

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 2, 2012

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting commenced the Spring Semester. It was called to order at 5:30 p.m. in 105 Boalt Hall.

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau

Chancellor Birgeneau talked about budget challenges the University faced, and how the campus was trying to deal with them, and what future actions might be taken by the Administration as well as by students.

They're going through an extraordinary period in California, and the nation, in terms of public disinvestment from higher education. In 2004, 35% of the support for UC came from the State. This year that number was down to 10%. The campus has pursued a wide variety of strategies. Student fees have approximately doubled, although that increase covers a little less than 40% of the shortfall.

Two positive features of the UC System are that they stand out among all public university systems in the country, and secondly, that one-fifth of their undergraduates have tuition that was returned in the form of financial aid. In addition, they have the Cal Grants program. The campus worked hard in Sacramento to make sure there was no compromise in this program. But for the first time, in the Governor's proposal this year, there's the beginning of a compromise to the program. The cost for low-income Berkeley undergrads is the lowest in the System; and the debt they graduate with is also the lowest, and second lowest in the country for a public university. So they've managed to maintain incredible access.

Data for grads was incomplete because grad school was more complicated. But generally, in graduate school the return-to-aid averages 48%, and 25% for professional schools.

To maintain access and excellence, the campus tried to cut administrative costs significantly, \$80 million a year. They've also increased the number of international and out-of-State undergrads. In addition, a faculty member invented a drug that successfully treats metastatic melanoma, an incredible contribution to humanity and a patent that will generate some funds.

Four to five years ago, the hierarchy of funding to the University was the State, research, and student tuition/philanthropy. Now it's research funds, by far the largest source, student tuition, private philanthropy and in fourth, the State, down to 10%.

Chancellor Birgeneau is working on a proposal with people in Sacramento. The federal government does not contribute directly to the operations of its great public universities. The federal government would redirect \$1 billion a year for ten years. If California's portion was \$125 million, the State would put up \$125 million. The campus would create chairs, like with the Hewlett model, with \$1 million each from

graduate fellowships across the country. As with the Hewlett chairs, things program would cover all departments.

Resolution Referral

The GA voted to fast track 1202a, In Support of the UCSA Student Lobby Conference and March In Sacramento; and 1202c , Budget Amendment to Fund the Event “On Revolution: A Conversation Between Grace Lee Boggs and Angela Davis” Hosted by WOCI.

Announcements

Presentation by Lee Maranto, Independent Hearing Officer

The new Code of Conduct is in effect that week, and Mr. Maranto’s position, Independent Hearing Officer, officially came into being. The position reports directly to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and oversees Student Conduct procedure. Ms. Navab has a list suggested changes to the new Code.

ASUC Report

Mr. Albright, ASUC Senator, said the ASUC President was excited to work with the GA to set up graduate polling stations for ASUC elections. Also, the Senate passed a bill to set up a committee, with two spots for Delegates, to look into moving the ASUC’s money out of the Bank of America.

Mr. Shah, ASUC Student Advocate, said they’ve been working with the GA to establish a GA liaison to represent grads. The GA will vote that evening on creating a Graduate Student Advocate.

A new provision allows records to be expunged. Records under the old Code are now more likely to get expunged.

GA Announcements

Tierra Bills, Graduate Student Support Project Coordinator, said monthly support meetings will be held tailored to various disciplines.

The Grad Division will hold a forum on Thursday for any questions people would like Dean Szeri to address.

The GA Business Office was doing an old-fashioned survey. People who complete it get a candy bar.

Guest Announcements

Mr. Goren, OE Student Communications Coordinator, said OE is moving into the implementation phase, for which there will be a job fair, open for all, no matter what people’s skill sets. Jobs of varying levels of involvement were open. Some are paid, graduate-level positions.

The UC Berkeley Amnesty International Chapter, and other organizations, are trying to end the death penalty in California and put an initiative on the ballot. People were asked to sign the petition.

Spring Funding Allocations

The Graduate Meetings, Events & Resources (GMER) Fund is generally for food and general supplies that groups need. 123 student groups applied, asking for \$80,000, and the Funding Committee recommended roughly \$28,000. With no objection, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations for GMER funding, \$27,923.40.

Grants are generally for special events or programs in the categories of Student Activism, Campus Diversity, Community Service, and Educational Improvement. Grants do not allow for food, stipends, salaries, or alcohol. There were 32 applications, the same number as last year, requesting over \$33,000.

The Funding Committee was concerned with a trend of publications using Grants to print hard copies. Another concern was the cost of renting rooms on campus. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations for Grant allocations, \$22,123.38.

By voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations on Contingency Fund allocations, \$2,045.00

The GA now has funding training workshops online. The Funding Committee was thanked for its work by the GA.

GA Elections

Election of the Graduate Student Advocate

The Graduate Student Advocate is a new position, dealing with Student Conduct and academic cases. The position is an Officer. Nominations were made for Ms. Channa, Law, and Mr. Cohen, Comparative Literature. Mr. Cohen was elected.

Election of Graduate Council Representative

A rep is graduating and a position was open. The Grad Council sets policies campus-wide for graduate studies and deals with other issues. Nominations were made for Mr. Hasan, Mechanical Engineering, and Ms. Bravo, Social Welfare. Ms. Bravo was elected.

Resolution 1202c

1202c, Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund the Event "On Revolution: A Conversation Between Grace Lee Boggs And Angela Davis" Hosted By WOCI, passed unanimously by voice-vote. It adds an event to the 27th Empowering Women of Color Conference (EWOCC), allocating \$2,000 from the Contingency Fund to fund the event.

Reports

Mr. Marchand, Assembly Affairs VP, gave written updates on Resolutions the GA passed in December and actions by the E-Board. The GA was working with the ASUC to increase grad student participation in ASUC elections. The Class Pass will be on the ballot. The CAVP and AAVP will attend some department meetings of grad groups to recruit Delegates.

Ms. Navab, GA President, said that for OE, most approved Student Services Initiatives are IT-based. They're hiring a new director. Also, the PRB is investigating what happened at the November 9 protests. Student reps of the PRB will meet with students about the procedure. Slides were shown of the Lower Sproul renovation project. The GA offices and Business Office staff would be located in Eshleman instead of Anthony Hall. They'll have a grad student terrace. Anthony Hall will be turned into more of a grad student lounge, with student publications. It would be reserveable. Also, Dean Edley, Law, and Mr. Robinson, UCOP General Counsel, are investigating policies around civil disobedience and the role of Administration, the police, etc. A town hall occurred and they'll meet with the GA, the UAW, the ASUC, and OccupyCal.

Ms. De la Torre, Campus Affairs Vice President, said Berkeley grads and undergrads had free admission to the Empowering Women of Color Conference, Friday and Saturday, March 2-3. She's also working on a grad mental health agenda and a survey will come out.

Mr. Ortega, External Affairs VP, said they're mainly planning for the Student Lobby Conference the first weekend of March, with all UC campuses. On March 5 there will be a March, rally, and press conference. They're also planning the SAGE meeting.

GA elections were coming up in March , or later, if needed. People interested in running for an office should talk to people currently in the position.

Resolutions

Since Alameda County already voted on the ban, 1111b was tabled indefinitely by unanimous voice-vote, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda.

1202a, was approved by unanimous voice-vote, On Directed Action In Support of the UCSA Student Lobby Conference and March In Sacramento.

The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

End Summary of the meeting



This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Philippe Marchand at 5:30 p.m. in 105 Boalt Hall.

Ms. Navab said they would be hearing from the Chancellor that evening, and they'd start a little early, since the Chancellor had to leave at 6:00. They won't discuss the events of November 9 or the protests, due to the BAMN lawsuit. The Chancellor was happy to address other questions about funding, sustainability efforts on campus, etc. But he wouldn't be able to answer any questions about the protest. Mr. Marchand said he would ask the Assembly to join him in welcoming the Chancellor. They were delighted to have him attend that evening. (Applause)

PRESENTATION BY CHANCELLOR BIRGENEAU

Chancellor Birgeneau said he would like to thank them. He had to leave at 6:00 for a good reason, in that they managed to get Mark Leno, the Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, to come to University House at 6:15. Also, he was just made aware that there is actually a moderate Democratic caucus, which has nine members. It tries to bridge between the Democrats and the Republicans to set some kind of sensible budget that is supportive of education. A member of that caucus was also coming to dinner. So hopefully they'll make a little bit of progress.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought he'd mostly take questions from people, but thought it would be worthwhile to talk about the budget challenges and the consequences of those challenges that the University has faced over the last five or six years, their impact, how people were trying to deal with them, and what future actions might be taken by the Administration, but equally, by students.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they have one specific proposal which they've worked on very hard, which was a combined federal, State, and philanthropic proposal, that he'd tell them about. If it's successful it could have a huge impact on graduate students specifically. He'll describe some of their attempts to move forward on it. They were actually working on this with graduate students in SAGE. He, Mr. Ortega, and Ms. Navab have been in conversations about this proposal, which he thought graduate students would be interested in hearing, and on which they'll be working together in Washington.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought everybody knew that they were going through an extraordinary period in terms of public disinvestment in higher education in California. And it actually wasn't just in California, but in the entire country. It was probably worthwhile to quantify that. In 2004, 35% of the support for higher education in California, for the UC System, came from the State of California. This year, excluding the Labs, that number was down to 10%. So in a very short length of time, the State has disinvested at a level that was really quite remarkable.

To quantify that, he'd give them the significance of this disinvestment by the State from Berkeley specifically. When he began as Chancellor in 2004, part of the recruiting strategy of Bob Dynes was to tell him that he had a compact with Gov. Schwarzenegger. Some of them may remember the "Compact," as it was called. In 2004, the Compact said that for funding from the State would be flat for one year, and then there would be 4% increases for three years and then 5% increases for the next three years after that.

Back then, in a year of flat funding, Berkeley's budget was about \$450 million. If Gov. Schwarzenegger's commitment had held, and had been upheld by the Legislature, and adopted by Gov. Brown, then Berkeley's funding that year from the State would be approximately \$600 million. Those are funds whose purpose is to pay the salaries of faculty, staff, GSIs, etc. And by the way, yearly increases of 0%, 4%, 4%, 5%

5%, 5% would just cover academic inflation, because the rate of inflation at the University is higher than that in general for the population as a whole, for a whole variety of reasons. So Berkeley should have been funded at \$600 million, which was really projected as an inflationary increase in 2004, instead, the funding this year to pay the salaries of faculty and staff is about \$240 million. So in a very short length of time, \$360 million literally disappeared from the budget. And those are funds whose purpose is to pay people's salaries. If the campus hadn't done compensating things, most of the salaries for about 4,000 people, half the staff they support from their State budget, would have found themselves unemployed. So the campus worked very hard to try to compensate for that. And fortunately, here at Berkeley they recognized several years ago what was coming. They also recognized that there was no silver bullet, no single way to bridge the shortfall, a drop in their budget that had been 35% down to a number that was closer to 10%, in a relatively short length of time.

The campus has pursued a wide variety of strategies. One strategy was to approximately double the student portion of fees. The increase in the student portion of fees has covered a little bit less than 40% of the shortfall.

As they know, there are two positive features to the UC System. One is that they stand out among all public university systems in the country, and that one-fifth of their undergraduates have tuition that is returned in the form of financial aid, which is given as grants for undergraduate students.

In addition, there's the Cal Grants program. Chancellor Birgeneau said he wanted to raise a flag about this. The campus has worked really hard with the people in Sacramento to make sure there's no compromise in the Cal Grant program; and that's been successful. The campus has given Cal Grants the highest priority in terms of getting it funded. And this year, in the Governor's proposal, for the first time they see the beginning of a compromise, to pull back on Cal Grants. The proposal was to change Cal Grants by only making them eligible for students with grades above some threshold level. In terms of where they want to be politically, this was very dangerous, as it was the start to cutbacks in the Cal Grant program.

As a result of the combination of federal Pell Grants, Cal Grants, the one-third return to aid, for their undergraduate students over the past several years, the real cost of education has gone down, not up. Low-income students don't pay tuition, which is paid by Cal Grants. So the rapid increase in tuition has actually provided more financial aid. It actually brings the cost down; and the cost at UC Berkeley for low-income undergraduate students is the lowest in the System. And the debt that they graduate with is also the lowest, and second lowest in the country for a public university. So they've managed to maintain access at an incredible level.

The average debt of an undergraduate who graduates is \$16,000. Of course that's a significant amount of money, but it's much below the national average of \$25,000 for an undergraduate student at a public institution.

For graduate students, he felt they don't have complete data because graduate school, as every one of them knew, is much more complicated, with professional schools, Ph.D. programs, Masters programs, etc. Generally, in graduate school as a whole, the return-to-aid is 48%, averaged over a number of colleges. So half the tuition money goes back to financial aid. And in the professional schools, it's lower, unfortunately, more like 25%. He actually didn't know until preparing these remarks that the graduate and professional school return to aid was as low as 25%. That's an issue they obviously want to address.

As for what else they've done to try and maintain both access and excellence there, and to make this the kind of school they want to come to for their graduate studies, they have, of course, tried to cut administrative costs quite significantly. They're fairly far along in that process, and have asked for student participation. The goal was to cut administrative costs by \$80 million a year, and effectively put that money into the classroom, even though much of it would just compensate for losses in State funding.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they've had an evolution in the make-up of the undergraduate body. When he came there and started as Chancellor in 2004, the target number for undergraduates who were California residents was 21,000. For a variety of reasons, that number was allowed to drift up to over 23,000. But none of those additional California residents were actually funded. So there was no funding from the State to cover the costs. So they had already decided, from him personally, to increase the number of international students among the undergraduates. He felt, in contrast to other universities he's been at, like Yale, the University of Toronto, and Oxford, that it was striking how few international students they had among the undergraduates. He felt that was not healthy for a mature, educational point of view. So they started to try and increase that number. It was 3%, by the way, compared to the incoming graduate class, which is 33% of graduate students. So the difference was a factor of ten. So they decided to increase somewhat the number of international students.

Once people understood the significance of the State's disinvestment and the damage it could do to Berkeley, then there was sort of a flip over. So they've been progressively increasing the number of undergraduates from out-of-State and who are international, but with a target number of 21,000 Californians. This is being done through overenrollment, not by replacing slots for Californians. He believed that year they have 21,500 California residents as undergraduates. That number will drift down to about 21,000, with 20% out-of-State and international students. The increased revenues from that, among other things, benefits graduate students significantly because they use the increased revenues, e.g., to increase the number of GSI positions in the gateway courses. That will start in the physical sciences and in mathematics, and then this year, in foreign languages. He believed that next year they hope to do that in the social sciences.

And then they also actually hit the jackpot. One of their faculty invented a drug that successfully treats metastatic melanoma, which is about one-third of those patients. This is an incredible contribution to humanity. One-third of people who might have died in a matter of months from metastatic melanoma now can have a reasonable life, for up to five years. The drug was just coming to market, and people probably read about it because it's gotten a lot of publicity. A side result is that the patent has generated some funds, some of which they're using to create new freshmen labs in the life sciences. And along with that will come an additional fee that can be used at the campus' discretion.

Chancellor Birgeneau said there were a variety of other things they've been doing. They've seen in the last four to five years an astounding inversion of funding of the University. Five or six years ago, if they looked at the hierarchy of where funds came from, the largest source of funding to the University was from State government. Second was research, and tied at third was student tuition and philanthropy. And now, the largest source of funding for the University was research funds. One interesting thing as they go through this disinvestment debacle, where they've gone from what should have been \$600 million down to \$240 million, is that research funding, which supports a lot of graduate students, has gone from \$450 million up to over \$700 million. So their research funding has proven to be incredibly robust. And of course, that's been great for the University. That means that research funding is now, by far, the largest component of the campus budget. Next after that is funding from student tuition. Not far below that is

funding from private philanthropy. And now, fourth, is the State, down to 10%, which was just a disgrace.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he would jump to a specific proposal that he's been working on with Sacramento. John Pérez, head of the Assembly, was on campus last Friday, not quite secretly, but sort of, to talk through the budget. He's very deeply loyal to Cal, and whenever they could, they try to urge him to reverse what's happening in Sacramento and to try and increase UC's funding. Mr. Pérez is having a meeting in early March with people who are head of state assemblies across the country. He was asking the campus to explain the proposal that Chancellor Birgeneau said he was about to tell the GA about.

One thing that's left out in their budget, compared to essentially every other country, is the federal government. They are the only Western country where the federal government does not contribute very directly to the operations of its great public universities. Chancellor Birgeneau said he chaired a committee on behalf of the Swiss Secretary of State a couple of years ago, for the Swiss government, looking at how that country funds its universities. And it was extraordinary how well the federal government of Switzerland funds its two state universities. He was President of a school for four years where the Canadian government created Canada Research Chairs, which again, has been extraordinarily valuable for Canadian universities. And of course, they had a visitation from the Educational Ministry from France, who went back and created a federal program, after looking at the situation in United States, ironically. This proposal may evolve in real time, and they'd welcome input on it. He wasn't at all sure they have the perfect means to convince the federal government, in this difficult time period, and to get bipartisan support, for federal support of the great public universities across the country.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they had one unsuccessful round about two and a half years ago. It was not successful because it was frankly focused on universities like Berkeley. But it gave him a good lesson in politics. They actually published an op-ed. in the *Washington Post* proposing a model that they have since abandoned. It was focused on Berkeley, Michigan, UCLA, Rutgers, etc. About six weeks after it was published the President of Idaho wrote an op-ed. condemning the plan, basically saying what a bad idea it was. Chancellor Birgeneau said he happened to run into the Idaho President at a meeting. The gentleman gave a little speech, and Chancellor Birgeneau said he then realized what a mistake he had made. He then took the President aside and figured he would in real time state that for whatever they did, they'd make sure it would include the University of Idaho. And it took the President less than 30 seconds to do a complete flip, and then he became very enthusiastic. Chancellor Birgeneau said that what he learned was that whatever they do had to be inclusive.

So they generated a model that is now getting tremendous support from other public universities across the country. But they have not yet gotten commitments from Washington. Potentially, it could be a general expansion of the Hewlett Chair model. The basis is that the federal government would agree to redirect \$1 billion for this, as there's no chance of getting new money. \$1 billion a year, for ten years, would be redirected from money currently spent on higher education, much of which is not spent very well; something people in Washington would agree with. This would be \$1 billion out of \$30 billion that's spent in higher education of all sorts, or 3% of this total budget.

The federal government would put up \$1 billion that would get distributed across the country, according to population. Except, in order to make sure that Senators from Idaho, South Dakota, etc. support this, there would be a threshold of \$5 million. If out of that \$1 billion, \$125 million comes to California each year, the State government would then agree to put up \$125 million. That would just be for research

universities. Every UC campus would have access to that \$250 million. Campuses would then apply the Hewlett Chair model, where Berkeley just successfully created 100 Chairs in four years, with individual philanthropists or what have you putting up \$1 million per chair.

So then they'd have \$1 million from the feds, \$1 million from the State, and \$1 million from a private individual. That was a \$3 million chair. Chancellor Birgeneau said they estimate that for Berkeley, this would generate about 25 chairs a year. As far as the payout from the \$3 million plan they're proposing, the first \$25,000 goes to the chair holder for his or her research. The next \$50,000 would create a fully funded graduate fellowship. That left \$75,000 that would be available to support the salary of the chair holder.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that if this is successful, over ten years it would create 10,000 new graduate fellowships across the country that would be permanently funded and would not expendable. And the cost, frankly, is not that large compared to anything in the federal budget, or compared to the amount of money currently spent on education. He talked to the head of one of the major funding agencies in Washington who didn't want to be quoted, but who thought it was great. If his agency spends \$4 billion a year on education, he would happily put in 10%, \$400 million annually, into this program. That's because it seemed to him, in the long run, that it would be much preferable.

Chancellor Birgeneau said there are a lot of details in this plan that he obviously couldn't give in such a short presentation. He's going to Washington in two weeks. He first had to get support from the California delegation. All the UC campuses were incredibly enthusiastic about this and they have a full buy-in. The Assembly Speaker, John Pérez is equally enthusiastic. Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought a really important thing was to get people to commit to not having any more budget cuts in California, including trigger cuts.

Chancellor Birgeneau he would apologize for going on a little longer than planned, but it was worth describing the proposal in detail because it's prospectively going to be very important. They think it has a real chance of being successful. It will take a lot of political advocacy with people in Washington. Graduate student organizations across the country can really play an important role. Alberto Ortega has been working with his GA equivalents at Michigan, the University of North Carolina, the University of Washington, and UC San Diego, to see whether or not they can put together a coherent program among graduate students to help advocate for this.

Mr. Marchand said they would take questions at that time.

Mr. Trager introduced himself and said he was the GA Sustainability Officer. His question was how they could help. He believed the Web site says the Chancellor called on political leadership to debate this back in November. The Chancellor had the power to help create a student lobby, a channel for grads to get their voices heard in Sacramento. He asked if the Chancellor could comment on that.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they've worked really hard on that, so far unsuccessfully, he had to say. And Mr. Pérez was coming to campus. Chancellor Birgeneau said he didn't want to get compromised, but it was an embarrassment as to how Mr. Pérez was totally willing to do this while they have not been able to get any Republicans to agree. Chancellor Birgeneau said he actually thought it was important if they just got agreement from Democrats, like Mr. Pérez who they know very well, and Mark Leno, who he's having dinner with that evening. But then it will end up being completely one sided. But Mr. Pérez is the

only one who could actually get a commitment; and he's fighting really hard. Chancellor Birgeneau said he couldn't agree more with Mr. Trager. He was, in a couple of weeks, taking to Sacramento the head of the Black Students Association and two of the leaders of the Chicano undergraduate community. He'll let them do all the talking. They'll work their way through different representatives. That was at least one way of getting student input. One way or another, they need to get these people on the campus. And that has just been an incredible challenge.

Mr. Klein said that since students now pay more of UC's budget than the State, he asked at what point students will get more say over the administration of the University. Chancellor Birgeneau said that Ms. Navab has a proposal that he strongly supports, to increase student representation on the Regents. He was strongly in favor of that. As for the reality of getting proportional representation, frankly, he thought it was pretty low. But he strongly supported increased student representation for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. He thought that was a good idea. There's a whole variety of things they're trying to accomplish, most of which he couldn't discuss publicly yet. The Regents hold all the power, and frankly, it was very frustrating. But one way or another, they had to make changes, and convince the Regents that this was a thing they should commit to, and that it included increased student representation.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said he knew there's an ongoing lawsuit and the Chancellor probably couldn't comment, but he wondered about going forward and asked if the Chancellor would be willing to commit to not using pepper spray. Chancellor Birgeneau said he wasn't going to talk about protests. Mr. Huet-Vaughn asked if he wouldn't talk about it at all. Chancellor Birgeneau said he wouldn't, not there at the GA meeting. Mr. Huet-Vaughn asked about questions regarding general policing issues. Chancellor Birgeneau said he wouldn't talk about those subjects.

Ms. Navab said that before Mr. Huet-Vaughn arrived at the meeting she announced that the Chancellor would not address anything related to the protest. Chancellor Birgeneau said that wasn't an indefinite statement, and was just for now.

Mr. Riffe said that \$30 billion is spent by the federal government on higher education. He asked where in the government that was being spent. Chancellor Birgeneau said it was all over the place, mostly in the Department of Education, which has limited interest in places like Berkeley.

Mr. Riffe asked if that amount was divided among community colleges, etc. Chancellor Birgeneau said it's over the whole spectrum. But there are also individual agencies that spend money on education. Their hope is with this approach they'll get bipartisan support in Washington. But even as the Chancellor at Berkeley, one would have hoped that any Senator would open their door to the head of the top public and teaching University in the country, it turns out that unfortunately is not to be the case, especially on the Republican side. So they're working hard on that. They're going to work consistently. He managed to flip both Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer to get their aggressive support, and that's been quite important, so people will listen. So he now he had to do the same with others for this challenge.

The first thing people tell you when you talk to them in Washington is, "Are you crazy? There's no more money, and we're just looking at cuts." So people try to cut the conversation off before they even get into it. So it took him a while to realize, something, and actually, the head of the agency mentioned something that was helpful in by saying that he'd be willing to reprogram his money. Chancellor Birgeneau said he realized that the right strategy was just that, to say that they don't need new money, but need to spend the money they are spending on education more effectively. The great research universities in this country

Omatter, and their public character had to be preserved. If they have this continuous disinvestment of public funds, there will be pressures that push people in the other direction. He's already hearing things from people that will not happen in Berkeley as long as he's Chancellor, such as perhaps one-third return to aid being too much, and maybe should be 30%, or 25%. But it's clear that there will be continuing pressures to readjust their priorities.

Mr. Marchand said there was time for one more question.

Mr. Nadler said that it seemed that one thing that creates distance between graduate programs is that some departments have better funding than others. It was mentioned how a lot of funding was coming back into graduate programs. A lot of departments in the humanities don't have access to those funds. He asked about supporting those kinds of departments.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that overall, the federal administration, through GSIs and other support, was trying to have a balance. He has a private life as a faculty member, besides life as a Chancellor. So he supports graduate students and has adequate funding, because there's still reasonable funding for physics. But it's an issue. He should have emphasized that the program they're proposing covers all departments. So there will be as many \$50,000 fellowships in the English Department, e.g., as for the Physics Department. That was a critical part. And similarly, with the Hewlett chairs. So people know the campus was at least cognizant of this problem, when the Hewlett chairs first came, it was initially suggested that the chairs should be focused on science and engineering. And early on, the campus said they actually wouldn't accept it on that basis, and that it had to be uniformly distributed across the whole University. And, in fact, that was finally happening. Frankly, the social sciences and humanities were a little bit slow to raise chairs. He raised a number himself, personally. In the end, the campus was actually sort of rushing to get a significant number of new chairs, which means new graduate fellowships, in the social sciences and humanities. So this program, very deliberately, was uniformly balanced.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that unfortunately, Sen. Leno was waiting for him. Ms. Navab said that if people have additional questions, they could give them to her and she would bring them up during their next standing meeting and bring back the information. Chancellor Birgeneau said he was also happy to come back sometime, especially to report back on his trip to Washington and his meetings with heads of the Assembly and different states. He'll try to think this proposal more, and there were ways in which politically active graduate students play a constructive role in helping to move this forward. He thought the prospect was very exciting. He wanted to thank them. (Applause)

Mr. Marchand said they would return to their regular meeting agenda. There's a sign-up sheet and he'd ask people to please sign in before they leave. He suggested a one-minute recess for people to pick up some sandwiches that were available at the front. With no objection, this meeting was recessed.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Back in session, Mr. Marchand called for a motion to adopt the agenda. It was so moved and seconded.
THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Marchand said four Resolutions were submitted and posted online. It was suggested to fast track two of them, 1202a, dealing with the UCSA Student Lobby Conference and a march in Sacramento at the beginning of March, and 1202c, dealing with funding an event that was paired with the Women of Color Conference, also happening at the beginning of March. As a result, they were printed. To fast track a bill required a three-fourths majority. He called for a motion to fast track 1202a and 1202c. It was so moved and seconded. An objection was raised. Mr. Marchand said that since this was like amending the agenda, he would rule that the motion was debatable. He'd open the floor to debate on this for three minutes.

Mr. Klein said he would like to divide the issue and vote on fast tracking the bills separately. The motion to divide was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Marchand said they would first talk about fast tracking 1202a. Seeing no discussion, he said they'd come to a vote. **THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK 1202a PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE UCSA STUDENT LOBBY CONFERENCE AND MARCH IN SACRAMENTO.**

Mr. Marchand called for debate on fast tracking 1202c. Mr. Klein said that as someone on the Budget Committee, it would be cool to meet and discuss the ramifications of the bill, and then come back to the Assembly with an informed opinion to help the GA make a decision on how to vote. He would like the chance to do that.

Mr. Hoople said he thought the reason not to do that is that the event was counting on funding and people were trying to get this up and running.

Mr. Marchand asked if Mr. Sheen, a co-author, could explain why this was moved at the last minute. Mr. Sheen said the program actually applied for funding through student group funding. The Funding Committee felt that for such a procedural issue it was somewhat less appropriate for a GA program to take money out of student group funding than from the broad GA budget. They didn't take vote. Most people in the room probably support the event, and the question was procedural.

Mr. Marchand said they were out of time on this matter. Mr. Klein moved to extend speaking time by four minutes. The motion was seconded and failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Marchand said that for those who were new to the GA, the motion was whether to consider the bill that evening instead of referring it to committee and waiting a month.

THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK 1202c PASSED BY HAND-VOTE, BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND THE EVENT "ON REVOLUTION: A CONVERSATION BETWEEN GRACE LEE BOGGS AND ANGELA DAVIS" HOSTED BY WOCI.

Resolution 1202b was referred to the Rule Committee, By-law Amendment to Set Term Limits for Executive Board Officers.

Resolution 1202d was referred to the External Affairs and Rule Committees, Directed Action In Support of the Alternative Tuition Proposal.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Presentation by Lee Maranto, Independent Hearing Officer

Ms. Navab said Mr. Maranto is the newly appointed Independent Hearing Officer, a position that students fought to create on the campus.

Lee Maranto introduced himself and said he was there to introduce himself and give a quick update on the revisions of the Student Code of Conduct, as well as the outcome of a task force that included students that proposed recommendations to revise the Code and create his position.

The new Code of Conduct is in effect, as of Wednesday. With that, his position officially came into being. There had been a lot of concern about how the process was laid out and how it lacked due process for students who found themselves in the Conduct process. That was addressed with the last round of revisions. For instance, they have various strict deadlines that are now part of the Code, to move the process forward. There was an article in yesterday's Daily Cal that had a link to the current version of the Code. He was happy to entertain any questions.

Mr. Maranto said he reports directly to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. His role is just to oversee the procedural piece of any issue dealing with Student Conduct. For instance, one new guideline is if a complaint comes to the Center for Student Conduct, they now have seven days to decide whether or not to charge a student for violating the Code of Conduct. Any questions or disputes would come to him to rule on. There are also other timelines, and changes to the panel hearing process. The panels involve faculty, students, and staffpeople who participate in a panel hearing. That's just one mechanism to determine whether or not a student committed a violation. Some significant changes made to that hearing process, which he'll now oversee and decide on any evidentiary or procedural problems or questions. He also has a separate role, depending on the type of administrative hearing, where he'd be the person determining responsibilities.

As a brief introductory note, Mr. Maranto said he worked in Student Affairs for six years and was currently wrapping up his JE, his law degree. So he had variable experience as well as experience in student affairs. He called for any questions.

Mr. Hoople asked if this was a graduate student position or if it was open to anybody on campus. Mr. Maranto said it was actually a career staff position. He's a staffmember who reports to Harry LeGrande, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

Mr. Froehle said there was an issue an issue with the rules being sort of suspended because of some sort of emergency declaration by the Chancellor, the timeline suspension. Mr. Maranto said that one previous concern, although not necessarily with the Code, was that how it was enforced was pretty subjective and

arbitrary. He couldn't say much more about what was going on because he wasn't there. But that was an issue that was raised in the task force. The Code really outlines step-by-step what should be happening at what point in the process.

Mr. Davidson asked if he could send out the Web site with the Code of Conduct. Ms. Navab said she would do that, and also post it on the GA Web site. Also, Harry LeGrande sent all students an e-mail that has a link to both the old and new Codes. Mr. Maranto said he could also include his contact information. If people have additional questions about the process, he could answer them. The only caveat was that if there's a specific issue with regard to a case, he couldn't talk about any pending cases. But he was happy to talk to people about the process itself, or the Code. His e-mail is lmaranto@berkeley.edu

Ms. Navab said that if people have questions about the protests in November, those fall under the old Student Conduct Code, not the new Code. Mr. Maranto said that any issue that took place prior to Wednesday will be charged under the old Code. At this point, any complaints that come in with regard to conduct that took place started on Wednesday forward, will be considered under the current Code now in effect.

Mr. Froehle said that one difference he noticed was the elimination of geographic box around campus. He asked if that would lead to a slippery slope of making more and more things campus related. Before if things happened outside the box, students could still be charged under Student Code of Conduct. If he was arrested in San Francisco, he asked if he was more likely to be charged under Student Conduct. Mr. Maranto said that fell under the purview of the Center for Student Conduct. It was his sense that less cases would be triggered because they took place in the box, although they may see others that necessarily would not have been triggered. It can kind of go either way. It would be CSC's call.

Ms. Navab said she's started a list for people to add suggestions for changes to the Code of Conduct. Changes had to be approved by UCOP. Mr. Maranto said there will be changes because of new federal guidelines that dictate how campuses respond to sexual assault. So there will be an upcoming version. Anything that seemed really problematic or glaring, he'll try to address in that revision. He considered it to be a living document that will continue to be revised, and he was open to feedback on problems as they arise. They're trying this out as they go with the new process and position. Berkeley had the only position like this in the UC and probably nationally. So there's some flexibility as to how the position will be shaped. Overall, he thought this was a really positive thing. He was open to feedback from students about things that don't seem to fit right or areas where the Code wasn't flowing well. Seeing no other questions, Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank him. Mr. Maranto said he would like to thank them for their time. (Applause)

ASUC Report

Andy Albright introduced himself and said he's an ASUC Senator. The ASUC President, Ms. Loomba, was really excited to work with the GA and was open to work on setting up graduate polling stations during ASUC elections. Also, last night the Senate passed a bill to set up a committee to look into moving the ASUC's money out of the Bank of America. Two spots on the committee are for GA Delegates, to be appointed by Ms. Navab. Grads were included because ASUC money is also GA money

Mr. Riffe asked where they'd move the money to. Mr. Albright said the bill specified moving it to either a local bank or a credit union. The committee has an April 18 deadline for a final report to the ASUC Senate.

Mr. Marchand said that if people would like to volunteer to be on this committee they should talk to him or Ms. Navab. Mr. Albright said the committee will consist of, but not be limited to, certain positions. If other people wanted to participate and offer their advice and thoughts, that was possible. He'll give more information to Mr. Marchand and Ms. Navab.

Samar Shah introduced himself and said he's the ASUC elected Student Advocate. A little later the GA will vote to elect a graduate student advocate. They might be interested in knowing what that position does. The role is to protect students' rights. The ASUC Student Advocate Office does that with an office of caseworkers who work on anything from students' Conduct issues to general grievances, academic issues, and financial and residency issues. They serve both grads and undergrads, but especially with academic, financial, and residency issues, they've found a lot of grads who came to the office would have appreciated a graduate point of view. So they've been working with Ms. Navab to establish a liaison, someone who at least initially would work with the Student Advocate Office to help grads, represent grads themselves, and eventually, if the pilot works out, maybe create their own staff.

Mr. Shah said he was on the Task Force to revise the Code of Conduct. There was an earlier question about whether changes in how the geographic box is considered would actually lead to less cases being taken on by the Code. Before, anything in the box, even if off-campus, could be a Conduct violation. Now, anything not on campus isn't a violation unless it deals with another student or with University property.

Mr. Froehle said he saw a new provision to expunge one's record, and asked if Mr. Shah anticipated that being used. Mr. Shah said that previously there was an informal expungement process. What would happen is that the SAO would write a really good letter to the Dean of Students, and expungement was considered on a case-by-case basis. The SAO's recommendation was to have a formal process. So expungement was happening, especially because there's been a change in the overall policy of records retention. Before, it used to be a blanket seven years. Now, unless the cases were very serious, such as sex crimes, records will be expunged in four years or graduation or degree, whichever came first. Cases that happened under the old Code, under the seven-year retention policy, are more likely to get expunged. Mr. Shah said he would recommend that Delegates pass this information on to their constituents. The Student Advocate Office has been successful with informal expungements, and they expect to be even more successful with the formal process.

GA Announcements

Tierra Bills, Graduate Student Support Project Coordinator, introduced herself. They're planning monthly graduate support meetings that will be tailored to various disciplines. The groupings are engineering and hard sciences; professional students, including policy and social work; and the arts and social sciences. There will be three meetings, and she would ask Delegates to give recommendations for locations for

these meetings. They'd like to have a relaxing environment, such as a student lounge. A question pertaining to this was included on the feedback survey.

Mr. Klein asked what the required attendance capacity was. Ms. Bills said it would be about 20, at the most.

Mr. Marchand said the next announcement dealt with the Graduate Student Forum. Ms. Navab said that Dean Szeri, from the Graduate Division couldn't be present, so she'd make the announcement. The Grad Division is doing a forum for grads next Thursday at 5:00 at the auditorium at Sutardja Dai Hall. People are requested to RSVP. It was technically due yesterday but will still be accepted. People could pose questions they would like Dean Szeri to address, anything from childcare, to OE, to benefits decentralization for GSIs, etc. The Web site for this is posted on the GA newsletter.

Mr. Klein asked if the meeting was going to be recorded. Ms. Navab said it wasn't, that she knew of, but maybe they could ask that of Mr. Szeri. Mr. Klein said the room was very well equipped for that.

Mr. Riffe asked if there will be food. Ms. Navab said there wouldn't be, not that she knew of. But apparently there are four pages of questions, so there's interest anyway.

Ms. Hsueh, GA Business Office Manager, said the Business Office was doing an old-fashioned survey. If people complete it and turn it in, they'll get a candy bar. People could also go to the GA Web site for the survey. There was also a bar code for smart phones that people could use to get to the survey. Mr. Marchand said he wanted to thank Ms. Ridell for helping the GA implement that. It was new for the GA.

Guest Announcements

Matt Goren, OE Student Communications Coordinator, introduced himself. He brings information to them from OE, and brings information from students to OE. There are some big upcoming events. OE is moving into the implementation phase, so things were actually happening now and will continue to happen for the next couple of years. They want more students involved in the implementation process. On Tuesday at 4:00, in the Senate Chamber, Eshleman Hall, there will be a job fair. All the implementation teams will interview grads and undergraduates to become members of those teams. He would ask Delegates to please give this information to their constituents. The jobs run the gamut. For students involved in electrical engineering, e.g., the Energy Management Team could use their skills. Somebody in the social sciences, e.g., could be on that same team and help design interventions to reduce waste. If people were interested in being part of OE, they could do so no matter what their skill set, or that of their constituents. People could send him an e-mail of their skills, or any plans they had to change things. If they've had the thought that, "If only the school did this or that," this was an opportunity to get funding for these ideas and actually make their vision happen. On Tuesday they'd hear what the implementation teams have to say.

Mr. Goren said that Bill Reichle was another communications head. Mr. Reichle said he's in the OE Program office and would leave his e-mail in case people have questions about OE. Mr. Goren said his e-mail is oecc@ga.berkeley.edu. Mr. Reichle's e-mail is wreichle@berkeley.edu.

Ms. Bravo asked if people who attend the job fair should bring a résumé. Mr. Goren said they should, and said it will be a speed-dating format. That's what the teams were expecting. Most grads probably have a résumé, but if they don't, they could work something out.

A Delegate asked if the teams will be established on the day of the job fair. Mr. Goren said the teams are already established and they're trying to put students on them. Teams already have some jobs in mind and already have some goals for students. They also want to create new roles to introduce to the teams.

Mr. Trager asked what level of involvement on behalf of the students will be put into the program and what level of hiring was being done outside the University. Mr. Goren said there has already been a long process, for some teams more than others. They've been bringing in people from outside the University. Some people on the teams now are already students. This is a more targeted effort to get students involved. There are also varying levels of involvement open to students. Some of the positions are liaisons, to gather information and share it with students. Other positions are much more involved. The Cal Planning Implementation Team is looking for skilled financial analysts, and other teams have similar, graduate-level positions. Positions that are higher up and include more involvement will be paid positions. Other positions are voluntary, and for others there's a stipend.

Ms. Jui asked if there's a Web site with the descriptions of the implementation teams. Mr. Goren said there are descriptions at oe.berkeley.edu. He didn't believe the job descriptions are up, and maybe they could do that before Tuesday. He would ask grads to please come on Tuesday at 4:00 and think about what they could offer that maybe the implementation teams haven't thought of yet. If people have any more questions they could talk to him or e-mail him.

Continuing Guest Announcements, Stacey Suh introduced herself and said she was with the UC Berkeley Amnesty International Chapter. Amnesty International and other organizations are trying to end the death penalty in California and are trying to put an initiative on the ballot. The savings generated by ending the death penalty would be put to use for law enforcement and to solve homicides. If they want to see this initiative on the November, 2012 ballot, she would ask them to please sign the petition.

SPRING FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Sheen said he would walk through each of the funds and then take questions. All three funds pretty much got more money requests than the last round, but roughly the same numbers they saw last semester.

The Graduate Meetings, Events & Resources (GMER) Fund is generally used to get food and general supplies that student groups need. For GMER, 123 student groups applied, asking for \$80,000, and the Funding Committee recommended roughly \$28,000. The Committee has very little discretion and they

basically just filter out things that can't be purchased with GA money, such as alcohol. If people apply and do homework, they're entitled to as much money as the Committee could give them. The number was low because of a change in the schedule, with two rounds this year instead of the four they had last year. The Business Office hasn't closed the accounts yet for Round 1 and the reimbursement window from last semester was still open. So they don't know exactly how much money will be put back into GMER for this round. The Committee was recommending the tentative approval of about \$28,000. And he would then ask the GA to give him the authority to do an automatic addition before the next GA meeting in March, based on the same formula.

Mr. Sheen said the screen showed the super groups the GA established. He wouldn't go through them that evening, but people could ask him about it offline. The screen showed the distribution of funds by super group and recommendation for the GA to approve that amount. It will be adjusted slightly because of a mistake he made in where a group was placed. The adjustment will be the addition of \$111.68.

Mr. Becker said there was another mistake in that Jurisprudence and Social Policy is not in the Law School but in social science, law and society. Mr. Sheen said the amount changed would be roughly \$200. It's okay if the amount was a little over \$28,000, since it will be fixed in March, with everything evened out.

Mr. Klein said that if they have a universal budget of \$40,000, the only spillover would come from Business, because nothing was requested there. So groups would remain the same, with just a percentage increase per grad group.

Ms. Klaus asked about groups that don't have events after March 1. Mr. Sheen said that for GMER funding, the money was to go for the rest of the semester. If groups plan on spending all of that money before March, he would plan on a 20% increase; and they could know that was coming. Beyond that, he couldn't tell them specifically how much. But that's what he would suggest if any group was trying to gauge exactly how much they could spend this month.

Mr. Klein asked if the Assembly could authorize a 20% guarantee in addition to what's given in the currently approval numbers, with the addition to come from the Contingency Fund, if necessary. That would be for groups that don't have events after this March 1 date. Mr. Sheen said 20% would be \$5-6,000. He'd work with the Business Office on that end. People should submit reimbursements, and then the Business Office will fix that as they get into it. He couldn't imagine this will happen too many times.

Mr. Marchand said that as a point of procedure, if anything crazy happens, they could bring that up at the next meeting. Mr. Sheen said they'll work on this administratively.

Ms. Navab asked if the Funding Committee looked at groups asking for money to reserve rooms in town departments, and said she felt that was a bad use of GA funding. She asked what the policy is around that. Mr. Sheen said he would get to that.

Mr. Tentori asked if he was 100% sure that all the super groups were correct in bioengineering. Mr. Sheen said bioengineering might be under engineering for the purpose of the school, but for planning super groups and GA funding, it was put in the bioscience field. That could be changed. The Funding Committee was looking at tweaking the categories. Two-thirds of the Delegates would need to vote to

change super groups. Mr. Marchand said he would suggest having a conference of the super groups rather than moving piecewise here and there.

Ms. Hsueh said the Round 1 deadline to submit receipts is February 17. When an event takes place, groups have 30 days to submit their receipts, and people shouldn't wait until the 17th. The sooner they get all the receipts in, the sooner they can close the books and know how much money was left over from Round 1.

Mr. Sheen called for a motion to approve. A motion was made and seconded to approve GMER funding, what was currently on the screen as well as the fixes. Mr. Marchand said the motion was to approve the amount, \$27,923, and authorize the Funding Officer, with the advice of the Funding Committee, to distribute the unspent funds from Round 1, plus the fixes that were just discussed. Seeing no debate, Mr. Marchand said they would come to a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GMER FUNDING, \$27,923.40, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE FUNDING OFFICER, WITH THE ADVICE OF THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, TO DISTRIBUTE UNSPENT FUNDS FROM ROUND 1 AND TO ADOPT THE CORRECTIONS TO THE FIGURES.

Moving to Grants, Mr. Sheen said that Grants are generally dispersed for special events or programs that fit in the categories of Student Activism, Campus Diversity, Community Service, and Educational Improvement. It's content-specific and is for things the GA has prioritized to developing the campus community. Grants currently do not allow for food, stipends, salaries, or alcohol. There were 32 applications, the same number as last year, requesting over \$33,000. The Funding Committee was recommending about \$22,000 in allocations.

Mr. Sheen said that traditionally, grants have been all or nothing, in that under their rules, they either fund the entire request or they don't fund it at all. This year the Committee adopted a policy to get it touch with groups and negotiate down to where they can fund them. They found that plans changed, and that a group, e.g., didn't have to spend a lot on room rental. So the Funding Committee was able to fund all the groups, some at lower, hopefully more efficient rates. The recommendations were included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Sheen said a few issues came up. They're starting to see a trend that concerned the Committee, with publications applying for funding for publication costs, i.e. for printing a bound publication from Grants. That's fine under their rules, but the concern was with the trend. This round four student publications applied. One or two groups applied for this last semester, and the number has grown a little bit. From conversations with the groups, the sense is that either the University or individual departments have scaled back on funding, or were not adequately supporting student publications. Mr. Sheen said they'll keep an eye on this.

Other concerns with this trend had to do with making the system more efficient. There are dozens of departments with publications. Maybe there was a way to pool costs or find alternatives, such as digital editions or having a way to make this more cost effective for everybody. That's something the Funding Committee would like to look for. They'll review funding procedures that semester and this might involve a new provision. They recommended funding three of the four publications that applied, each for

\$1,500, with the caveat that this does have some impact now and in the future on other things they could potentially fund. In general, there was a broader policy question and the Committee would like to talk to publications to flesh out what was going on on campus.

Mr. Sheen said the second issue dealt with the cost of rental for rooms on campus, and the concern of spending \$1,000 on an event, with the money all going to rent a space on campus. The Committee several times asked groups to see if they could find alternative places at lower costs. While they did fund all the room reservations for events, this was sort of a larger concern they're seeing, and they're not sure how to deal with it. People in groups made good faith efforts to find better alternatives. He called for any questions.

Mr. Helu asked if Grants and Contingency came from the same accounts. Mr. Sheen said there's one line item for all student group funding. The Funding Officer, with the approval of the Funding Committee, sets, within that line item, how the line item is divided. Mr. Helu said that it didn't really matter, then, if money was for grants. Mr. Sheen said it didn't. It matters in that their general goal was to hit about \$20,000 each round for grants. Grants only compete with other grants, but Contingency Fund requests compete with other considerations.

Mr. Twigg said \$1,500 for publications seemed like a lot. Mr. Sheen said in most cases it costs more to print a journal. Mr. Twigg asked about groups posting online. Mr. Baur said all the groups post their publications online for free. The Committee discussed the merits and concerns with continuing to fund publications for copies of physical print. There are questions of distribution and cost effectiveness, but also getting the biggest bang for the buck. The Committee wondered if the GA should play a role in encouraging open access via the Internet.

A motion to extend speaking time by 15 minutes was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Klein asked if the Woman of Color Collective, with a recommendation for \$710, was the same as the GA Project. Mr. Sheen said it's a group in the Law School working on recruitment and retention.

Mr. Trager said he thought funding publications was frankly pretty silly and fiscally irresponsible of the GA. He asked if they could get publications to become sustainable. Mr. Sheen said they weren't at the point that semester where they could develop a measureable system of accountability to make sure that happens. It's something the Committee was thinking about. There was a suggestion to think about how to incentivize that.

Ms. Pymer said she contacted a science publication that prints 2,500 issues at a total cost of \$4,500, and charge \$15 a year for a print subscription.

Mr. Helu said several grants were for airfare or speakers, and asked why they consider give Contingency Fund money for airfare and speakers, and asked if Contingency should be for something else. Mr. Sheen student group that ask for more than \$1,500 have a couple of options. It could apply for the entire money through Contingency, or from Grants and Contingency. The Funding Advisor generally advises people to apply for Grants rather than Contingency for overflow. Contingency could apply for events coming up.

Mr. Helu asked why they were divided and not considered all together. Mr. Sheen said it wasn't very predictable. Ms. Navab said the Executive Board on Wednesday decided fund groups requesting money

for rooms from the Room Reservation Account. The GA put money aside for Pauley and other rooms. A funding request for a room in Stanley Hall was made by Tekla Labs, in the group's own department. That was questionable, since most departments will give waivers to their own students. Mr. Sheen said the Funding Committee asks groups with significant requests for room reservations if they could get a waiver. He believed an attempt to get a waiver was made. The group didn't know what the decision was, and was still waiting when the Committee made its recommendations.

A motion to approve Grants as presented. The motion was seconded. Seeing no debate Mr. Marchand said they'd move to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON GRANTS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, \$22,123.38.**

Mr. Marchand said they would next consider Contingency Funding.

Mr. Sheen said Contingency covers everything else, extraordinary events or things that may need more funding. They reviewed five applications, totaling about \$8,700, and they approved two of those events, at about \$2,000. He called for any questions.

Mr. Klein asked what Expanding Your Horizons was asking to do. Mr. Sheen it's a student group that's an extension of a non-profit organization training girls from underprivileged, diverse, or low-income backgrounds. They asked for a lot of money for room reservations at the Alumni House and VLSB. It's a good program, but with the resources the GA has, the Committee didn't feel this was something they could afford.

Mr. Klein asked why they decided not to fund the Homeless Harmless Ministry that Berkeley. Mr. Sheen said that went back to effectiveness. It's the Committee's feel for what kinds of projects they want to do. The group was requesting funding basically for food. Ten students, as he recalled, would go to People's Park every week and hand out food. It's a great cause, but the Committee didn't think this was the appropriate funding source for that.

A motion to approve Contingency Fund allocations was made and seconded.

Mr. Klein moved to amend the recommendations and to strike funding for the American Indian Graduate Student Association and to restore funding to the Berkeley Homeless Ministry.

A motion to call the question on the main motion and immediately come to a vote was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINGENCY FUND ALLOCATIONS PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, \$2,045.00

Mr. Sheen said an exciting development is that they now have the online funding training workshop, a well-presented slide show, that student group representatives are required to take in order to get reimbursed.

Finally, Mr. Sheen said he wanted to thank folks on the Funding Committee. They met for a little over 10 hours as a group. And on top of that, folks really put in a lot of time evaluating and thinking about this

stuff, and having really good conversations. And then, of course, the Business Office processed about 150 applications in two days, so he wanted to thank them as well. (Applause)

GA ELECTIONS

Election of the Graduate Student Advocate

Mr. Marchand said the Graduate Student Advocate is a new position that was created at the December meeting. It deals with Student Conduct and academic cases. It's 8 to 10 hours a week, with a monthly stipend of \$500. The person would be elected until June, with the position to be elected with all the other positions for the next academic year.

Ms. Navab said the position is an Officer, like the Funding Officer or the Rules Officer. The position is not a member of the E-Board and is supervised by the President.

Mr. Marchand called for nominations for the Graduate Student Advocate. Nominations were made for Preeti Khanna, Law School; and Kfir Cohen, Comparative Literature.

Mr. Marchand asked if they were Delegates. Ms. Channa said she was. Mr. Cohen said he wasn't. Mr. Marchand said a Delegate or Officer had to nominate him. It was so moved.

Ms. Navab noted that people didn't have to be a Delegate to fill the position.

Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Marchand called for statements from the candidates.

Kfir Cohen introduced himself and said he's in Comparative Literature, his eighth year. He's been involved with the GSI Union for about two years and with OccupyCal, and with other organizations that are, in a way, engaged with the relationship of graduate students with the Administration. He's a GSI. This type of relation with management is something he's become more interested in for the last two years. He'd be very happy to do this. As for his involvement in the GA, the Department usually gives the GA position to younger students, and he was involved in the GA when he was a bit younger, through his cohorts.

Preeti Khanna introduced herself and said she was from India and is getting her Masters at Law from Boalt. She practiced law mitigation for about six years and was management consultant for human resources for five years prior to that. She loved advocacy and she loved governance.

Mr. Marchand said they would open the floor to questions for the candidates.

Mr. Trager asked Ms. Channa what her management consulting experience was. Ms. Channa said she worked for five years after her Masters in HR with US-based global consulting organizations. She advised organizations on maximizing their people process by structuring organizations in various ways.

When a company gets big or was just starting, there can be structural, process issues, and she worked to make sure employees were happy and engaged, with their productivity maximized.

Mr. Becker asked Mr. Cohen which GSI Union on campus he was a part of. Mr. Cohen said there's one GSI Union, although a caucus was formed. He belongs to that caucus. He hasn't run for any position.

Mr. Hasan asked about their prior experiences with the Berkeley Administration. Ms. Channa said she didn't have any. Mr. Cohen he didn't either. He's worked with faculty and department chairs, but not in any official capacity.

Ms. Navab said the Graduate Student Advocate job wasn't specific to Code of Conduct issues and wasn't specifically related to the Administration, or to protests, and could be for grievances involving academics or housing, or childcare. It was a very broad category.

Mr. Baur asked about the time commitment, and how much time and effort they expected to provide. Ms. Channa said the job description calls for four hours for office hours, drop-ins, and advising, and ten hours for background work, case research, e-mails, etc. With her schedule, she was comfortable with that amount of time. Mr. Cohen said he's a GSI, 60% employment, and is an eighth year, and fairly advanced. His thesis is mostly written, so between six and eight hours a week was very easy.

Ms. Bravo asked if they could explain their philosophy in general about the position. Ms. Channa said it had to be resolution oriented. There are a variety of issues that could come up, and the policy was to resolve conflicts as much as possible within the framework of the rules. Resolving conflicts was the role of the Advocate. Mr. Cohen said that when there are conflicts, students don't usually know what their rights are. So any mediator first had to provide them with as much information as possible. These situations made students very anxious, so the idea was to have the conflict resolved between the position and the Administration and limit direct antagonistic conflict with the student.

Ms. Navab said the Rules Officer asked her to clarify the length of the position. Like all of the GA's Officers, it would go through June. The position for next year would be elected in March and April, along with all other GA Officer elections, with the positions to start in July.

Seeing no other questions, Mr. Marchand asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Back in regular session, Mr. Marchand asked to have the candidates brought back in and said he would like to congratulate Mr. Cohen for being elected Graduate Student Advocate.

Election of Graduate Council Representative

Mr. Marchand said the GA has three Graduate Council representatives and an Alternate. One representative, Sam Saxena, is graduating and therefore had to leave the position. People attend one meeting a month, held on Monday afternoons. The Grad Council sets policies campus-wide for graduate studies

and deals with other issues like graduate funding. He called for nominations. Ms. Navab said this group makes a lot of academic decisions for the campus.

Ms. Boatman said a lot of new degrees have been brought up, and another interesting subject the Grad Council discusses includes online degrees. They vote on additions to programs and also do departmental reviews.

Mr. Helu asked what Delegates were involved, so they knew what departments they're in. Mr. Marchand said Ms. Boatman is in Material Science; Ms. Ng is in Music; and the Alternate is Ms. Hernandez, Law.

Nominations were made for Haider Hasan, Mechanical Engineering; and Rosa Bravo, Social Welfare.

Mr. Sehgal asked about the term of the position. Mr. Marchand said it will end in June, with a vote that semester for the next academic year.

Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Marchand asked the two candidates to make short statements.

Rosa Bravo introduced herself and said she was from the School of Social Welfare, with a concentration in management. She would like the position because she's always been interested in education. She was an undergrad there. Most of her education has been focused on retention and she's worked for the Student Learning Center her entire time there. She was passionate about education.

Haider Hasan introduced himself and said he's a Ph.D. student in Mechanical Engineering. During his undergraduate career he sat on a similar undergraduate committee. He initiated a late night mass tutoring organization as an undergrad. He made changes that are still in place for the recitation section of the course he used to teach. He's currently writing a textbook on the experiences he had as a GSI. His future plans included being a professor. He really enjoyed working with students and he really believed in education.

Mr. Marchand called for any questions for the candidates.

Ms. Navab said the Grad Council gets a lot of important information that is not always communicated to a larger audience. She asked how they'd involve grad students and how often they'd share information. Mr. Hasan said he'd share information after every meeting. It was important to communicate things timely. And he'd be open to getting any e-mails. If the GA would be interested, he could also hold office hours. Ms. Bravo said she'd also provide information as soon as possible, through e-mails or at GA meetings. She attends all GA meetings.

Ms. Navab said that was not criticism of current Grad Council reps, who were fabulous. She asked if the nominees were available for Exec Board meetings Wednesday afternoons at 4:30. Mr. Hasan said he would be. Ms. Bravo said she wasn't at that point, but could be.

Ms. Boatman asked Ms. Bravo about her career aspirations. Ms. Bravo said she'll graduate that year. Her long-term goal is to open a non-profit in her hometown, Salinas, California, focused on education and providing supportive services for the large Latino population there, people whose parents are farm workers.

Seeing no other questions, Mr. Marchand asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Back in regular session, Mr. Marchand asked to have the candidates brought back and said he would like to congratulate Ms. Bravo for being elected Grad Council representative. (Applause)

A motion to amend the agenda to consider Resolution 1202c at that time was made and seconded.

Mr. Klein said he would like to first hear the report from the Women of Color Initiative. Ms. Navab said Delegates should have written reports available. The Project Coordinators were also on the agenda.

THE MOTION TO CONSIDER SB 1202c AT THAT TIME PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

The following Resolution, 1202c, was absent Veronica Garcia and Mike Sheen:

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND THE EVENT “ON REVOLUTION: A
CONVERSATION BETWEEN GRACE LEE BOGGS AND ANGELA DAVIS” HOSTED BY WOCI

WHEREAS, on March 3rd, the Women of Color Initiative (WOCI) is hosting the 27th Empowering Women of Color Conference (EWOCC) at the UC Berkeley campus; and

WHEREAS, this year's EWOCC, under the theme “A Holistic Approach: Justice, Access, and Healing,” will focus on the mental and physical well being of women of colors, including: speaker panels on disability justice and the intersections of art, activism; as well as on-site meditation, yoga, acupuncture, and massage; and

WHEREAS, this year, WOCI is also coordinating a special pre-conference event featuring the internationally renowned activists and scholars Grace Lee Boggs and Angela Davis; and

WHEREAS, the attendance at this event is expected to be at least 800 attendees -- double the expected attendance at EWOCC; and

WHEREAS, while the WOCI programs and event budget line is set at \$2,000, the majority of EWOCC's budget is funded through ticket sales; and

WHEREAS, the pre-conference event, “On Revolution: A Conversation Between Grace Lee Boggs and Angela Davis,” requires additional funding (for speaker honoraria, rental of Pauley Ballroom, sound system, and videographer stipend) beyond what is currently in the WOCI programs and events; and

WHEREAS, \$7,800 of the \$15,000 general Contingency Fund has not yet been allocated;

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND THE EVENT “ON REVOLUTION: A CONVERSATION BETWEEN GRACE LEE BOGGS AND ANGELA DAVIS” HOSTED BY WOCI (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that \$2,000 be allocated from the general Contingency Fund to the WOCI Programs and Events budget towards funding this event.

Mr. Sheen said the Women of Color Conference Planning Committee initially requested about \$2,000 in funding for one component of the Conference. They were able to get excellent speakers. The Funding Committee felt the most appropriate route was to get the funding from Contingency as opposed to applying as a student group or GA project.

Ms. Garcia introduced herself and said she's the EWOCC Coordinator. Kim McNair introduced herself and said she was the former WOCI Coordinator. Tala Khanmalek introduced herself and said she was a grad student in Ethnic Studies is the new WOCI Coordinator, just hired before Winter Break.

Ms. Garcia said the Empowering Women of Color Conference has been an institution at UC Berkeley for over 20 years. It not only has meaning for the community there, but also for women of color communities in the East Bay and beyond. A lot of attendees come from all over the country, and they expect about 500 people that year. Their budget has increased as the Conference has increased. This year they have an opportunity to have two very extraordinary speakers, so an additional event was being planned in conjunction with the Conference. Angela Davis and Grace Lee Boggs will talk about the activism they've been engaged with for, in Ms. Boggs' case, over seven decades.

Ms. Garcia said she wanted to show a brief clip from a documentary to give context to the speakers and why the Coordinators were so excited to have them come here and why they were requesting additional funding. Ms. Boggs' work on environmental justice has earned her a huge following all over the country. So they expect this event to have 800 attendees, if not reach capacity for Pauley. A video was shown. Ms. Garcia noted that Ms. Boggs is 96 and is still very active in trade organizing. She called for any questions.

Mr. Helu said the Resolution states that the budget for Programs is \$2,000. He asked how much of that goes for this event. Ms. Garcia said they allocated across honorariums for the speakers. She was willing to lower that. Mr. Helu said there already was a budget line for the WOCI. He asked how much of that \$2,000 already goes to this event. Ms. McNair said that last year, all of it did.

Mr. Klein said there's a distinction between the main Conference and this additional event. He asked if all the money the Resolution asks for goes towards the event on Friday. Ms. Garcia said that was correct.

Ms. Navab asked if the Coordinators were looking at this as a two-day Conference, not as two events. Mr. Garcia said the two events are closely tied together. The Conference theme is “Justice, Access, and Healing,” and both women have practice in those areas. So this was seen as being one Conference over two days.

A Delegate asked if this was already funded by the GA. Ms. Garcia said it wasn't. The Delegate asked what percentage was funded by the GA. Ms. Garcia said they got funding from other departments and

Reports

programs, like the Department of Ethnic Studies, the ASUC, the Department of Gender and Women’s Studies, Gender Equity, and the Center for Race and Ethnicity.

Ms. Navab said costs were also covered by ticket sales to non-Berkeley students.

Ms. Garcia noted that this is something that draws people from all departments.

Mr. Klein asked why the Resolution wasn't brought up in December. Ms. McNair said that Contingency funding was on a rolling basis. Mr. Klein said he was just curious. Mr. Sheen said there were conversations all last semester about this. They've been trying to figure it out. The Project chose to come to the Funding Committee first during this round.

Mr. Klein asked what happened last year with Conference funding. As he recalled, they also requested funding from the Funding Committee, and the same thing happened last year. He asked if that was correct, where they requested grants and decided to just let the Delegates decide. Ms. McNair said they weren't given funding from the Delegate body at all, from GMER. Ms. Navab said that what Mr. Klein mentioned was from two years ago. Mr. Marchand said that last year the Programs and Events line of the Women of Color Initiative was \$3,500. And \$1,500 was cut from this Initiative from last year. They didn't ask for Contingency Funds last year.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1202c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND THE EVENT “ON REVOLUTION: A CONVERSATION BETWEEN GRACE LEE BOGGS AND ANGELA DAVIS” HOSTED BY WOCI.

Ms. Garcia said she would like to thank them.

REPORTS

Mr. Marchand, Assembly Affairs Vice President, reported. He said he gave some updates in his written report on Resolutions the GA passed in December. They passed actions through the Executive Board and he'd try to tell the Assembly what happened with those. He's been working with Ms. Navab and the ASUC Elections Council Chair to see how they can improve participation for grads in ASUC elections. The Class Pass will be on the ballot this year, and should attract some interest in voting. If there's anything Delegates could think of that the GA could do to make it easier for grads to participate, or to communicate to grads why the ASUC elections matter, he would ask them to please let the GA know.

Also, as occurred last year, Mr. Marchand said that he and the Campus Affairs VP were planning to attend some department meetings, at departments that are not represented in the GA, or that have Delegates who don't attend. The idea was to recruit more Delegates and make sure more departments were served by the GA

Ms. Navab, GA President, reported. Regarding Operational Excellence, most of the Student Services Initiatives that have been approved are IT-based, to improve advising, to make better financial aid systems, and to have systems talk to each other. They're hiring a new director for that and they're in the final process, with three candidates. She and Ms. Loomba were doing the last round of interviews. That person should be hired in the next two weeks.

Also, the Police Review Board is investigating what happened on November 9. The students on the PRB, Eve Weissman, the GA rep, and Omar Kunbargi, the undergrad representative, will meet with students on Monday to give an update on what the procedure will be for the PRB investigation and to solicit input on how students would like to proceed. There are different ideas. It will be at 7 p.m. in the Madrone Room, 4th floor of MLK. If people had further questions, Ms. Navab said she would be happy to go into more detail.

Ms. Navab said they had some slides to show on what the Lower Sproul renovation project will look like. The slide showed what the outside of Eshleman and MLK will look like. The basement will include a meditation space, enclosed offices for the Recruitment and Retention Center, QARC, and 1,000 square feet of practice and performance space. So the student groups that people see rehearsing on Lower Sproul will now no longer have to practice at night on concrete.

The floor above it is the main floor. There are two different proposals. The newest proposal is to have a larger restaurant with a pub built into it, a little bit higher class than what they now have. There would be seating on the Plaza. There would also be a grab-and-go food station, with the rest to be lounge seating for students. What they were seeing were not the most updated plans, because the architects haven't sent them the most recent plans.

The next slide showed the view from Bancroft, looking in.

The next floor up includes more practice and performance space, a little catering kitchen to be used for events, and space for groups. The next floor up is the main floor for student organizations. There will be open space, with cubicles or a neighborhood-like set up with a few enclosed meeting rooms that could be allocated or reserved.

The next floor was for student government. The GA offices and Business Office staff would be located there instead of Anthony Hall. The next slide showed the grad student terrace, solely for grad students. A slide showed space for the ASUC Auxiliary/Center for Student Leadership and ASUC offices.

The top floor of the building would include a student government lounge, a meeting room, a space for large events, to replace Eshleman Library. There is also a catering kitchen and the Senate Chamber, which would be larger, designed more like the room the GA was meeting in that evening. It will have more seating than the current Senate Chamber.

The GA building, Anthony Hall, would be turned into more of a grad student lounge, to be used for events and for student publications. It would include space that grad students could reserve for different things. It will have a full kitchen and potentially a childcare center, if they could get funding for that.

The next slide shows the MLK basement; the Lower Sproul Plaza level of MLK. There would be four food vendors with dining and seating. The Bookstore would remain, with a new addition, a south addition that opens up to Bancroft.

The next slide showed the upstairs level, the Upper Sproul level of MLK. It includes lounge seating, the Multicultural Center, and space that was unallocated at that point. There are different ideas of businesses that could go in there, such as a pharmacy or convenience store that could be open later hours. There would also be a coffee shop. She called for any questions.

Mr. Froehle asked if the grad terrace would be open to the air above. Ms. Navab said it was mostly open, although it was partially covered. They're working on being able to have alcohol there. Mr. Froehle asked if the floor above was student government space shared by the GA and the ASUC. Ms. Navab said it's ASUC-controlled space that the GA could request to use.

Ms. Navab said they haven't fully fleshed out what will happen with Anthony Hall. There are two pots of money for Lower Sproul. Originally, there was one project, at \$223 million. The campus had some savings on what they thought it would cost, and so the main project became \$193 million, with \$30 million left over to use to further develop areas that were kind of neglected. Anthony Hall wasn't to have gotten a whole lot of renovation, and now it will. They'll potentially get new floors, ADA-compliant doors, new furniture, a kitchenette, etc.

Mr. Riffe asked if moving the GA out of Anthony Hall into Eshleman will cause any conflict of interest for the original endowment. Ms. Navab said the original endowment says that Anthony Hall had to stay a graduate student space controlled by the graduate government and that it had to have a publication. So they'd leave the publication there, and other student group publications could use the space. Mr. Marchand said moving GA offices would mean they'd be closer to the ASUC Auxiliary, to the ASUC, and to the Senate Chamber. Ms. Navab said this decision was made before her presidency and before last year. The idea was that there isn't a grad student lounge on campus that was ADA compliant and was readily accessible. Stephen's Lounge wasn't accessible to wheelchairs. The idea was to have a graduate student center. Mr. Marchand said that if people want to see the plans for that, they could make them available. They're still talking to the architects.

Ms. Navab said that Dean Edley, from the Law School, and Charlie Robinson, General Counsel for UCOP, are doing an investigation of policies around civil disobedience and the role of Administration, the police, etc., in dealing with things like future Occupy protests. They held a town hall on Tuesday to get student feedback and they're meeting with the GA, the UAW, and the ASUC; and OccupyCal has been invited to attend a smaller session with them on Tuesday. If people have any particular things they'd like taken back, she would ask them to please let her know.

Ms. Navab said that if people have other ideas of what should be done with Anthony Hall, she would ask them to please let her know. They're thinking of putting in an audiovisual system so they could show presidential debates, have movie nights, etc.

Ms. De la Torre, Campus Affairs Vice President, reported. She wanted to thank the Assembly for approving funding for the Empowering Women of Color Conference. People were all welcomed to

attend, on Friday and Saturday, March 2-3. It's free for grads and undergrads at Berkeley. She had a written report that, for some reason, wasn't posted online.

Ms. De la Torre said she's working on the graduate mental health agenda. They're conducting a survey for all graduate student that is supposed to come out in the middle of February. She would ask Delegates to please promote it and have their departments do it. It's broader than graduate student mental health, and will help the GA tell the Administration what grads' concerns are and what things needed to be worked on, and that there was hard data to back up those claims.

Ms. De la Torre said a mental health resource will come out in March. If people have any questions they'd like to be answered, they should let her know. For instance, if a GSI's student came to them with a problem, the GSI should know where to go for help. Ms. De la Torre said they're trying to think of questions like that, and if people could think of any, she would ask them to please direct them to her, at cavp@ga.berkeley.edu.

Ms. De la Torre said she's also working on campus committees. The GA Campus Affairs Committee has been really helpful in streamlining campus committees. There are a lot of committees, but people don't know what all of them do. She wanted to make sure that the person who comes after her was ready to hit the ground running and knows which committees were really important and which ones maybe they didn't have to worry about so much, although she tried to make sure every committee had appointments. There aren't enough students volunteering. If Delegates would like to volunteer for a campus committee, that was always welcome.

Ms. De la Torre said the people on the Grad Social Club couldn't be there that evening, so she wanted to fill the GA in on an upcoming event. They'll have a comedian, Adam Ruben, come to campus on February 6. They'll also have a St. Patrick's Pub Crawl. In addition, the graduate student boat cruise was also coming up.

Mr. Ortega, External Affairs Vice President, reported. The main thing they've been doing is planning for the Student Lobby Conference coming up the first weekend of March. It's part of an annual conference the GA hosts. All the UC campuses together, undergrad and grad student associations, will participate. They'll have a march on the Capitol and a press conference on Monday, March 5. If any of them were interested in attending, they should let him know. Additionally, they're taking about six to eight other students to be there for the whole conference. It involves learning more about the history of the UC and the history of higher education as a whole in the US and California. It's really quite a bit of training for people, preparing them to meet with legislators on Monday.

Mr. Ortega said they also have been planning the SAGE meeting during Spring Break, the Spring Student Advocates for Graduate Education Conference that they have every year. The last thing they've been involved with is with UCSA meetings and advancing the different agendas of the UCSA, for grad students specifically. There's been quite a bit of movement. They're trying to get more students appointed to the Board of Regents and there seemed to be pretty good support from a number of the Regents, and from some of the other members of the various campuses and their Administrations.

Ms. Navab said they're also trying to change the criteria for how Regents are selected. Mr. Ortega said they're trying to create a set of guidelines for all the appointed Regents selected by the Governor

Resolution 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda

Regents' terms are for 12 years, and every four years new Regents are selected. They've mostly been very wealthy individuals who are very successful. There's a move to create some guidelines so Regents better represent the State and so they have more experience with the University and what it meant to be a UC student.

Ms. Navab said that applications to be Student Regent next year are due February 23.

Ms. Navab said she wanted to remind everybody that GA elections were coming up in March, essentially, or later, if they need to move them. If anyone was interested in running for any office, or was interested in applying to be a Project Coordinator, many of the positions will open up, and they should talk to people. She believed a couple of officers will continue, but a lot of seats will be vacant. And obviously, people could always challenge any of the current occupants. If people were interested in running, Delegates should talk to whoever was currently in the office they're interested in running for.

Mr. Klein said the GA doesn't vote for Project Coordinators. Ms. Navab said that was correct, but people could put themselves in the running for a position.

Mr. Marchand said there's space on the feedback form for any questions about positions. Ms. De la Torre said she won't be in the position next year, and if people were interested in it, she would ask them to please talk to her.

Ms. Navab said the current Student Regent and the Student Regent Designate will be on campus on Tuesday at 4:00 for anybody with questions on what's involved in the position.

Mr. Klein asked if the Student Regent serves for 12 years. Ms. Navab said they serve for two years, with one year as a voting member. The position fully pays for tuition. Other Regents get 12-year terms.

Mr. Marchand said that if people were interested in the Budget Committee, they should contact Ms. Epstein.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Trager said Resolution 1111b, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda, was tabled from the December GA meeting. He wasn't present at that meeting and would apologize. He heard Delegates were unsure of the ramifications of the bill. Given that Alameda County has already passed the bill, the point of the GA voting on it was moot. He would ask to table the bill indefinitely. It was so moved and seconded. Seeing no debate, Mr. Marchand said the question was called. **THE MOTION TO TABLE INDEFINITELY RESOLUTION 1111b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A PLASTIC BAG BAN IN ALAMEDA COUNTY.**

The following Resolution, 1202a, was authored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE UCSA STUDENT LOBBY
CONFERENCE AND MARCH IN SACRAMENTO

WHEREAS, last November, the GA Delegates passed Resolution 1110c expressing support for “the goals of restoring State revenue to public education through progressive tax measures and a reform of corporate property tax”; and

WHEREAS, a number of ballot measures have been proposed to increase California State revenue through income and sales tax increases; and

WHEREAS, Governor Jerry Brown’s proposed 2012-13 budget includes \$300M in additional funds to the UC System, contingent on the passage of tax increases; and

WHEREAS, the same budget reduces eligibility to Cal Grants (a predicted \$110M in cuts) and includes a \$200M trigger cut to the UC if the tax initiatives fail; and

WHEREAS, continued advocacy efforts are necessary to ensure the UC students’ priorities are represented in the next California budget cycle; and

WHEREAS, the University of California Student Association (UCSA) is holding its annual Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento from March 2nd to 5th; and

WHEREAS, the UCSA is partnering with CSU and community college students to organize a massive mass rally and march in Sacramento on March 5th;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA send between six and eight representatives to the Student Lobby Conference.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that GA Delegates encourage UC Berkeley graduate students to participate in the March 5th rally and march in Sacramento

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that information on the March 5th rally and march, including transportation to Sacramento, be posted on the GA Web site and included in a GA mass e-mail.

Mr. Marchand said this is the march and rally Mr. Ortega mentioned. It will include CSUs and community colleges, and the unions. Students plan to walk from Berkeley to Sacramento.

Mr. Hoople asked how people are selected to go on this. Mr. Ortega said that for the weekend conference, they usually don't get that many applicants. When they get more than they can take, they give priority to people who have been involved in External Affairs and who are Delegates. Ms. Navab said the GA could pay for up to six people to go.

Mr. Ortega said there will be buses going to Sacramento on Monday for the rally.

A Delegate asked where the funds are coming from. Mr. Ortega said that was part of the External Affairs budget

Mr. Trager asked what costs were involved. Ms. Navab said costs hotel reservations and transportation.

Mr. Helu moved to call the question and end debate. The motion to come to a vote was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1202a PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE UCSA STUDENT LOBBY CONFERENCE AND MARCH IN SACRAMENTO.

Ms. Navab said that if anybody was interested in sitting on the Investment Committee the ASUC Senate formed to move ASUC funds out of the Bank of America, they should let her know.

Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank people for staying until the end.

Ms. Navab said they'd see people at the Bear's Lair.

This meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary