

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 1, 2012

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:34 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

The following bills were referred to committee:

1203a, By-law Amendment Defining Sustainable Food and Beverage Criteria

1203c, Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of the Middle Class Scholarship Act

1203d, Standing Policy and Directed Action Against the Proposed UC Berkeley Honor Code

1203e, Directed Action In Opposition to Criminal Charges Stemming from Non-violent Campus Protests

1203b, By-law Amendment to Modify Election Procedures for Graduate Council Representatives was fast tracked for consideration that evening.

Guest Speaker -- John Wilton, Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance

Vice Chancellor Wilton's areas were Finance, including the CFO, Capital Projects, the Controller, the Budget Director, Human Resources, Intercollegiate Athletics, Business and Administrative Services, Operational Excellence and joint reporting with Facilities for IT.

A presentation was given focusing on finance and business strategy.

The four main revenue sources for Berkeley are State support; government/research grants; philanthropy, which includes return on investments; and tuition and fees. A massive shift in revenue sources occurred from 2003 to 2012. State support declined from \$500M to \$250M, a 70% decline when inflation is included. But the other sources of revenue have grown significantly.

There's a fungability problem, with some revenue sources restricted in their uses. There's also an issue with government. The State provides 11% of Berkeley's total revenue but has 80% of the governance rights.

The State has run significant deficits in 9 out of the last 10 years. The level of State investment in the UC System was unlikely to reverse quickly.

Contrary to popular belief, Berkeley's total revenue and expenses have grown every year in the last ten years. But their peers have been growing at a much faster rate.

UCOP sees all ten campuses as the same, and focuses on increasing State appropriations and tuition, restructuring debt, and on ballot measures. Berkeley was developing a strategy that didn't depend on that focus working

They should argue for the State to restore and to contribute towards UC pension costs. They should try and get the federal government to support higher education. They should have flexibility at the campus level to do things individually.

For FY 1213 they'll introduce a new budgeting/financing approach campus-wide to enable managers to have a strategic view. They should also be much more aggressive in growing revenue.

A guiding principle is to only pursue those revenue opportunities that are consistent with Berkeley's public purpose, mission, and values.

Mr. Wilton has an advisory board that was looking for students. It's starting to meet and will work on one or two specific projects.

For undergrads, low-income students are protected against tuition increases. Self-help money has declined. Berkeley has one of the lowest loan balances for undergrads. Mr. Wilton was new to campus and has not really dug into graduate funding. There was likely a problem with a group whose needs were not being addressed in the current financial model.

Examples of the problem of governance were given: taking a year longer to construct a building because it had to go through UC and the Regents; or taking two and a half years for Public Health to be able to teach a course online for people in the field to improve their skill sets, the same course, same teachers, and same curriculum it's had for years.

As for Athletics, about \$69-70M is spent, about 3% of total campus budget. \$60M is what Athletics raises itself, and pays a campus "tax," \$3 million. So Athletics costs a net of 0.3% of the total campus budget. Contact with Athletics results in other philanthropy that is estimated at \$25M per year.

Announcements

Cal Corps, and Community-based Learning

The GA heard from Suzan Akin, Faculty/Graduate Student Program Manager for the Cal Corps Public Service Center. It supports faculty and grads students around engaged scholarship and appropriating community-based work into teaching and research. This is a new resource. Cal Corps can help grads volunteer and with professional-based internships, or research.

GA Projects Updates

The GA heard brief reports from the following:

Veronica Garcia, Empowering Women of Color Conference Coordinator. The Grace Lee Boggs/Angela Davis talk and the Conference will occur that weekend.

Bianca Suarez, Graduate Minority Outreach, Recruitment, & Retention Project Coordinator (GMOR). GMOR is an ombudsman for diversity issues or hate crimes on the department level and works on diversity in admissions policies and on campus climate. Graduate Student Diversity Admit Day is March 18. The Project also put together a diversity resource handbook

Ruth McFarlane, Graduate Women's Project. March is National Women's History Month. The Project supports networking, provides resources for grad women, and does advocacy. Two concerns have come up that year, family and parenting concerns and women's health issues.

Tierra Bills, Graduate Student Support Project Coordinator. They planned the New Graduate Student Orientation and have held workshops on stress management, financial management, tax preparation, fellowships, and co-sponsored a number of events by grad student organizations, such as barbecues. They have a new initiative around mental health, the Graduate Help Support Meeting Series.

Fiona Tang, Project Coordinator for the Berkeley Graduate Blog. They're looking for a third blogger.

The Grad Social Club will host an event at the Berkeley Art Museum at 7 p.m. March 17 is a pub crawl in Berkeley. The Bay Cruise, which will occur on Saturday, April 7.

A GMSP workshop by the Career Center on salary negotiation will be held on March 7.

The Business Office survey was ending.

ASUC Announcements

A Perspectives showcase will be held on Friday, with 16 groups performing in a night of cross-cultural engagement.

Guest Announcements

Mr. Alvarez is doing a survey, asking what change people would make at Cal for a better human experience.

Election of GA Treasurer

Ms. Epstein resigned as Treasurer. The position starts in July and the term was for the 2012-13 year.

Report from the President

The Class Pass Referendum will be on the ballot as part of ASUC elections, in which grads vote. This allows students to ride AC Transit and funds shuttle buses. The Daily Cal is trying to affirm the VOICE Referendum, a \$5.00 fee to fund the Daily Cal and student publications.

A search is on for next year's Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator, a paid position.

The Council of Presidents, of all grad and undergrad student bodies in the UC System, will meet with Pres. Yudof.

The governance structure of the health centers was changed and has been centralized to UCOP. The process has been very problematic.

The GA is co-hosting "An Evening with the Chancellor" for 30 grad students

Report from the Assembly Affairs Vice President

Regarding benefits decentralization, benefits used to be paid by the central campus, such as remissions. The campus now funds departments to pay benefits, although these funds didn't actually have to be used for benefits any more. Feedback on this was requested.

Report from the Campus Affairs Vice President

A survey was coming out to inform on mental health advocacy.

Report from the External Affairs Vice President

A forum was held with the ASUC and the offerings the City has, and whether it was meeting student needs. The City is rezoning some areas. There will be a Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento, with a march and lobby meetings with representatives. The UCSA met and the grad Action Agenda for the year is to have three Student Regents. Nationally, there will be an advocacy trip to Washington during Spring Break.

Contingency Funding Report

Last month the GA passed about \$28K in funding. The Business Office was closing accounts from last semester and the projection was to get about \$24K back from last semester.

There were seven applications for the Contingency Fund that month. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations for Contingency Funding, \$3,970.

Report from the Environmental Sustainability Officer

A sustainable happy hour for networking will happen. They're also working on Take Back the Tap, after a student vote against the use of bottled water on campus; on Sustainability Fellowships; and planning for Earth Week. The food at GA meetings is about one-third as carbon intensive as normal food, at the same price, provided by the Berkeley Student Food Collective

ASUC Judicial Council Openings

The ASUC is holding elections in April and is looking for grads to sit on its Judicial Council.

Election of GA Treasurer (cont'd)

The GA elected Haider Hasan as Interim GA Treasurer for that academic year and GA Treasurer for 2012-13.

Resolutions

By voice-vote, the GA passed 1202b, Resolution on a By-law Amendment to Set Term Limits for Executive Board Officers. The By-law prohibits people from serving more than three years in any one or

any combination of positions as President, Assembly Affairs VP, Campus Affairs VP, External Affairs VP, or Treasurer.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA voted to indefinitely postpone 1202d, Resolution on Directed Action In Support of the Alternate Tuition Proposal. The bill would have had the GA support and work on the UC Student Investment Proposal presented by Fix UC. It involves undergrads committing a certain percentage of their incomes for 20 years.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA tabled until the next GA meeting 1202e, Resolution on directed action in support of Chancellor Robert Birgeneau’s Endowed Chairs Proposal. The bill would have the GA support and work on Chancellor Birgeneau’s Endowed Chairs Proposal. The proposal was to create a \$3 million endowment from a \$1 million contribution each from the federal government, the State government, and from a private donor. Amendments were discussed but not voted on. The bill was tabled in order to review the full proposal by the Chancellor. Committees that were originally assigned the bill will continue to work on it.

By a hand-vote of 21-9, the GA approved 1203b, Resolution on a By-law Amendment to Modify Election Procedures for Graduate Council Representatives. The election is changed from the three candidates receiving the highest number of votes to, instead, first having a majority vote for each candidate, followed by the four highest vote-getters being elected.

The meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

End Summary of the meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Philippe Marchand at 5:34 p.m. in Eshleman Library, 7th floor, Eshleman Hall. Mr. Marchand asked Delegates to sign in on the Delegates’ list, and asked Alternates to indicate the name of the Delegate they were representing. There was no feedback form that evening and they'd take attendance based on people signing the list.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Marchand said he had two requests to amend the agenda. Mr. Sheen asked to add a Contingency Fund report from last month, and Mr. Trager wanted to add a Sustainability Committee report. With these additions, the meeting would end at 8:00 if they stayed on schedule. Mr. Marchand called for a motion to amend the agenda. It was so moved and seconded. **THE AGENDA WAS ADOPTED, AS AMENDED, WITH NO OBJECTION.**

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes

- 6 -

Resolution Referral

Guest Speaker -- John Wilton, Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance

Mr. Marchand called for any amendments to the minutes, and noted that there was a typo, and the date should be February. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 2, 2012 MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Marchand referred the following bills to committee:

- 1203a, By-law Amendment Defining Sustainable Food and Beverage Criteria, to the Environmental Sustainability, Budget, and Rules Committees
- 1203b, By-law Amendment to Modify Election Procedures for Graduate Council Representatives, (fast tracked and considered that evening)
- 1203c, Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of the Middle Class Scholarship Act, to the External Affairs and Rules Committees
- 1203d, Standing Policy and Directed Action Against the Proposed UC Berkeley Honor Code, to the Campus Affairs and Rules Committees
- 1203e, Directed Action In Opposition to Criminal Charges Stemming from Non-violent Campus Protests, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, and Rules Committees

Mr. Kehoe moved to fast track Resolution 1203b, By-law Amendment to Modify Election Procedures for Graduate Council Representatives. Mr. Marchand said that would require a three-fourths vote and it meant the GA would consider the bill that evening, rather than referring it to committee and voting on it at the next meeting. He asked Mr. Kehoe to explain the reason for fast tracking it. Mr. Kehoe said they were going to include it in the annual By-law review by the Rules Committee, but they wanted to consider the bill that evening because it will affect the GA's election next month. Also, the bill was only going to be referred to the Rules Committee, which drafted the bill. THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK 1203b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

GUEST SPEAKER -- John Wilton, Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance

Ms. Navab said she would like to introduce John Wilton, the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance. He oversees units like the UCPD and had the second reporting line in the Health Center. He's formerly from the World Bank.

Vice Chancellor Wilton said that under his area was finance, which includes the CFO, Erin Gore, and a Capital Projects unit does financing for those projects; the Controller and the Budget Director, with Laurent Heller just appointed; Human Resources, Jeannine Raymond; Intercollegiate Athletics, Sandy Barbour; Business and Administrative Services. Ron Colev. under whom are many administrative

functions fall, including Mail Services, Environment, Health, and Safety, and the Health Center. Mr. Wilton noted that Mr. LeGrande has the police. Operational Excellence and Mr. Szeri, in that role, also reports to him. Mr. Wilton said he also has joint reporting for IT and the CIO, Shel Waggener, with Vice Chancellor Ed Denton, Facilities. That was the landscape Mr. Wilton said was under his area.

Mr. Wilton said his presentation focused on finance and business strategy. He made a video, at certain people's suggestion, that runs through the financial dynamics of Berkeley. It's about ten minutes long, on YouTube and the Berkeley Web site.

Mr. Wilton said the slide showed the four main revenue sources for Berkeley. It's not comprehensive because some sources of revenue were quite small and difficult to aggregate under one heading. But the main drivers of revenue are State support; government/research grants; philanthropy, which includes return on invested balances; and tuition and fees.

From 2003 to 2012, there's been a massive shift in sources revenue. State support went from \$500 million to \$250M, which is about a 70% decline when an inflation rate is included. However, the other sources of revenue have grown significantly. State appropriation is the result of a complex political process. For the other three sources, they could all go somewhere else, so Berkeley had to compete for them. So Berkeley, by definition, is now in a more competitive environment than in 2003.

Another thing that comes out of the slide is an underlying fungibility problem. Certain revenue sources are restricted in their uses, such as contracts and grants; and even philanthropy is quite restricted. So even if the campus has money in one area and a need in another, the money can't be transferred.

Mr. Wilton said there also may be an underlying governance issue. In 2003, the State was the predominant provider of financing; and this year the State will supply about 11% of Berkeley's total revenue. And yet, the State has 80% of the governance rights, an odd structure for an organization. The State helps to finance a number of buildings and buys the land, and has a lot of sunk equity in the University System.

Mr. Wilton said the next slide shows the latest forecast for the State's fiscal outlook. The State of California has run significant deficits in 9 out of the last 10 years. The disinvestment by the State, the decline of 70%, is bad public policy. Investing in all forms of education leads to innovation, job growth, economic growth, and is probably socially desirable, and in the long run, more than pays for itself. Going back to his World Bank days, there were many instances of governments implementing bad public policy. This is one of them.

The level of investment by the State in the UC System was unlikely to reverse quickly. The UC System is not the highest priority of the Governor or the voters. There are backlogs in K-through-12 education, in infrastructure, in an underfunded pension program, and the list goes on. So even if the State's fiscal forecasts improve, budgeting for a 70% increase in State appropriations wouldn't be the best business plan. And they may want to plan running the University without State appropriations.

Mr. Wilton said the next slide showed revenue that supports core activities. It shows total revenue and total expenses, as the University was basically run to break even. What's interesting about the graph is that it's not consistent with the public message. He'd guess that 9 out of 10 people believed that Berkeley's total revenue and expenses were on a decline. That's because they focus exclusively on State

appropriations. But for total revenue and total spend, Berkeley has grown every year in the last ten years. That's a reflection of the faster increases in philanthropy, contracts and grants, and tuition, than the decline of State appropriations, in aggregate.

And, of course, it's not just dollars. If they look at faculty retention; or the number of undergraduate applications; or new buildings, Berkeley has actually been growing, and was not in decline. However, for what they consider in the academic sense to be Berkeley's competitors, or for operating expenditures per fiscal year, while Berkeley has been growing, their peers have been growing at a much faster rate. That reflects the fact that the other schools are not so dependent on State appropriations. So a gap has been opening up. A number of public universities have also been growing faster than Berkeley. Cal is in the middle of the pack. But as the chart suggests, there's a bit of a problem opening up.

Berkeley's financial model shows that they have a medium-term structural financial problem. That's not unique to Berkeley. As to what they're going to do about the budget, they've created a fairly sophisticated financial model. It models things in a lot of detail and then aggregates that to look at an aggregate look at what happens to Berkeley under different assumptions. If they look at Berkeley going forward, it has some underlying structural deficits. It has an underlying fiscal/structural deficit, but that would probably be the case if he modeled the other nine UC campuses. They all probably all have fiscal deficits in the long run.

Mr. Wilton said that one number he found in a UCOP publication was about \$2.5 billion in the future to meet additional funding requirements. In the slide he was trying to show UCOP's approach to funding this problem. UCOP focuses on trying to float all boats in that they see all ten campuses as the same, and undertakes actions to make all of them sustainable. So UCOP tends to focus on trying to increase State appropriations, increase tuition, restructure debt, and depends on ballot measures to raise revenue.

The State of California does not contribute to pensions of the UC System, although it contributes to community colleges and to State Universities. This is one of the big cost drivers of Berkeley and the UC System going forward.

Mr. Wilton said his argument is that UCOP's focus is okay, but in the analogy he used, if this works, all boats float; and if it doesn't, all boats sink. Berkeley would probably sink at a slower rate because they are actually different. But it would be useful to have a strategy in place that wasn't dependent on UCOP's focus working. It may be that the State doesn't increase the monies it provides to the UC System; and it could be that tuition increases become politically and socially unacceptable. Therefore they'd have a big problem, because that's the basis of the strategy.

Mr. Wilton said the strategy they're trying to develop, and what he was trying to work on with his team, was an approach that would supplement UCOP's focus if fails. And it would put the campus on a sustainable basis over the long run by actually focusing in on what Berkeley can do with its own unique strengths and weaknesses. He believed they can do this.

Mr. Wilton said the next slide was their plan for financial sustainability. It's a summary of the different ways of trying to solve the financial problem. One thing that comes out of the model is that there's no silver bullet, no one thing they could do to make the system financially sustainable. One thing they should argue for is the restoration of State appropriations, and they should argue that the State should start to contribute towards UC pension costs

Secondly, they should make a bigger effort to try and get the federal government to support higher education. The US is unique in that it's the only developed country in the world where the federal government doesn't supply financing to its higher-level public educational institutions. The campus actually has a proposal whereby they can start to do that.

Mr. Wilton said he wouldn't go into philanthropy, although it would be good if they could raise more money through philanthropy.

As for the Regents/UCOP, the slide shows a very simple summary of a very complex set of issues around governance and allowing the campus to have more flexibility at the campus level. UCB was saying that it could do things individually, on the campus level, if all these other things don't work.

Increasing efficiencies was OE. They want to develop a financial roadmap of what they can do, and to strategically allocate budgets and significantly grow revenue.

Mr. Wilton said that for the next slide, they are significantly changing the way they manage their budget for FY 1213. Next year they'll introduce a new budgeting/financing approach campus-wide based on a new tool, CalPlanning. It will be the first time they actually have data and financial information that's organized and consistent. Hopefully, every one of the 29 major organizational units on campus will actually have a budget for the first time. Some units on campus don't really have budgets, and instead, have a checking account. They don't actually have data and can't really manage themselves.

The new financial framework will be incredibly helpful because it should enable managers to actually have a strategic view and then allocate resources to achieve strategic objectives. It's sort of boilerplate financial planning that most institutions would be able to do. But it's something that UC campuses don't do really well. So they'll move to base budgets, look at one year ahead, look at where they are relative to the budget, and start to think about integrating capital budget. They have a habit of budgeting on an incremental basis, which creates massive dislocations in the way they run the institution. So there are lots of opportunities to do things in a more efficient way, and actually get an insight into how to do things more efficiently. One example is the new productivity suite funding, where they pay for something once rather than having 6,000 transactions.

The last slide showed basic beliefs about the financial growth initiative that gets to a major shift. If they think Berkeley has a structural deficit, and they know the campus can't issue debt, you can solve the deficit in two ways: cut expenditures or grow revenue. And what they're trying to emphasize is that they should adopt a strategy that's much more aggressive in terms of growing revenue.

Mr. Wilton said that his hypothesis is that they cannot maintain Berkeley's access and excellence by cutting expenditures. He thought it would be simply impossible. So the only way to maintain access and excellence was to aggressively grow revenue. That was the key to sustainability.

The second point is that there are real ideas out there that would generate revenue. The challenge is to focus on growing opportunities where there's actually a net margin that's positive. If they grow activities that lose money, it doesn't solve the problem. That's not to say that they shouldn't grow things that break even, but they won't solve the problem. In order to do this, they'll need to have a lot of focus on those things that make a lot of difference.

Mr. Wilton said that the last point was that he couldn't do that from where he sat, and this had to be an effort of everybody on campus, particularly the faculty. And then from this, they developed a business strategy that would get into the details of what things to focus on and how to achieve them.

One of the primary, overarching constraints on all this, one of their guiding principles, is that they can only pursue those revenue opportunities that are consistent with Berkeley's public purpose, mission, and values. So there may be revenue opportunities they would not pursue simply because they're inconsistent with what Berkeley is. That was a given. But even taking that as a principle, there are a lot of opportunities to grow Berkeley.

Mr. Wilton said that's where they are at the moment, as well as a look backward and a look forward. He'd be happy to take questions. Mr. Marchand said they had ten minutes for questions.

Mr. Alvarez said that if money wasn't an issue, he asked what the next biggest problem would be. Mr. Wilton said he would say that it would be their ability to continue to maintain excellence and access, and maintain their standing as a global, public university, given that other institutions aren't standing still. Irrespective of that, the campus would have to adopt to change. He found it extraordinary that given that they're an institution that's known for being fairly radical, that trying to change things there was a major effort, such as changing the way they do the budget.

Mr. Alvarez asked what the change was. Mr. Wilton said he thought that a lot of people love to remain in an environment they've been in. People get familiar with what they do and are resistant to change. They find lots of reasons to argue against it. Secondly, there was an interesting finding by Bain Group when they studied OE. Bain has a database of 860-odd clients, stretching from private to public to in between. One of the ways they rank them is capacity to discuss complex issues compared with the capacity to implement them. Berkeley scored 469. So Berkeley was the last in their database, Berkeley was one of the defining characteristics of Berkeley was that it was really good at analyzing a problem and worst at actually doing anything about it.

Ms. Navab asked about his advisory board. Mr. Wilton said they've only met twice, and will try to meet in the next week or two. He's reached out to try and form an advisory board, and Ms. Navab and Ms. Loomba were very helpful in advising him how to do it. They sent out a general notification and invited people to a meeting. He spoke randomly about what they'd do and then people around the table broke into groups and wrote up issues. His thinking was to work on one or two specific projects, and rather than just have a random sort of dialogue about issues of the day, to come up with a couple of things they can work on jointly. One might be getting into the financial model of Berkeley.

Mr. Wilton said some students at one of the campuses came up with a financing plan. Mr. Wilton said another idea was to look at that plan and see if Berkeley could do it better. He didn't think the plan really worked. He'd love to have other people on the group.

Mr. Hoople said that as graduate students they have access to administrators and faculty, but they really don't interact with anybody else in the middle of this chain. He asked what they could do to help smooth this process to make their budget more efficient, being at the very bottom of the chain. Mr. Wilton said he had no idea. He was a bit worried about coming to the meeting that evening because he dreaded a question about graduate financing. He believed he's started to understand undergraduate finance and where the money comes from and how much financial aid there is. For graduate funding, Andrew Szeri

wrote him a nice summary of about four pages; and it was good that there were two people present that evening from Mr. Szeri's shop. Mr. Wilton said it was on his to-do list to get much more into the weeds of how graduate students are funded.

This was a gross simplification, but if they look at undergraduate students at the moment, students from the lowest-income families are protected against tuition increases to a large extent. When they look at the self-help money for the past five or six years, the costs of coming to Berkeley have declined. One of their achievements was rolling out the new Middle Class Access Plan. Berkeley is the only public institution in America to do that, for families earning between \$80,000 to \$140,000. But then there's a problem about the amount of loans that people have with when they leave Berkeley. When you run that data on their undergraduate population, Berkeley has one of the lowest loan balances for undergraduates. It's not just in dollar amount, but it's all relative.

But in thinking about the graduates, he had to dig into the funding, and he hasn't done the study yet. Graduates get a lot of assistance, a lot of financial support, through different mechanisms. When they look at data, it must be that there's a group within this population whose needs were not being addressed through the current financial model. But that's about as much as he understood. That may be another issue to take up in the working group.

Ms. Navab said that Mr. Wilton was relatively new on campus and, in fact, just hired his chief-of-staff. So in the coming months and years, hopefully he'll have a better plan to fund graduate education.

Mr. Trager said it was mentioned that Berkeley was good at understanding, but found it difficult to implement things. He would assume there are difficulties with rules, or people, or structural difficulties, and with people not getting things done. He asked where it would be most effective for the GA to apply pressure to alleviate that. Mr. Wilton said there are lots of rules that don't make sense and are accidents of history. Maybe they made sense when the rules were created. These rules are at both the campus and the UC System levels. So one problem they struggle with relates to all the rules that are imposed on them through the UC System. That was his issue with governance. If the campus builds a building, it might take a year longer than it should because they had to go through UC and the Regents. He'd ask why the campus would need Regental approval to build a building that was built either with philanthropy, student money, or somebody else's money. If the System wasn't contributing, the question was why the campus would need its okay.

Mr. Wilton said that one great thing about Berkeley is that it's decentralized in its decision making; and there's a great cultural and historical testament about that decentralization. So even if the Chancellor wanted to do something, it may be difficult. And in the history of Berkeley, the Academic Senate is quite a powerful and important body. And then they had to look at the composition of the Academic Senate and who controls that body, and if that body was traditional or more progressive. He understood that one example was an idea that Public Health came up with to teach a course online, for the many people in their 30s and 40s who want to improve their skill sets in the health sector but who couldn't come to campus. It's taken two and a half years to get that course approved. And it's the same course, the same teachers, and the same curriculum that has been given for years. That can't be a good way to run a business or a university, taking two and a half years to get a course approved that they're already teaching. All they were doing was to change the venue. But such a change had to go through the Academic Senate, the Systemwide Senate. And he could give millions of similar examples. If they want to change what they pay people, they can't do that. There are tons of other stuff that they can't actually do.

Mr. Terhorst asked how much the campus spends on athletics and asked how that's changed over the last ten years. Mr. Wilton said they spent this year about \$69-70 million on athletics on this campus. That's about 3% of the campus' budget total. The interesting thing about Athletics, though, is that it is the most successful business unit, school, or whatever, at leveraging up money. So of that \$70 million, \$60 million is money that Athletics raises itself. If they assume Athletics didn't exist, then they wouldn't have \$60 million of revenue. So the net cost to the campus, the support that Athletics gets from the campus, was about \$9.5 million that year. And that is actually 0.5% of the University's budget, which is what it costs to have the Athletics Department. Yet Athletics pays back to the campus about \$3 million through a sort of tax that's imposed whenever anyone on the University generates a certain amount of revenue. That money goes into the general pot. So if they were going to do it appropriately, they would take that \$3M out of the \$9M received, ending up with \$6M. So the Athletics Department probably costs a net of 0.3% of the total budget.

And then because they have an Athletics Department, they had to think about how much potential they get that wasn't captured in the \$60 million in revenue the Department generates itself, through tickets, philanthropy, and stuff they sell. If they were to ask head of University Relations, Scott Bidy, how much philanthropy that doesn't go to Athletics and that the campus wouldn't get if they didn't have an Athletics Department, and his estimate is \$25 million per annum. So if they do that math, the Athletics Department actually generates about \$18 million to the rest of the campus. But the athletics issue generates so much heat. If they just accepted the simple number of \$9.5 million, 0.5% of the total spend, one had to wonder if they wanted to allocate that much energy to 0.5%, or if it would be better to look at things that generate revenue. That was an interesting hypothesis. There were only so many hours in the day, and it's a question of what people wanted to take the time to do.

Ms. Navab said she would like to thank him. Mr. Wilton said he would like to thank them. (Applause)

Ms. Navab said that if people were interested in sitting on Mr. Wilton's advisory committee, they should let her know.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Cal Corps, and Community-based Learning

Suzan Akin introduced herself and said that this might sound hokey for a meeting, but it seemed like people have been sitting for a while, so she would invite them to stand up with her and stretch for a few seconds. She wanted to thank the GA for giving her some time at its meeting. She's the Faculty/Graduate Student Program Manager for the Cal Corps Public Service Center. She asked how many of heard of Cal Corps, and noted that a few of them have. Cal Corps does a lot of different things, and that evening she wanted to talk to them about the stuff they do specifically for graduate students. Cal Corps programs are a connection point for folks who want to get involved in the community. They do a lot of work with undergraduates around student organizations, tutoring, literacy, internships, and leadership, that kind of stuff. They also advise student organization if they want to run service events.

Ms. Akin said the work that she does was specifically to support faculty and graduate students around engaged scholarship and appropriating community-based work into teaching and research. This was new and pretty exciting. They just got the resources six months ago to fund somebody full-time in this position. So this was exciting new support for graduate students; and new support for graduate students doesn't happen that frequently on campus. So she was excited to be there with them.

Ms. Akin said she wanted to talk to them a little about the stuff that Cal Corps does, ways for grads to get involved, and resources that were available to them. Cal Corps can help grads get involved in the community, whether through volunteering, professional-based internships, or research, and can help to find partners and figure out ways to connect. They also have some programs for graduate students. One was the American Cultures Engaged Scholarship program for undergrads as well. Also, the Chancellor's Public Fellows supports faculty in developing and implementing community-based support. That could be traditional service learning, where students do direct service with a community organization, or something that was a little broader, depending on how the course works. But there's community input and community interaction with students.

The Oakland Community Builders is something graduate students have participated in before. It focuses on community organizing. There are semester-long internships with grassroots, community organizing groups in Oakland. A lot of folks have done this program.

If they're interested in funding, the Shinnyo Fellowship can provide funding for a year for proposals people submit for projects that had something to do with serving the public good, building peace in the world. Funding amounts vary, and while this Fellowship doesn't provide funding as for a full-time job, but it helps support people in their work so they don't have to do all of it voluntarily.

Ms. Akin said an instructor handbook for assigning community-involved courses was posted online about a month and a half ago. This was a great resource for GSIs or grads who work with a faculty member interested in developing a course.

Ms. Akin said she's a full-time staffmember there, so if they want to talk about this and feel out what their interests were, she would be happy to do that. Cal Corps has two offices, the undergraduate business office in Eshleman, Room 505, and her graduate office, in 102 Sproul Hall.

Ms. Akin said she also wanted the GA to know that Cal Corps is developing a graduate student-specific Web page that should be up in a week or so. It will have the information she mentioned and other resources. If grads were interested in getting involved, that would be a good place to start. She'd leave stickers with the Web site she'd leave, publicservice@berkeley.edu/gradstudents. She'll let the GA know when the Web page is up. Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank her. (Applause)

GA Projects Updates

Veronica Garcia introduced herself and said she was the Empowering Women of Color Conference Coordinator. She wanted to thank the Delegates for the Contingency funding the GA approved to help fund the speaking event that will occur on Friday in Pauley Ballroom from 4:00 to 6:00. They expect to

reach capacity, so people should get there early. The Conference is on Saturday, and they expect about 700 people. Their keynote speakers are Radmilla Cody and Andrea Smith. They have people from across the country coming to the Conference, and a lot of international press and interest in the Grace Lee Boggs and Angela Davis talk on Friday. She hoped people could make it.

Bianca Suarez introduced herself and said she was the Graduate Minority Outreach, Recruitment, & Retention Project Coordinator (GMORR). She's also a Delegate from the Department of Education. GMOR has two hats. It's an ombudsman for issues of diversity or hate crimes on the department level and also works on diversity when it comes to admissions policies and campus climate. She attends a lot of meetings with administrators and folks at the UC-wide level. She works closely with the American Indian Graduate Program and the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion. This month they'll have the Graduate Student Diversity Admit Day on March 18. About 250 admits will visit campus, folks who are up for Graduate Diversity Fellowships. Delegates might have already been contacted for small groups within their departments. They'll host a reception for those students from 2:00 to 4:00 on that Sunday. They're looking for students to attend and to host those perspective students and give them a sense of what it meant to be at Cal. The notice is on the GA Web site. Ms. Suarez said she was asking for people who are interested in attending to confirm with her.

Ms. Suarez said another project they're trying to do is to work with graduate students of color organizations. The Project put together a diversity resource handbook. The GA used to issue such a handbook in the 1990s, but it hadn't been printed for over 12 years. She met with Equity and Inclusion Vice Chancellor Basri two months ago and he agreed to help fund it. The handbook will have editorials from current graduate and professional students, on what's happening in specific departments around research initiatives, an Op-Ed from Mr. Basri, and some faculty. The back half of the guide will look at the community, for people transitioning into this space, such as where people can eat. There will also be an analysis of matriculation and retention rates for the past ten years, and a comparison study looking at Berkeley in relation to other institutions.

Ms. Suarez said the GMOR Committee will meet for the first time on Thursday, March 8, from 5:00 to 7:00 at Anthony Hall. She would ask Delegates who signed up for this Committee to please send her an e-mail confirming if they could attend.

Ruth McFarlane introduced herself and said she was the Project Coordinator for the Graduate Women's Project. March is National Women's History Month, so they have lots of stuff going on. She sent Delegates an e-mail. She would ask them Delegates to let the women in their departments know, which would be appreciated.

Ms. McFarlane said the Project does three things. They support networking, social and community building on campus for graduate women; they provide resources for grad women with academic or professional concerns, and have programs for the development of graduate women; and they do advocacy. Ms. McFarlane said she's been in the position since last fall. One thing she's found is that issues that need to be advocated about kind of bubble up from the grad student community. Two things have bubbled up that year in particular. She would ask Delegates to let women in their departments know that there was somebody they could get it touch with as an advocate. Two things have come up this year are family and parenting concerns for graduate parents and women's health issues, and having a rating

system or a way to know who the good caregivers were at Tang and off-campus. They're working on that project with a few other graduate women.

Ms. McFarlane said the other issue was around parenting concerns, given budget cuts. There's a childcare subsidy on campus for families of graduate students, and that was about to get slashed, probably in July, and it might be gone all together by next year. It's a huge resource for people with kids. She's been going around campus to find out who addresses childcare issues. This also involves grad students with older parents. She tries to bring resources together, working with a few graduate women to do that.

If people hear things bubbling in their departments for this Project to get involved with, she would ask them to let her know.

Ms. Pymer asked if the GA Web site could be updated so that it lists events. Ms. McFarlane said she would do that.

Tierra Bills introduced herself and said she was the Graduate Student Support Project Coordinator. The Project plans events that hopefully make life a little easier for graduate students in general. They plan the New Graduate Student Orientation and had an awesome turnout, with over 700 students show up. They've also held workshops on stress management, financial management, tax preparation, fellowships, the Ford Fellowship in particular, and co-sponsored a number of events by grad student organizations, such as barbecues and things like that. This semester they have a new initiative around mental health, the Graduate Help Support Meeting Series. They meet monthly in a different department, to share about challenges they face. This month they're funding a tax preparation workshop.

Ginger Jui introduced herself and said a mental health mixer was coming up at the Tang Center on March 14, from 3:30 to 5:30. There will be networking with the Tang Center and leaders of student groups and others interested in these issues. The Tang Center was well plugged into the undergraduate population but there didn't seem to be many graduate students involved in mental health. The Tang Center was interested in getting the word out and meeting with grads.

Fiona Tang introduced herself and said she was the Project Coordinator for the Berkeley Graduate Blog. They have two guest bloggers and they're looking for a third. She'd send an e-mail out.

Ms. De la Torre said that Aaron Welch, from the Grad Social Club, had to leave. On Friday night they're hosting an event at the Berkeley Art Museum at 7 p.m., followed by drinks at Pappy's Bar. March 17 is a pub crawl in Berkeley. On Friday morning tickets will go on sale for the Bay Cruise, which will occur on Saturday, April 7. Tickets are \$58 and include three drinks and a three-hour cruise on a nice, casino-style boat around the Bay. Ms. Navab said people had to be 21 and over.

Ms. De la Torre said there will be a workshop on salary negotiation that will be held, sponsored by the GMSP, on March 7, presented by Debra Behrens, of the Career Center.

Ms. Hsueh said that Friday at midnight is the last time that people could respond to the Business Office survey, on the GA Web site. When they complete the survey, they can come to Anthony Hall and get a candy bar.

ASUC Announcements

Ms. Navab said that Mr. Albright apologizes for not being there, but he had to work that evening. There will be a Perspectives showcase on Friday at Zellerbach at 7 p.m., with general admission at \$7. Over 16 groups will perform for a night of cross-cultural engagement. There are listings on Facebook.

Guest Announcements

Mr. Alvarez introduced himself and said he was from Psychology. He's been asking a question to people on campus whose attention he could get, administrators, faculty, and students: "What would you change at UC Berkeley to get a better human experience for you or your fellow students?" He had a small team that's creating an online and in-person presence to focus on creating interdisciplinary collaboration, something a lot of grad students have asked for, as well as advising, which is also something a lot of undergrads ask for. They want to make sure they represent the full student body, as many people as they can communicate with. He'd like to see if people would be willing to add this question to the GA survey that was going out.

ELECTION OF GA TREASURER

Ms. Navab said that Mollie Epstein has resigned as Treasurer. Ms. Navab read the letter of resignation. Ms. Epstein stated that she had to resign as Treasurer effective immediately. While she enjoyed serving as Budget Officer and Treasurer, circumstances made it difficult for her to continue in an official capacity. She hoped to remain active in the GA and looked forward to training the new treasurer and helping to create the 2012-13 fiscal year. Ms. Epstein thought the GA had a great Budget Committee and she was confident that the budget creation process will be suitable. People could contact her with any questions.

Ms. Navab said the person they elect as treasurer will start in July and be in office for the 2012-13 year. The GA's By-laws don't actually say anything about people resigning and what to do in that case.

Ms. Mendoza said they could hold two elections, one for an interim treasurer to serve until July, which she would recommend doing. The other option was to suspend the By-laws so that whoever they elect that evening would start immediately, with their term to last until July, 2013, although that was in violation of Robert's Rules. Ms. Navab said a third option was to elect a treasurer and then have another motion to have them start a few months earlier. Ms. Mendoza said that would be a suspension of the By-laws.

Mr. Marchand said they would elect next year's treasurer and then discuss the interim position afterwards.

Ms. Navab asked if there were any questions about the position. Mr. Froehle asked what the position pays. Ms. Navab said it pays \$700 a month for 10 months. Mr. Marchand said the position deals with

budget issues and is a non-voting member of the Executive Board and attends E-Board meetings almost every week. The person also meets with the Budget Committee once a month and meets with Ms. Hsueh for current financial data. The GA was also trying to invest funds and collect interest, and the treasurer would be involved in that as well. Ms. Navab said that Ms. Epstein will help to write next year's budget, which she's already started.

Mr. Hasan asked what was needed in the next few weeks to develop a budget. Mr. Marchand said Officers and Project Coordinators have submitted budgets. The Budget Committee next month will do most of the work drafting the budget. Delegates will see the budget in April and then vote on it in May. So this time period will actually be the most work. Ms. Navab said the treasurer also usually sits on the Commercial and Student Services Board, the former Store Operations Board. It meets once a month and governs ASUC commercial operations, the vendors and the Bookstore. Mr. Marchand said the person in the position can also sit on other campus finance committees as they wish. The work could be shared with the President.

Mr. Marchand called for any nominations. Candidates must be grad students but didn't need to be a Delegate. If there's no nomination, he would suggest moving on and coming back to this point later, so people could think about it.

REPORTS

Report from the President

Ms. Navab said the Class Pass Referendum was approved to be on the ballot by the ASUC Senate, so it will be part of the April elections. Grads students can vote in those elections. The Class Pass is the little sticker on their ID that allows them to ride AC Transit. It also funds shuttle buses on campus. In addition, the Daily Cal is trying to affirm the VOICE Referendum, a \$5.00 fee that would go towards funding the Daily Cal, with a small portion to go to the ASUC and the GA for student publications. That was yet to be approved by the Senate, but it was coming up for a vote.

Ms. Navab said they're looking to hire next year's Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator. This person Co-Chairs the Lower Sproul Workgroup meetings for the new Student Union and the remodeling of Anthony Hall, MLK, and Cesar Chavez. It's a paid position and was open to grads and undergrads. Positions will take place in the next couple of weeks. The job description will be posted on the GA Web site.

The Council of Presidents, of all grad and undergrad student bodies in the UC System, will meet with Pres. Yudof. If there are any issues of a Systemwide level Delegates would like to bring up, they should let them know.

Ms. Navab said there have been some major changes to the student health centers. The Regents did an audit of UC health centers, the Tang equivalent on all campuses, at the end of last year, following a malpractice suit at UCLA and a physician at the Tang Center being accused of sexual assault. A company did a bunch of audits and reported on changes that could be made. The Regents considered the big-ticket

items in the report, and at the January meeting, it was kind of fast tracked with absolutely no student input and very little input from health centers or vice chancellors on campus. Essentially, the governance structure of the health centers was changed. They currently report to a vice chancellor on their campuses. But governance has been centralized to UCOP and health centers will now report to Jack Sobo, who is kind of like a COO, and to the Committee on Health Sciences, which oversees UC medical centers. Along with that, other changes have been proposed, including forcing all of the health centers to go to a unified, electronic health records system. However, Berkeley just spent \$4 million implementing its own system. The system for credentialing physicians would also be changed. There would also be changes as to how to code the services that students get. People want to code for doing outreach or fliering on Sproul. If somebody speaks to a fraternity or sorority, that would be coded and kept in a central database that could be data mined for quality checks, risk management checks, etc. UCOP wants all of these changes to take effect on July 1.

Ms. Navab said that the process has been very problematic, with no student input, little or no campus input, and with no financial model to back this up. And it would cost millions of dollars. There has been speculation about this potentially coming out of SHIP savings or a tax on campuses. Students are asking to have a financial model presented. It was unlikely for the cost to come out of SHIP. They're trying to mobilize the campuses and chancellors to work on this issue.

Ms. Navab said the GA is co-hosting an event with the Chancellor's office, "An Evening with the Chancellor," following the grad forum they held a couple of weeks ago. Four grads went, and a lot of money was spent on it. They realized grads don't like to go and sit and hear information told to them. If they could create a dialogue in a more informal setting, that could be more effective. So they're trying to host an event with the Chancellor, the Provost, and a Vice Chancellor, for 30 grad students, over drinks and light refreshments. Delegates should get an e-mail about that. The GA will try to come up with a list of criteria and have diverse department representation, with first-come, first-served. She called for any questions.

Ms. Hoople asked who was driving the push to change the way the health centers are governed. Ms. Navab said it was Regent De La Pena, an ophthalmologist. Ms. Navab said that Mr. Sehgal sits on a board dealing with this. Mr. Sehgal said the ability of health centers to practice was called into question.

Ms. Navab said there were small-ticket items, like vaccines not being refrigerated, and big items, like people with out-of-date licenses. Mr. Sehgal said the idea was to more closely define how student health centers are governed. Ms. Navab not all the changes are bad. But the question was with the appropriateness of the process and the timeline to implement changes. If things are done without understanding implications or training staff, it could lead to more errors. So people were trying to slow down the process, think it through, and plan it out. Mr. Sehgal said that from a regulatory perspective, these things had to be done by the summer, or one or more of the health centers would no longer be able to operate. So some of the changes had to be fast tracked. What they did was to lump the majority of the changes together. Ms. Navab said student body presidents, mostly external vice presidents, are working on this. Mr. Sehgal said he's not involved in the administration of the Berkeley health center, but is on a committee dealing with quality and safety.

Mr. Marchand said there was no feedback form that evening because there was only one question. They welcome Delegates' feedback, especially on how the meetings are run.

Mr. Marchand said that one of their Action Agenda Items was benefits decentralization, and he met with the campus' Chief Financial Officer, Erin Gore, to discuss that. Some things were clarified. As they knew, if a grad was a centrally funded GSI, their benefits used to be paid by the central campus, such as remission of fees or health care insurance. What's happening is that instead of departments paying this out of department funds, and the central campus giving remissions, and basically giving back fees that were already paid, the central campus is now giving up budget to departments and telling them to use that to pay all the benefits that the campus used to pay. They're still keeping track of how much departments pay for fee remission, because fees increase every year, much faster than inflation. This year they sent letters to departments adjusting allocations by a certain amount to account for the fee increases for this year. He thought it was a bit strange because on the one hand they say they're decentralizing benefits and will have departments make their own allocation decisions; but on the other end, they're still keeping track of these things. These funds exist as what the University calls "19900 funds." State money and tuition money is more fungible than other sources, so they lump them into a general funds category and use them as they want. So money that's been decentralized for benefits doesn't actually have to be used for benefits any more. The Budget Office believes this gives more flexibility to departments in designing funding packages for students. As the GA heard Mr. Wilton say, they're interested in looking at the whole funding situation for grads so departments can offer stable funding solutions. This seems to resonate with students. Students often don't know if they'll get funding until the last minute when they get a GSI position, or things fall together. Hopefully the uncertainty and unpredictability in fees and funding situations will be decreased. The campus is moving away from earmarks, and hopefully departments will continue to spend for fee remissions. Mr. Marchand said he hasn't gotten much feedback about benefits decentralization, and if people want to help decide what to do, they should let him know.

Report from the Campus Affairs Vice President

Ms. De la Torre said she was also working on a health agenda, with both projects and a survey, which should be almost done. She'll send it to Delegates and would ask them to spread it to their departments. There will be a keg for the department with the most participation as a percentage of their department. There will also be prizes that are randomly awarded, including tickets to the boat cruise and meal for two at Chez Panisse.

Ms. Navab said the survey was to inform mental health advocacy and for the budget memo to the Chancellor, which will indicate where they think funding is important. Mr. Marchand said this was the third year they're doing this, and they'll try to see trends.

Ms. De la Torre said she was also trying to gather a central place for resources to put on a Web site regarding climate, something the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion was also working on.

Report from the External Affairs Vice President

Mr. Ortega said that at the City level, the office held a forum as part of a series, collaborating with the ASUC and the City on things that interact among those groups. The topic of the forum was different offerings the City has, and whether it was meeting student needs. There were representatives from the Chamber of Commerce and other members of the City. There was a small group there, but they had a pretty interesting conversation about what it is that they need from students and how students could participate. The City is rezoning some areas, designating building requirements, what activities can occur, such as bars, how late businesses can stay open, etc. There will be a hearing on Tuesday at City Hall. Stating what people would like to see in Berkeley could have a big impact. Ms. Navab said that people have said that they want karaoke and dance bars. Mr. Ortega said that if people can't attend, they should send their Councilmember an e-mail, which also helps.

At the State level, Mr. Ortega said they're working on the Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento. They hope to have something like 10,000 students marching on Monday. In the afternoon there will be lobby meetings with representatives. People can also go to the whole weekend conference. They'll stay at a nearby hotel. The larger conference will include training on higher education and State financing. People's costs will be covered. Mr. Marchand said that people could also just attend on Monday, and should reserve a seat on one of the buses.

Mr. Ortega said the UCSA had a meeting at UCLA. The graduate student Action Agenda for the year is to have three Student Regents. Over the year they've been trying to figure out whether or not this was something the Regents thought they could change within their own construct, how they interpret the Constitution, and whether they have that power. General Counsel has decided that they are not able themselves to create a new student Regent seat. So the UCSA is exploring new ways to still achieve their agenda and other ways to have student input. They're trying to leverage some of the headway they made into getting support from some Regents into at least having members on each Regental committee have provide some feedback. Before there was very little student input in those committees.

Mr. Ortega said that at the national level they're preparing for the advocacy trip to Washington during Spring Break. They're taking four students there. So far they're putting up many of the same advocacy items from last year. He called for any questions.

Mr. Hasan asked what will happen that coming weekend. Mr. Ortega said the UCSA is a coalition of student governments in the UC System, grad and undergrad. Every February or March, the UCSA has a conference in Sacramento, attended by 4-500 students. About 60 or so are grads. Some events focus on grad students and building a grad student community around Statewide and Systemwide issues. At the Conference there's general training on how the State Legislature works, how UC is structured, who the Regents are, the power they have, etc. They also go over the Advocacy Items that the UCSA has been working on throughout the year. It culminates on Monday, where people use what they've learned over the weekend to advocate effectively with their legislators.

Mr. Hoople asked how many people were coming from Berkeley. Mr. Ortega said he believed that for people attending the whole Conference, from Berkeley there will be about 40 undergrads and seven grads. For the march on Monday, he wasn't sure. Ms. Navab said a lot of schools were bringing buses.

Mr. Sheen said he'd give an overview of the budget. Last month they talked about what was happening with GMER and last month the GA passed about \$28,000 in funding, with the caveat that he would add additional money. That will happen in the next week or so. The Business Office was still in the process of closing accounts from last semester. They're projecting that they'll get about \$24,000 back from last semester, based on 10% of the accounts that have been closed. That should mean they'll add at least \$6,000 to the pot.

For the other stuff they're doing, the numbers in red on the slide showed the amount that will remain if they pass Contingency funding that evening, which totals \$12-13,000. That money will hopefully be good for the rest of the semester. All the money not spent by student groups will be used for student group activities over the summer.

As for the Contingency Fund report for that month, Mr. Sheen said they had seven applications. The application for the Optometry Class of 2015 got lost during Round 1 and will be calculated in GMER and distributed, assuming Delegates approve funding. The Transportation Graduate Students Organizing Committee (TransOC) submitted a late application. The group is new and the Funding Committee gave them leniency and will consider the application to be for GMER funding and calculate it as such.

The Iraqi Refugee Assistance Project was denied funding as it was largely a travel expense. The Peking University Alumni Association had its meals for speakers reduced, and honoraria fees were also reduced, based on a formal policy to reduce those fees. Quinto Sol Remembered canceled an event for which they were funded a grant and a GMER allocation, totaling about \$1,300. The event was postponed to this semester and no money was spent from those previous allocations. The group didn't realize it couldn't access the money and came back with a second request, for a little bit more, which the Funding Committee approved.

A Delegate said the maximum for Contingency funding is \$1,500. She asked if proposals far exceeding the maximum were because they used 100% of the funds. Mr. Sheen said that Contingency is actually fully discretionary for the Committee. They've tried to limit allocations to \$1,500. But groups could ask for as much as they want.

Mr. Klein asked why requests from TransOC and SPICEMACEY at Berkeley weren't general grants requests. Last year they did this as well, and instead of applying for grants, they applied for Contingency. The groups were told last year to apply for grants. He asked if the Funding Committee addressed that. Mr. Sheen said they didn't. Mr. Klein asked if there was a reason the allocations couldn't have been from grants. Mr. Sheen said there wasn't, that he could recall. He didn't think that was a concern to the Committee.

Mr. Klein asked if TransOC should have been a GMER application but wasn't turned in on time. Mr. Sheen said the group initially checked the GMER box, scratched it out, and checked the Contingency box. They were requesting food and drink. This is a new group that started last semester. It didn't ask for GMER funding because they started after the GMER deadline.

Mr. Helu asked about Quinto Sol Remembered. Mr. Sheen said the total budget was \$18,000 and the group has about \$10,000 from different sources and expected to get \$4,000 more. They asked the GA for the remaining \$4,000. The Funding Committee was pretty sure the group could still hold the event and

that the group could move money around, as occurred last semester. The Funding Committee thought the merits of the event were good and wanted to support it, but not for the total amount.

Mr. Hoople moved to approve the recommendations of the Funding Committee for Contingency Funding. The motion was seconded. Seeing no debate, Mr. Marchand said they would come to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINGENCY FUNDING FOR FEBRUARY PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, \$3,970.** Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank Mr. Sheen.

Report from the Environmental Sustainability Officer

Mr. Trager said he wanted to go over some things they're doing on campus. They're having a sustainable happy hour on Friday to network for sustainability projects, at 4:00 at Beta Lounge. They're currently working to try and network with One Bike Initiative on campus. They're also working with Take Back the Tap. Last year the students voted 5,000 to 1,000 to pass a Referendum against the use of bottled drinking water on campus. Mr. Trager said he's been conferring with the Pepsi reps trying to explain the Referendum to them. In the new Pepsi contract, the campus doesn't have to buy bottled water, and that concern of students got translated to an actual sustainability item.

They're continuing to work on the Sustainability Fellowships Program, trying to get dedicated funds so students can study sustainability there. They're also planning for Earth Week. Throughout that semester, he hoped to help educate people on how to address sustainability metrics. At the end of last semester there was a snafu about explaining things and a small argument about plastic bags.

Mr. Trager said the food they eat is about one-third as carbon intensive as normal food, but at the same price. It was provided by the Berkeley Student Food Collective, which is awesome, and is located on Bancroft. Mr. Trager said that people were discussing talking about having a policy where the GA could have sustainable food, such as grass-fed, free-range chicken.

A Delegate asked about making Berkeley more bike accessible. Mr. Trager said there could be more bike parking. Ms. Jui said the Campus Bicycle Committee is actually taking input on bike issues. One big thing is access on to the campus, which was really poor. For example, Dana Street was one way going south, but everybody rides opposite traffic to get on campus. There were a lot of things like that. Mr. Hasan said he thought bikes getting stolen was a big problem.

ASUC Judicial Council Openings

Ms. Navab said the ASUC is holding elections in April and the ASUC is looking for grads to sit on its Judicial Council. The J-Council reviews elections violations and procedures and rules on judicial matters. They are appointed by the GA President. They haven't been able to get any grads interested in serving.

For Law students and people interested in these things, Ms. Navab said they'd love to get some nominations. Otherwise, undergrads will take grad seats.

Mr. Helu asked about the time commitment for the position and what impact the J-Council has on grad students. Ms. Navab said there's training that people go through training that wasn't very long. The biggest time commitment is the confirmation process. People are interviewed by a committee and then the Senate votes. After that, it's just when cases come up. If there are no cases, they don't meet. In terms of the benefits to graduate students, she thought issues will come up, especially around the Referendum, where grads might want to have a seat. Plus, grads tend to be removed from ASUC politics, and it was good to have an outside perspective. Mr. Marchand said that if there's a grad issue, undergrads would be ruling on it.

ELECTION OF GA TREASURER (cont'd)

Mr. Marchand said that people could nominate themselves for just the interim, or just for next year.

Mr. Hasan nominated himself for the position, for interim and for next year. Mr. Marchand noted that Mr. Hasan was currently on the Budget Committee. He called for any other nominations. Mr. Niederhut nominated Mr. Klein, who respectfully declined. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Marchand said nominations were closed. He invited Mr. Hasan to speak for a minute.

Haider Hasan said he's been on the Budget Committee that year and hoped he could make the next budget.

Mr. Marchand called for any questions. Mr. Klein asked how many years he's been in the GA and what he liked and disliked about its financial structure. Mr. Hasan said this was his first year as a grad student, so it was his first year in the GA. He liked that the GA funds so many different aspects of University life. He disliked that it was so hard to do, although he thought it was worth the work.

Mr. Niederhut asked, on a scale of 1 to 10, how awesome he was. Mr. Hasan said this may come off as being self-centered, but he thought he was an 11!

Mr. Klein asked if he'd promise, if elected, to increase funding for outreach activities. Mr. Hasan said he couldn't decide that without more information. Ms. Navab said he wouldn't be making that call, and that decision would be made by the Delegates.

A Delegate asked about his department. Mr. Hasan said he was in Mechanical Engineering.

Seeing no other questions Mr. Marchand asked Mr. Hasan to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After a discussion off the record and a vote, Mr. Marchand asked to have Mr. Hasan brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate Mr. Hasan for being elected Interim GA Treasurer and GA Treasurer for 2012-13

RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolution, 1202b, was authored by Bahar Navab:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO SET TERM LIMITS FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD OFFICERS

WHEREAS, student associations depend on a periodic renewal of their leadership to sustain their organizations; and

WHEREAS, executive officers should be encouraged to develop new leadership and ensure the transition of their knowledge and experience; and

WHEREAS, to address these issues, many student associations have set term limits for their executive officers; and

WHEREAS, the By-laws don't current specify term limits for Executive Board officers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that section 2.3.6 of the By-laws be amended as follows:

2.3.6. Terms. Terms of Officers shall start on July 1 and shall last for one year. No individual may serve for more than three (3) terms in any one or combination of the following positions: President, Assembly Affairs Vice President, Campus Affairs Vice President, External Affairs Vice President, or Treasurer.

Ms. Navab said the Resolution would limit Executive Board terms to three years, in any combination of Exec seats. It doesn't preclude people from being a Project Coordinator or chief-of-staff, or federal or State liaison for the External Affairs VP. The idea behind this was to force the GA to build leadership within the GA rather than just having the same people run year after year. Looking at other campuses, both in the UC System and at comparable public schools, they also have term limits.

Mr. Shybut asked how often people run for consecutive terms. Ms. Navab said that Mr. Marchand would get termed out, the President before her would have been termed out, and Mr. Ortega would get termed out. It was quite common, although that hasn't always been the case.

Mr. Tentori asked why three years was chosen, and not two or four. Also, he asked why this rule shouldn't be expanded to everyone, including Officers, such as Rules, Funding, etc. Ms. Navab said the E-Board talked about different time spans. She believed the thinking was that the first year people get their feet wet and learn what to do; the second year was knowing the players and doing the work well; and then there was an extra year. That could be amended. As for not applying term limits to other Officers, her thinking was that the one way the GA builds leadership is through having people serve in lower time-commitment positions, other than being a Delegate. Officers generally don't commit the time that other Exec Board members do, and because of the way Officer positions have been structured, they're not part of the E-Board anymore and do silo work. Ms. Mendoza does rules specifically, e.g., and Mr. Sheen works on student group funding and Travel Grants. So it's not the same type of position.

Mr. Helu asked why there wasn't a term limit for the president only, as opposed to the entire Board. He was concerned about not having enough people to run for GA positions. Ms. Navab said that part of why they don't have people to do them is because they haven't done a great job of developing people early on. Part of it is because the same people keep sticking around, willing to do it. She didn't think this has been an issue just with the presidency and can be seen in other positions. The president wasn't the only important seat on the Board.

Mr. Davidson suggested amending the policy to three years in one position and four years overall. Ms. Navab said she didn't feel strongly about three years versus four years. Besides developing leadership, the other reason for this change was that having the same people in one specific position has people on campus associate the presidency, for instance, to a specific person. And after that person leaves, administrators could still go to that person rather than to whoever filled that roll, making the job more challenging, with the new person having to constantly figure out what was going on and why people weren't providing information, e.g. She believed that was something that Mr. Marchand experienced when he was President last year.

Mr. Kehoe said he thought this also shows a commitment of the GA to graduate students doing graduate work as opposed to doing graduate student government work. While it's important, it's also Mr. Marchand putting aside his studies to be Assembly Affairs VP. The GA appreciates that, but at the same time, for the good of graduate students serving in these positions, their terms should be capped. Ms. Navab said that Mr. Daal will be an 11th-year Ph.D. student, partially because of how many years he spent at the GA. That wasn't really a healthy trend to encourage.

Mr. Ortega said that part of the reason they chose three years was to allow somebody to be VP for a couple of years and then become president, e.g.

Mr. Terhorst said the notion was a good idea, but it wasn't clear that it would cause the GA to foster leadership. It just forces people out. They need to consider what they'll do to develop the next generation. Ms. Navab it doesn't guarantee the development of leadership, but part of the reason people haven't focused on that is because they know they can keep going in a position.

Mr. Niederhut he asked if there was a plan in place to preserve institutional memory when turnover was being forced. Ms. Navab said Officers have to write transition reports every year. For transition or leadership development, additional By-laws can be written to encourage or enforce that. This year all of the Exec Board other than her will be graduating, or graduating in the middle of next year. Ideally, positions can be staggered so not everybody would leave at the same time.

Mr. Kehoe asked if no current Officers would be termed out if the bill passed. Ms. Navab said that no one planning to run again will be turned out.

Mr. Goren said that if the purpose was to build greater leadership or better transition, he didn't see how the bill would do that. It just forces people out. Another alternative would be to have two-year terms that are staggered, like with the Student Regent. The person who was just elected would kind of intern with the preceding person. That would create easier transitions and involve more Delegates, rather than simply forcing someone out.

Mr. Marchand said that some people are in three-year programs, which would make it very difficult for them to serve two years. Three terms were chosen partly because the person who becomes president more often than not will come from the E-Board. International students have very normative time. He didn't think it would be possible to be in a leadership position in the GA for more than three years and spend normative time in a Ph.D. program.

Ms. Navab said a two-year term would eliminate a lot of professional school students from running, because a lot of them get involved in their second year of their two-year program. So she wouldn't want to put in a two-year requirement. The funding would also become weird, and they'd have to double the E-Board budget to fill two people for the same seat. And they have a hard enough time getting people to commit to one year. A two-year commitment was big for someone in a Ph.D. or a professional program. In terms of developing leadership, in some situations it does force that. When she ran for president, she asked Mr. Daal not to run and instead, to work with her that year and help her in the position that year. He wanted to run for another year and finish things he started. That was his right, but it wasn't developing leadership. If somebody was interested, she would ask why they shouldn't build something.

Ms. Pymer said she believed every position has a committee they're involved with. She thought that was a fairly efficient pipeline for future leadership. The AAVP has the Assembly as a "committee," and the president has the E-Board as a "committee."

Mr. Kehoe said the bill doesn't actually force the GA to develop leadership. He thought it was sort of sink or swim. If they try to implement this, maybe it wouldn't happen, and they'd have growing pains as term limits start. But he thought it would be more effective in the end since it would make people look at how to get someone else into their position, and would make them look ahead earlier.

Mr. Goren said he didn't see where forcing someone out was, by itself, building leadership. He thought those were two very different ideas. If they want to build leadership, the GA should create measures to do that. In politics, the purpose of term limits was typically to prevent one party from dominating an election, or prevent one very popular politician dominating a political sphere.

Mr. Hoople said there was some concern with three years, and with terming people out with no one to fill the position. The GA could always vote to suspend this rule if they couldn't find a president and really liked the one they had. Also, the GA was a little bit different from the typical political organization. If there are term limits, he thought E-Board members would have more of a focus in the back of their minds about fostering community development, whereas otherwise, people could just decide to fill the position again the following year if nobody else decided to run. Being forced out could make them think about who they want to take on the position.

A Delegate called the question on the Resolution, as it submitted, with no amendments. The motion to end debate and come to a vote was seconded and passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1202b PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO SET TERM LIMITS FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD OFFICERS. Mr. Marchand said that in the opinion of the Chair, the vote was more than two-thirds.

The following Resolution, 1202d, was authored by Alberto M. Ortega Hinojosa:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ALTERNATE TUITION PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the University of California is a public university supported in part by taxpayers, directly through State appropriations and indirectly through federal and State grants; and

WHEREAS, over the past four decades, the State of California has continuously decreased its contribution towards the University of California; and

WHEREAS, the lack of financial support towards the University of California has resulted in increasing student fees (from \$3,429 during the 2001-02 academic year to \$13,200 in the 2011-12 academic year) and increasingly high levels of student loans; and

WHEREAS, new financial models are needed to ensure that the University of California remains financially accessible to students regardless of their income; and

WHEREAS, students from the University of California, Riverside, have formed a coalition named “Fix UC” that has developed a proposal, “UC Student Investment Proposal,” which would guarantee attendance be affordable for all students; and

WHEREAS, the Fix UC proposal (www.fixuc.org) stipulates that students would pay costs of attendance after graduation by committing 5% of their disposable income for 20 years of employment; and

WHEREAS, the UC Student Investment Proposal has been presented to the Regents of the University of California, and the Regents have committed to study the feasibility of the proposal and work with Fix UC;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of California, Berkeley Graduate Assembly, supports the UC Student Investment Proposal presented by Fix UC and is committed to collaborating with them.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Committee will form a working group to work with Fix UC students in future iterations of the proposal.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice president will present this resolution to the Fix UC Leaders and work with them in the future development of the proposal.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President and Vice Presidents of the Graduate Assembly will present this Resolution to the Office of the President, the UC Berkeley Chancellor and other relevant officials of the University of California, and work with them to explore the possibility of implementing this proposal.

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ALTERNATE TUITION PROPOSAL (cont'd)

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice President will present this Resolution to the University of California Student Association (UCSA).

Mr. Ortega said he introduced the Resolution to have it as a point of discussion and give the GA an opportunity to take a position on this topic. The proposal would be for students who go to a UC System as an undergrad to then commit a certain percentage of their income for 20 years. There were still a lot of logistics that needed to go into this and it was in its very early stages. It's been put forth to the UCSA and to a number of other campuses. The idea for the Resolution was to make sure the GA had an opportunity to take a stance on this, one way or another.

Mr. Klein said the proposal that was being described sounded similar to a loan. He asked how it was different than a student loan, where people pay a percentage of their income to pay for their education. Mr. Ortega said that loans are for specific amounts. People have the option of taking out a loan or not. The proposal calls for a graduated scale of one's disposable income. If they make very little money, they repay very little. Ms. Navab said there was also no interest involved.

Mr. Kehoe said the Rules Committee said the ASUC has not taken any action on this and this was something that concerned undergraduate tuition only. Therefore the Committee didn't feel it was appropriate for the GA to take a position or to make any movement on this issue until the ASUC has decided to do something itself.

Mr. Ortega said the External Affairs Committee was concerned that there currently was no language for graduate students and how graduate student funding would work out. The recommendation was to either form a workgroup that would explore what a UC Irvine workgroup was doing that's working on this. This might come up in the future, and if so, the GA would want to make sure they have a plan in place. If there isn't an interest for a workgroup, then he would suggest tabling the bill indefinitely until the GA needed to take a position.

Ms. Navab said she would recommend amending the Resolved Clause to say that the GA directs the UC Financial Oversight Workgroup, which they already have, to work with Mr. Wilton's office to analyze this proposal. What Mr. Wilton said was that if they think this was a bad proposal, they should draft their own language. She would recommend somebody amending it to say that.

Mr. Hoople said he would make that motion. As part of that, he would also like to take the External Affairs Committee's recommendations under consideration and say they'd only form a workgroup and not support this as a general grad position.

Mr. Marchand said the External Affairs Committee recommended striking the first Resolved Clause, so the GA would no longer support it, and striking the fourth Resolved Clause, which says they'll talk with the office of the President and others. The second recommendation out of committee was that the External Affairs office would form a work group to work with the ASUC. It would have the Financial Oversight Committee work with Vice Chancellor Wilton's office, to analyze and propose a modified version. Mr. Marchand said the third part of the amendment would have the External Affairs VP present this Resolution to the Fix UC leaders and work with them. Mr. Hoople asked to remove that part

Ms. Navab said the amendment would replace all the Resolved Clauses with what they just discussed.

Mr. Marchand said the amendment would strike the first, third, and fourth Resolved Clauses and would change the second Resolved Clause to say that the financial oversight workgroup would be directed to work with John Wilton's office to analyze and propose an alternative version to Fix UC.

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Hoople moved to table the amendment. Mr. Marchand said the motion would table the proposed amendment until the next meeting. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Kehoe asked if they'd table this indefinitely and then introduce another amendment. Ms. Navab said they could vote on the amendment and then table the Resolution. If they table it first, it wouldn't be amended. They could also refer it back to committee.

Mr. Hoople moved to table the Resolution indefinitely. Ms. Navab said that would kill the bill. Mr. Marchand said the motion was to postpone indefinitely. He called for any debate.

Ms. Bravo asked if another Resolution would come up. Mr. Marchand somebody could bring up an alternative version. If the motion to postpone indefinitely is approved, the bill wouldn't come back. Ms. Navab said she would write a new version.

Mr. Helu moved to call the question. The motion to end debate and come to an immediate vote passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO INDEFINITELY POSTPONE RESOLUTION 1202d PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ALTERNATE TUITION PROPOSAL.

The following Resolution, 1202e, was authored by Alberto M. Ortega Hinojosa:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANCELLOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU'S ENDOWED CHAIRS PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the University of California is a public university supported in part by taxpayers, directly through State appropriations, and indirectly through federal and State grants; and

WHEREAS, over the past four decades, the State of California has continuously decreased its contribution towards the University of California; and

WHEREAS, new financial models are needed to ensure that the University of California remains financially accessible to students regardless of their income; and

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANCELLOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU'S ENDOWED CHAIRS PROPOSAL (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Chancellor Robert Birgeneau has developed a new funding model that will create endowments whose disbursements will be targeted towards graduate education and is modeled as follows:

The program will create endowed chairs at the amount of \$3 million per chair, whose annual disbursement of \$150,000 will be used to fund a faculty's salary and a doctoral student's education. The program highlights include the following:

- Federal and state governments match new philanthropic investments in university endowments 1:1:1;
- States also maintain existing funding levels for participating universities;
- Federal government appropriates \$1 billion annually for ten years for the program; this funding could represent a redirection of existing funds;
- Federal funds are available to all states and distributed according to objective criteria;
- The nation's leading Ph.D. granting public research and teaching universities would be eligible;
- Funding would support endowed academic chairs, directly supporting teaching and research; and

WHEREAS, the Chancellor's Endowed Chairs Proposal will create a long-term reliable and predictable source of income; and

WHEREAS, the Endowed Chairs Proposal will benefit UC Berkeley graduate students; and

WHEREAS, we understand that the proposal is still in draft form and the Chancellor is actively editing it to improve it;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of California, Berkeley Graduate Assembly, supports Chancellor Birgeneau's Endowed Chairs Proposal and is committed to collaborating with him in promoting its goals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice President and the External Affairs Committee will work at the State and federal levels to educate legislators and other relevant offices about this proposal.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice president will present this Resolution to the University of California Student Association and seek Systemwide student endorsement.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the External Affairs Vice president will present this Resolution to Student Advocates for Graduate Education and seek to include it as part of SAGE's priorities.

Mr. Ortega said this is a proposal the Chancellor discussed at the last Delegates meeting. It creates a \$3 million endowment from a \$1 million contribution each from the federal government, the State government, and from a private donor. That would create a chair that would fund, in part, the salary of a faculty, and in part, provide money for research and for graduate student funding. The idea was to structure this so it would go towards the country's public land grant universities. The recommendation by the External Affairs Committee was to support the Resolution and the Chancellor's proposal.

Mr. Kehoe moved to amend the bill per the Rules Committee's recommendations. He would first ask a question, and asked how this proposal would affect people from the GA who will be going to Washington, given the limited time they had. He asked what would change if they didn't do this, and asked what would be in place. Mr. Ortega said that currently, they have three broad, general topics: taxation and indebtedness, which speaks to certain tax benefits in place for students. They're looking at income-based repayment and tax issues when that is forgiven. There are also a whole set of immigration items that deal with visas and visa renewals. There's another one on funding levels towards different federal programs that fund research and fund grad students, like NSF funding, for instance.

Mr. Kehoe asked if the proposal had a chance and was worth pursuing as an agenda item. Mr. Ortega said the purpose would be less for the GA to advocate at that point, since it was a little too close to their trip to DC, but it would enable the Chancellor to say that grad students support this when he tries to get somebody to author legislation; and that could be pretty valuable to the Chancellor. It could also let partners of the GA that have been working on this, like the Association of American Universities and the Association of Land Grant Universities, know that they have the GA's support. So when they work on it with Congress, they could speak on behalf of the GA.

Mr. Kehoe moved to amend the first Resolved Clause, to strike, "Chancellor Birgeneau's Endowed Chair Proposal and is committed to collaborating with him in promoting its goals," instead, read as follows: "Resolved, that the University of California, Berkeley, Graduate Assembly supports the principles embodied in this proposal and is committed to collaborating with Chancellor Birgeneau."

Mr. Ortega said the proposal wasn't listed out, and they'd be listing the things they think would be in the proposal. Ms. Navab said she could e-mail out the Chancellor's proposal.

Mr. Kehoe said he would strike the second Resolved Clause directing the External Affairs VP and the External Affairs Committee to work on this at the State and federal levels.

Mr. Marchand called for discussion on the amendment.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said it wasn't clear from the Whereas Clauses what the principles are. Maybe they could elaborate on them.

Mr. Shybut asked if they could say whether they support the proposal itself.

Mr. Kehoe said that if they want the Resolution to support the actual proposal, he was fine with that. But he didn't think the GA should do it at this meeting, since people haven't had time to look over the specific proposal. If people want to look at it, they should table the bill.

Ms. Navab asked if tabling the bill would impact Lobby Day. Mr. Ortega said he didn't think it would. The Chancellor wouldn't be able to bring this up until his next trip, which would be in a couple of months.

Mr. Helu asked if the final proposal was any different from what was written. Mr. Ortega said he couldn't say specifically, although they were pretty much the same.

Mr. Hoople said the original language, that they support the principles of the proposal, gives the GA leeway in case they discover something they don't like. He also wasn't in favor of putting everything off because they'd have a long meeting next month.

Ms. Navab said that one main change is that the name of the proposal was different, and is called "Knowledge Made In America." They might want to update that in the Resolution.

Ms. Pymer moved to amend the amendment, to instead of having the first Resolved Clause say "principles," to instead say "in general federal funding for graduate student education." Mr. Marchand said it would read that the GA "supports federal funding for graduate education embodied in this proposal..." The motion was seconded.

Mr. Marchand called for discussion on Ms. Pymer's amendment.

Mr. Sehgal said that if the weight of the GA adopting this was to allow Chancellor Birgeneau to say that his grad students support this, they stop that ability if they don't say they support this.

Mr. Helu said that the Resolution doesn't really help or support Chancellor Birgeneau, and if that was the goal of the amendment, the GA wasn't really accomplishing much with this.

Mr. Hoople said the proposal wasn't just about federal funding, but was coupled with private donor and State funding. So it's a special combination. He didn't think the proposed language captures that sentiment.

Mr. Kehoe said they had to make this amendment in line with the actual proposal. He moved to table the bill until the next meeting. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Sehgal said that if they table the motion, he asked if they would discuss the same thing, or if they were directing someone to review Chancellor Birgeneau's proposal, to make sure it's in alignment with what the GA wanted. Mr. Marchand said the Committees that consider the bill, External and Rules, could still work on it. They couldn't mandate someone to consider this in a motion to table the bill.

Mr. Twigg said there were a lot of issues, and having the full proposal would allow them to make proposed amendments. That's why the Committee amended the motion in the way it did.

Mr. Ortega said he could commit to reviewing the Chancellor's proposal.

Mr. Hoople moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO TABLE 1202e UNTIL THE NEXT GA MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF

CHANCELLOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU'S ENDOWED CHAIRS PROPOSAL, AS AMENDED,
WITH COMMITTEES THAT WERE ORIGINALLY ASSIGNED THE BILL TO CONTINUE TO
WORK ON IT.

The following Resolution, 1203b, was authored by Ben Kehoe and Adriana Mendoza:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO MODIFY ELECTION PROCEDURES FOR
GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Graduate Council Representatives serve as liaisons between the Graduate Assembly and the
Graduate Council of the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, as such, Graduate Council Representatives serve as the voice of the Graduate Assembly in
Graduate Council affairs; and

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the Graduate Assembly to ensure that Graduate Council Representa-
tives adequately represent the Graduate Assembly and are approved by a majority of the
delegates;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that section 2.4.4 of the By-laws be amended as follows:

- 2.4.4. Election. The Graduate Assembly shall annually elect three (3) Representatives and one (1) Alternate Representative to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate. Elections for the Graduate Council Representatives and Alternate shall take place during the March Assembly meeting or at the next earliest possible Assembly meeting. ~~The three candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be the Graduate Council Representatives and the candidate receiving the fourth highest number of votes shall be the Graduate Council Alternate.~~ **The election of Graduate Council Representatives shall begin with an individual majority vote for each candidate. Only candidates who pass this vote shall be eligible to represent the Graduate Assembly on the Graduate Council. If three or fewer candidates are eligible, they shall be the Graduate Council Representatives. If more than three candidates are eligible, an additional round of voting shall occur in which the three eligible candidates receiving the most votes (with no threshold) shall be the Graduate Council Representatives and the eligible candidate receiving the fourth highest number of votes shall be the Graduate Council Alternate. Delegates may vote for any number of candidates. In the case of ties, additional tie-breaking votes between the tied candidates shall be held.** Ideally, the Graduate Council Representatives shall reflect the academic diversity of the graduate community.

Mr. Kehoe said that at the end of GA elections last year, people had an issue with the interpretation of the By-laws and whether or not there was a threshold for electing Graduate Council representatives. The By-laws were suspended and a vote took place according to the rules in the Resolution. He thought those rules were clearer than the ones the GA currently have. To prevent the circumvention of their procedures

the Resolution implements a two-round vote. Delegates would first become eligible by being approved in an individual, majority vote. If there are more than three candidates there would be another vote, and the three people with the most votes would become the representatives, and the fourth would become the Alternate. If there are fewer than three candidates, they wouldn't need the first vote.

Mr. Hasan asked if this wouldn't take a lot more time. Mr. Kehoe it might, although votes themselves go pretty quickly, and it's the debate beforehand that was time consuming; and this change wouldn't add any more debate. It shouldn't have a huge impact. Mr. Marchand said the process would be the same, except for having two votes in succession, or multiple votes.

Ms. Ng said she supported the spirit of the Resolution. In practice, the GA has generally suffered from a lack of candidates for the Grad Council representative position rather than an excess of candidates. So she wasn't sure where the Resolution would leave them. As one of the Grad Council reps, she believed it was really important to have three people present at each of the meetings. There are ten professors and the students are sort of inherently at the low end of the power balance. It seems that Grad Council reps have always stood together besides their personal differences and differences in their disciplines. That's because the differences between grad students and professors was so great that the students end up falling on the same side. She wasn't sure it was quite as important to have a total stamp of approval for each rep as it was to have three people and an alternate attend the meetings.

A Delegate asked if, in the second round vote, people were allowed to vote for everyone, and asked what the point was of the first round. Mr. Kehoe said that if they have an approval vote, and a Delegate didn't want to approve somebody, but didn't care if the person got elected or not, if there's a threshold, the GA might accidentally fall below it.

Mr. Marchand said the question was having a vote of approval instead of voting for people individually. Delegates would vote for the people they approve. If more than three people get over 50%, the reps would be the three who got the most votes.

Mr. Sheen said he thought Delegates should be able to vote for up to three candidates in the second round instead of for as many as they want. That would promote voting for the three people one wanted as opposed to one person they don't want. He would eliminate the last sentence of the proposed amendment, **"In the case of ties, additional tie-breaking votes between the tied candidates shall be held."** It seemed vague as far as what the standard was for a tie-breaker vote. There's no such standard in the By-laws, so it might be more consistent to leave that to parliamentary procedure.

Ms. Navab said that Grad Council was really important, and it was important that the people the GA sends forward have the confidence of at least a majority of Delegates. Every other position had that standard, where people need a minimum number, a majority vote, to move forward. As the GA promotes the Grad Council, more and more people have been interested in the position, and there have been contested elections. This came up last year, where people didn't feel comfortable sending forward the three candidates they had; and as a result, the GA had to make up a procedure. This should be a standard policy.

Mr. Marchand said that for all positions, they ask for a majority, because there's only one president, or one AAVP. But there are three Grad Council reps. If 60% of Californians vote Democrat, the entire Assembly shouldn't become Democrat. With three reps, it comes down to the last sentence in that

paragraph, which is in the original By-laws, about reflecting the academic diversity of the graduate community.

Mr. Marchand said that if he could propose an amendment, he would suggest keeping the original election procedure as it is, but saying that in the case of three or less candidates, each candidate should be subject to an approval vote, 50% plus one. The reason is because they don't want people to simply be appointed. If there's a competitive election, he wouldn't want 60% of the Delegates to block a candidate that 40% of the Delegates want, or even 30%. If there are three reps, someone with the approval of 30% of the Delegates should probably be on the Grad Council.

Mr. Klein said he strongly appreciated the first round, where the candidates had to get 50% for approval. In general, the GA will approve people who are capable. But he wanted the power to deny somebody the ability to represent the GA if he didn't think they were capable. He didn't think getting 30% approval was enough, and thought they should entrust people for this position by at least half the Delegates.

Mr. Kehoe said the Assembly has shown that if people feel strongly about not having somebody on the Grad Council, they're willing to suspend the By-laws and take action and change the rules on the fly to make that happen. To him, that's an affront to the procedures. People should work within the By-laws and only suspend them in extreme cases. The bill would prevent those situations from happening in the future. He thought that was the most important reason to have this procedure.

Mr. Twigg said the main reason they didn't restrict the second round was vote taking and keeping track. He didn't think they cared about absolute numbers, for the second round, but relative numbers. The Committee looked into instant runoff voting, but the problem was that it would require many more rounds of voting. It was indicated from the beginning that they wouldn't have any more than two rounds. Having just one round doesn't provide for the opportunity to say yes or no to a specific candidate or, alternatively, to approve them and then rank them. They picked two rounds as a compromise between having one round and having a true ranking system.

Mr. Helu moved to amend, and to strike "Delegates may vote for any number of candidates." and replace it with "Delegates may vote for up to three candidates." The motion was seconded.

Mr. Davidson said he was against attempting to decrease the number of votes during this stage of the election.

Mr. Kehoe said that if they vote for everybody, they vote for nobody. They could vote for four instead of three.

Mr. Klein moved to call the question on the amendment. The motion to go directly to a vote passed unanimously by voice-vote.

The motion to approve Mr. Helu's amendment failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Helu asked if the Chair could describe what happened last year, so people know why this was coming up.

1203b, By-law Amendment to Modify Election Procedures for Grad Council Representatives (cont'd)-36-

A motion to extend speaking time by three minutes failed by hand-vote. Mr. Marchand said they'd go straight to a vote on the Resolution.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1203b, AS SUBMITTED, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 21-9, RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO MODIFY ELECTION PROCEDURES FOR GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Marchand said that concluded the meeting. He would like to thank people for attending. He said the GA will be having elections at next month's meeting.

This meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary