindel said the ASUC representative wasn't present because ASUC Senators were having their yearly dinner with the Chancellor at that time.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

This meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

Present at the GA meeting of November 6, 2003

| | |
|---|---|
| Cannel Levitan, Bioengineering Planning | Carmen Rojas, City & Regional Planning |
| Jay Stagi, City & Regional Planning | Paul Chen, Economics |
| Peter Fishman, Economics | Josh Fisher, ESPM |
| Sherri Ehya, History of Art Biology | Christine Petersen, Integrative |
| Susan Gaylard, Italian Studies | Mydria Clark, Journalism |
| Sachi Cunningham, Journalism | Anik Banerjee, Law |
| Aisha Pew, Law | Guy Johnson, Law |
| Hien Nguyen, Law | Karimah Lamar, Law |
| Stephanie Lacambra, Law | Bernice Espinoza, Law |
| Marc Gonzales, Law | Tim Griffiths, Law |
| Yungsohn Park, Logic & the Methodology of Science Engineering | John Goodrick, Nuclear |
| Leah Ackerman, Physics | Michael Daub, Physics |
| Marion Bailey, African Diaspora Studies Anthropology | David Cohen, |
| Kira Blaisdell-Sloan, Anthropology | Jesse Leaman, Astronomy |
| Matt Eckerle, Bioengineering Bioengineering | Virginia Platt, |
| Rob Ricketts, Business Administration | Kai Wang, Chemical Engineering |
| Lola Odusanya, Chemical Engineering Regional Planning | Duane De Witt, City & |
| Justin Doull, City & Regional Planning Civil&Environmental Eng'rg. | Emily Berkeley, |
| Shay Sayar, Comparative Literature | Vivian Hwa, Economics |
| Charles Hammond, Education | Ronald Cruz, Education |
| Suzanne Mills, Education | Thomas Philip, Education |
| Yatish Patel, EECS | Kathryn Vulic, English |
| Peter Oboyski, ESPM | Iyko Day, Ethnic Studies |
| Will Collins, Folklore Geography | Jeanifer Casolo, |
| Robert Schechtman, German | Amy Aisen, History |
| Jessen Kelly, History of Art | Deborah Pedersen, IEOB |
| Chris Clark, Integrative Biology | Sylvia Valisa, Italian Studies |
| Carrie Lozano, Journalism | Chad Heeter, Journalism |
| Takeshi Akiba, Jurisprudence & Social Policy Architecture | Blaine Merker, Landscape |
| Brooke Killian, Law | Catheine Ahn, Law |
| Funmi Olorunnipa, Law | Erick Munoz, Law |
| Lillian Hardy, Law | Ross Astoria, Law |
| Rishi Sharma, Law | Marc Ettlinger, Linguistics |
| Johanna Franklin, Logic & the Methodology of Science Mathematics | Peter Gerdes, |

Andro Hsu, MCB
Susan Mashiyama, MCB
Engineering
Julian Lippmann, Mechanical Engineering
Mechanical Engineering
David Bithell, Music
Engineering
Collin Vaughan, Optometry
Performance Studies
Benjamin Boudreaux, Philosophy
Miguel Daal, Physics
J. Peter Coppinger, Physics
Anat Shenker, Public Policy
Richard Quang-Ahn Tran, Rhetoric
Maria Hollowell-Fuentes, Sociology
Sociology
Paul Macneilage, Vision Science

Kathryn McElroy, MCB
Jevan Furmanski, Mechanical

Jessica Preciado,

David Barnes, Nuclear

Monica Stufft,

Trevor Lanting, Physics

Matthijs Randsdorp, Physics

Neil Abrams, Political Science

Allison Cole, Public Policy

Natasha Ong, Social Welfare

Manuel Valleé,

Resolution as amended

Resolution to Protect and Promote Academic Freedom, Civil Liberties, and Civil Rights Against the USA Patriot Act, and Related Directives and Executive Orders (as amended on the floor)

Whereas, the University of California, Berkeley has a diverse population, including non-citizens, whose contributions to the campus are vital to its character and function; and

Whereas, the University of California, Berkeley and all of its members, including non-citizens, are governed and protected by the United States Constitution, its Bill of Rights, and the California State Constitution; and

Whereas, fundamental rights granted by the United States Constitution are threatened by passage of sections of the USA Patriot Act, the Homeland Security Act and several Executive Orders which allegedly, among other things:

- Violate the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution through the expansion of the government's ability to wiretap telephones, monitor e-mail communications, survey medical, financial and student records, and secretly enter homes and offices without customary administrative oversight or without showing of probable cause;
- Violate the First Amendment to the Constitution by limiting the freedom of association and assembly;

- Give law enforcement expanded authority to obtain library records, and prohibits librarians from informing patrons of monitoring or information requests;
- Violate the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution in establishing secret military tribunals, and in subjecting citizens and non-citizens to indefinite detention even while depriving them of right to counsel and right to trial;
- Authorize eavesdropping on communications between lawyers and their clients; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley opposes discrimination against any person solely on the basis of ancestry, race, ethnic or national origin, color, age, sexual orientation, gender, religion, physical or mental disability; and

Whereas, full protection of academic freedom, civil liberties and civil rights, and an atmosphere respectful of the dignity of all members in the community, are essential to academic inquiry (including all research and education) as well as civic engagement, which constitute the core missions of our University; and

Whereas, Chancellor Berdahl has established several administrative committees (such as the joint Administrative/SISS Task Force on the USA Patriot Act) to oversee the campus's response to the Act and related legislation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley that it has been, and remains, firmly committed to the protection of academic freedom, civil liberties and civil rights.

Resolution to Protect and Promote Academic Freedom, Civil Liberties, and Civil Rights Against the USA Patriot Act, and Related Directives and Executive Orders (as amended on the floor)

Be It Further Resolved that the Graduate Assembly work proactively with the campus administration to protect and promote students' freedom of speech, assembly, and association, the right to privacy, the right to counsel and due process in judicial and administrative proceedings, and protection from unreasonable searches and seizures.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly and the UC administration plan, promote, and participate in community dialogue on academic freedom, civil liberties and civil rights;

Be It Further Resolved that the Graduate Assembly urge our federal legislative delegation to carefully monitor the implementation of the USA Patriot Act, related Directives and Executive Orders, and work actively toward the repeal of those portions that diminish the protection of academic freedom, civil liberties or civil rights;

Be It Further Resolved that the Graduate Assembly President, Jessica Quindel, shall mail this Resolution to the UC President, the Chancellor and all Vice Chancellors, members of campus committees and administrative units in charge of USA Patriot Act compliance, the Governor's office, and the California federal legislative delegation.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the GA calls upon the Academic Senate to support the GA's opposition to the Patriot Act.