

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 3, 2011

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m. in Eshleman Library, Eshleman Hall.

Announcements

The Grad Social Club will have a speed dating social and a “Winter Wonderland” celebration on December 16. Aaron Welch said that was all they had to announce. Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank them.

Speakers from the UC Library Bindery talked about services they offer, particularly creating bound copies of dissertations.

An announcement about AirBears was made by Michael Green, Director of Telecommunications. Feedback was requested. The service costs about \$7 million a year. They're improving coverage in buildings with very poor coverage.

The campus will be working with AT&T. The company offered \$2 million to expand Wi-Fi on campus. The campus will also spend that amount, and spend \$1.3 million, to add 1,300 access points, totaling 4,000 access points.

ASUC Announcements

External Affairs has a postcard lobbying campaign with the UCSA, “Save Our State, Fund Our Future,” trying to get Prop. 13 reform on the ballot. Another postcard campaign, with the USSA, asks the Super Committee to protect grants for higher education. The ASUC will send a bus of students to the Regents meeting. A “Tastes of Berkeley,” will be held, featuring food from local vendors. Another event, Peace Not Prejudice Week, will be held.

There's a new policy for getting waivers for Pauley Ballroom, with the standard being approval of half waivers.

Announcements of Upcoming GA Events

A Sex and Dessert Workshop will be held, by the GWP. SAGE will hold a Fall Summit on campus.

Guest Announcements

The GA hired Amanda-Nicole Ridell as Funding Advisor/Analyst.

The Library has funds available to publish journals.

Optometry has paid volunteer opportunities in its Research Center.

Cornel West and Carl Dix will speak on campus, "In the Age of Obama... Police Terror, Incarceration, No Jobs, Mis-education: What Future for Our Youth?"

Funding Contingency Report

By unanimous vote, the GA approved the recommendations of the Funding Committee for contingency, \$8,396.00.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

The following bills were referred to committee: 1111a, In Support of Three Student Regents; 1111b, In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County; 1111c, To Invest \$30,000 in the Graduate Assembly's Fund Functioning as an Endowment; 1111d, To Create a Graduate Student Advocate Position.

Presentation by the Student Regents

Jonathan Stein and Alfredo Mireles spoke.

Projected out to 2015-16, UC faces \$2.4 billion budget shortfall, caused by, among other things, enrollment growth, guaranteed raises in union contracts, retirement issues, and health care increases. UC has handled \$1 billion of the shortfall by steps such as Operational Excellence and increased enrollment from out-of-State and international students. But they have \$1.4-\$1.5 billion gap remains.

For the first time, students now pay more than the State.

Low-income Pell Grant recipients is 39% across UC, a remarkable number. That's also the number of UC undergrads who are the first in their family to go to college. Berkeley educates more Pell Grants students than all the Ivy Leagues do together.

To fill the budget gap, UCOP considered, and rejected, reducing quality, reducing access. They decided to increase tuition. There's a proposal to increase tuition 16% a year for four years. But there's some dis-sension about that among the Regents. Other ideas are corporate fundraising and a ballot initiative.

The meeting recessed in order to hold a meeting of the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation.

Reports

President's report: the Council of Presidents, of UC student governments, met with Pres. Yudof to talk about four-year plan to increase tuition 16% yearly. The GA will hopefully create a graduate Student Advocate position. The meeting entered into closed session to discuss Lower Sproul. A number of different groups are considering placing student fee referendums on the spring ASUC ballot.

Assembly Affairs VP's report: with no objection, committee nominations were approved.

Campus Affairs VP's report: By unanimous voice-vote, the GA voted to post the open WOCI Coordinator position. A grad student mental health survey will be conducted.

External Affairs VP's report: A survey is on the GA's Web site regarding what students want regarding Berkeley business districts. In-district visits are being planned. There's a petition to change the tax status

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

of fellowships. Mr. Ortega lobbied in Washington. Things were at a standstill because of negotiations in the Super Committee. The Higher Education Act of 1965 needed to be re-authorized. The Department of Education is changing the conversation to quality. Pres. Obama's proposal to consolidate of student loans was actually limited in practice and wouldn't include most grads.

Resolution Discussion and Vote

With no objection, the GA approved, as amended, 1110b, Resolution on Directed Action In Support of Having the Graduate Assembly Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series, put on by the City and the University.

By voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, 1110c, Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the ReFund California Campaign, the UCSA Budget Campaign, and the November 9th-16th Week of Action.

By voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, 1110d, Resolution on Standing Policy In Support of Expression, Assembly, and the Occupy Wall Street Demonstrations.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

End Summary of the meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Philippe Marchand at 5:33 p.m. in Eshleman Library, Eshleman Hall. Mr. Marchand said people will notice they have three microphones for speakers.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Grad Social Club

For the Grad Social Club, Luz Gonzalez said they don't have that many events coming up. There are five spots left, only for girls, for the speed dating social. It will take place on Saturday. It sold out within the first two days or so. They're also planning a "Winter Wonderland," a holiday celebration on December 16. Aaron Welch said that was all they had to announce. Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank them.

GA

Bahar Navab said she would like to welcome Delegates to the November meeting. The Executive Board had a request. Staff stay extra to help out with the Delegates meeting, including Jason Yiu and Susan Hsueh, from the Business Office. The Executive Board would request that people show them respect and

Announcements (cont'd)

- 4 -

be polite to them while they are at the meeting. At the last meeting people got a little bit aggressive with some GA staff. If things weren't working out how Delegates would like, she'd ask people to speak to staff calmly and with respect. The E-Board would like to thank them very much for that.

Mr. Marchand said there might be some heated debate that evening. They'll keep a speakers' list and said they don't want back and forth between two people debating. If people have a question, they should ask it of the Chair, for the Chair to refer to that person.

UC Library Bindery

Mr. Marchand said the next announcement was from the UC Library Bindery, about bindery services for graduate students. Mike Foley introduced himself and said he is the Director of Operations at the UC Library Bindery. He would also like to introduce Pam, from the Moffitt Copy Center. He would first like to congratulate all of them for their accomplishment at being a grad student at UC Berkeley. It was quite a feat to come this far on their educational path.

Mr. Foley said they may be interested in a service the Library has available as they wind up their dissertation work. Dissertations can be printed and bound, with an easy, online ordering system. He had samples of the work they do. Giving bound copies of their dissertation was a great way to honor the people who have supported them on this journey, whether their parents or faculty on their review committee. One feature they provide is the hand stamped UC seal, which is not something people could get elsewhere since it's copyrighted. They passed around a few samples of their binding. People can do the entire order at their Web site, bindery@berkeley.edu. For about \$75, they could have it at their doorstep.

Mr. Foley said that for the Moffitt Copy Center, they also have copy services that grads might be interested in. If they have fliers or newsletters they want to publish, all those needs could be taken care of.

Mr. Klein asked why a State university restricts copyright usage. Mr. Foley said he didn't have a precise answer, but thought it was proprietary, with the University not wanting private industry taking advantage of that.

Mr. Marchand asked people to please not have side conversations when others were speaking as it made it difficult to hear.

AirBears

Mr. Marchand said the second announcement was from Michael Green, about AirBears.

Michael Green introduced himself and said he is the Director of Telecommunications for the campus. He wanted to give the GA an overview of where they spend their money and would ask them for some feedback on AirBears.

For the service it costs about \$7 million a year. For the network and for security they spend about \$11 million a year: \$8 million for the network and \$4.1 million for security, projects, and building. One project is the Interbuilding Campus Communication System (ICCS). It's a five-year plan for the campus. So there's quite a lot invested in that.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

The screen showed what they'll spend each year for the next ten years to get some buildings with very poor coverage up to the right standards, interconnecting with fiber around the campus. Right now they're working on Boalt and Wurster. Then they'll do Barrows. They're trying to build a loop. Most of their work in the future will be in the Oxford corridor, where the Art Museum will be located, and where most of the new buildings for the campus were located.

They work on risers inside the buildings, between the floors. They spend quite a bit of money trying to keep that working properly. They have a number of those planned for the next several years, totaling about \$25 million, or about \$5 million a year in capital that's going into that. The next screen showed a list of riser projects, in case people were interested in where that money was going.

Mr. Green said there was one thing he wanted to talk to grads about. Wireless on campus has been bad for a very long time. He spent the last year working with AT&T, along with a bunch of procurement folks and members of the team, and he'll talk to the GA about what they're doing with AT&T and where they're going next.

For Stadium Wi-Fi, AT&T has offered to give the campus \$3 million for enhanced Wi-Fi coverage for the Stadium. Mr. Green said they'd see how that works out. For cellular coverage, AT&T will give the campus up to \$30 million to cover the campus with cell service that will blanket the campus. It will be available in buildings, particularly larger buildings, where people don't get penetration from the outside. They'll probably start that coverage around March.

Mr. Green said the next issue he wanted to talk to them about was Wi-Fi for the campus. AT&T has offered what was basically a grant, where they'd throw in \$2 million and the campus would throw in \$2 million. That will provide the funds to expand Wi-Fi on campus. Right now they spend around \$1.3 million, about \$1,000 each for 1,300 access points, to provide coverage for AirBears. If they keep that same rate, they'll be looking at adding 4,000 access points.

One nice thing about this, although maybe not so much for grads, is that they're going to cover all the residence halls, which have very poor Wi-Fi. They're going to roll the campus and the res halls simultaneously. They'll see a little bit of this deployed probably in January. If people are in Haas, Simon, or Boalt, or happened to be around the High-Performance Athletic Center, they've already done the installations there for the cellular coverage and they'll follow that shortly with Wi-Fi. As they go into those buildings, they'll see what a lot of the campus will eventually look like.

Mr. Green said that before they complete absolute coverage, it will be dramatically increased. They have some agreements to connect buildings in the area. They have other big, networking structures going on, including campus IP video security for Helios West, with video going in, partly for safety.

Mr. Green said the slide showed the most important features of the Oxford Corridor expansion.

The next slide showed what they're working on. The Eshleman replacement is a big deal for them. When Eshleman is replaced, one thing they'll try to do is to get Wi-Fi on Lower Sproul. This will be the first Wi-Fi they'll work on. They have some around the campus that they had to take out because they didn't have money to run it. But when Eshleman is replaced, the architecture will provide for Wi-Fi, and they'll attempt to cover Lower Sproul. That will be nice. They still have fairly decent usage of outdoor Wi-Fi. It's just that they don't have the money to run it.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

Right now they have 70 buildings with full coverage; 50 with partial coverage; and 12 buildings with no coverage. One thing they want to know is where people want Wi-Fi for the campus. Infrastructure Services would like to hear about this from the student community.

Ms. Navab said that on the Delegate feedback form there's a question about where they'd like AirBears coverage expanded. For those who live in the dorms, or in grad housing, University housing was included as a choice. Their responses would be helpful.

Mr. Trager said that the access points that will be added are perhaps 100-watts each, meaning that the campus will add 400,000 watts in energy every year. Mr. Green said he hasn't calculated the energy cost. Mr. Trager asked if anybody has calculated the energy use. Mr. Green said they haven't, but they could. The Delegate said that if they're planning to increase accessibility, there's a trade-off with energy; and these are energy-hungry appliances. People might want to question a corporation giving the campus money for things the campus had to spend money on afterwards, indefinitely, to obtain the service.

Mr. Green said that on the cellular side, the expense of the energy is built into the campus' contract. In terms of energy savings, that's a different topic that they could also discuss. But he thought that was a reasonable comment. They have heard from the community that the number one priority for IT service was to expand Wi-Fi. So they're going to expand it at their own expense. The energy consumption would be the campus' expense. That's not to say it's trivial or that it doesn't matter. He saw the point that was raised, that AT&T was going to give this to the campus. The campus wouldn't extend Wi-Fi quite as far without the contribution, but they still would have done a significant expansion, because that's what they've heard that folks want.

Mr. Griscti front center asked how they came to use AT&T versus one of the other providers. Mr. Green said that AT&T was the only one that would give the campus money. They could have picked another one. AT&T probably knows, and other carriers probably know, but he didn't actually know what the whole community spends on wireless. But he did know where the University spends money, since that was part of his department. They spend about \$800,000 a year in a corporate type of contract with AT&T. The next one was Verizon, at \$300,000. That's a pretty decent gap. He talked to each one of them, T-Mobile, AT&T, Sprint, and Verizon. They were all very interested, except for Verizon. They wanted to do something with the campus, but wanted the campus to spend money; and he doesn't have money.

Mr. Zachritz said that Wi-Fi kills trees. He asked if there has been some sort of environmental impact statement that had to be submitted for this type of project. Mr. Green they have a committee on non-ionizing radiation that has looked at the known factors related to Wi-Fi. The campus follows the Committee's guidance. He would be interested in peer reviewed type of material that demonstrates there is a health risk. The campus has looked for that and hasn't found it. They mostly rely on EH&S and the Committee. It's not something that's trivial, but they need more clear evidence to have an opinion.

Mr. Rabkin said that from the slide showing the map of the coverage, this was done building by building. He asked if there were outside areas with service, , since there are a lot of outside places to sit, and if that was or wasn't considered a priority. Mr. Green said outside places weren't a priority. It would be great if they were. About three years ago, when they had a little bit more money, they put outdoor sites on Moffitt and Memorial Glade. It's very expensive to do. But the budget was cut. This work will be for replacement buildings. This area, Lower Sproul, will be the only outdoor service for this area. That's

Announcements (cont'd)
ASUC announcements

- 7 -

because they could build it into the new Eshleman. But there are a lot of complications with providing outdoor service. A committee on campus looks at the aesthetics. There are a lot of historical buildings, and antennas can't just be put outside everywhere. They could put them on existing roofs they never build networking. They don't have power on roofs; so there are very serious constraints for getting Wi-Fi outside.

Mr. Niederhut said he was happy to see AT&T kick in for network coverage. He asked if there was a charge for non-AT&T customers. Mr. Green said it depended on whether he was talking about Wi-Fi. For cell service, AT&T will be the carrier. If another carrier wants to pay to access the system, the campus will distribute that carrier's system across the campus, both outside and in buildings. On the Wi-Fi side, they'll absolutely continue to operate AirBears and guest accounts. In addition, AT&T will operate AT&T Wi-Fi. So AT&T customers will get access. If somebody is not with AT&T and they're not affiliated with the University, they'd have to pay. And the campus splits that. Other universities get \$2,000.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn asked what costs will be incurred to run the Stadium Wi-Fi, and asked what the educational value was in having Wi-Fi there. Mr. Green said that Wi-Fi for the Stadium is not paid for by the campus as a whole, and if it goes into the Stadium, it will be paid for by Intercollegiate Athletics. So whatever relationship they feel Intercollegiate Athletics has with the campus, it will be based on that. The campus will split those contracts. Campus money goes into the \$4 million for the campus. At the end of the contract, the campus will own the equipment. That's also true of all the fiber that is put in for the cellular service. The campus has a responsibility to keep it functioning. Having 4,000 access points wasn't trivial, but it's important to the campus. So that's where they're allocating resources. The campus will be responsible for ongoing funding. They'll own all of it, and ownership reverts to the campus at the end of the contract. On the cell side, it reverts on installation.

Mr. Klein asked if he said they'll be an AT&T Wi-Fi network and also the regular AirBears network in the same areas. Mr. Green said that was correct. Mr. Klein asked why that was the case. Mr. Green said the reason for that was to offload, from AT&T's point of view, video. If students watch lectures, YouTube, whatever, they will offload the data traffic onto the AT&T Wi-Fi SSID. If a device is enabled to do that. So for AT&T, it's to offload data, to try to help with the data situation. The cell service on campus is bad, from the campus' point of view. The campus wants that because they split the revenue. So for the campus, it's potential revenue generation.

Mr. Marchand said that they were out of time. Seeing no other questions or requests to extend speaking time, he would like to thank Mr. Green. Mr. Green said he would like to thank them

Ms. Navab said that if people have further questions, they could direct them at her and she could share them to Mr. Green. People could write any questions on their feedback form. Mr. Green said he's listed on the campus directory, and people could e-mail him directly.

ASUC Announcements

Mr. Albright introduced himself and said he's an ASUC Senator. He had a report from the Office of External Affairs, which is running two campaigns on Sproul at that time. The first one is a postcard

ASUC announcements (cont'd)
Announcements of Upcoming GA Events

- 8 -

lobbying campaign in conjunction with Mr. Ortega, who has the postcards available that evening. This is a UCSA campaign, "Save Our State, Fund Our Future," trying to get Prop. 13 reform on the ballot for next November. The second postcard campaign is in conjunction with the US Student Association and asks the Super Committee in Washington to protect grants for higher education. If people see folks with postcards on Sproul, it would be great to take a few minutes to sign on.

Mr. Albright said that on November 16 there will be a meeting of the UC Regents. Last night the ASUC Senate approved money to send a bus of students to go to that meeting. They'll send about 50 students. There will also be a lot of other buses going, sending folks. So if any Delegates were interested in going, or if they knew anybody who was interested in going, there will be a sign-up sheet on asuc.org.

Mr. Albright said the ASUC Office of the President is having "Tastes of Berkeley," a program on Thursday from 11:00 to 2:00 on Lower Sproul. People pay a few dollars and there are a lot of different local vendors with food. It showcases a lot of food from around Berkeley.

Regarding Peace Not Prejudice Week, a whole bunch of student groups are putting on a week of events. It was originally started a few years back when a group on campus hosted something called "Islamofascist Week." After that, a whole bunch of groups responded with Peace Not Prejudice Week. It will be held November 7-10, and the events are Peace through Film, with the movie "Crash" to be shown. There will be Peace through Dialogue, with a discussion of identity and multiculturalism. On the 9th they'll hold Peace through Language, with poetry showcases, monologues, songs, and spoken word. And on the 10th, from 5:00 to 7 p.m., there will be a peace rally on Upper Sproul.

Also, Mr. Albright said the ASUC Finance Committee established a new policy for approving waivers for Pauley Ballroom. They're no longer going to give approval of waivers for student groups. They'll approve half waivers, and full waivers for groups that can show a need.

Mr. Albright said that if people have any questions, they have his e-mail address. Seeing no questions, Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank him. Mr. Marchand noted that the GSI Union was also chartering buses, and a representative will be at the meeting later to talk about that.

Announcements of Upcoming GA Events

Ms. De la Torre said that people should have seen the fliers for the Sex and Dessert Workshop. She would ask people to please take some and put them up in their departments. It's sponsored by the Graduate Women's Project, and it's supposed to be a space for women to have a conversation, but everyone was welcome and invited to attend. It will be a safe space, given the topic.

Mr. Marchand said packets are available for the ReFund California campaign and the November 9 Day of Action next week. They still haven't discussed the GA's endorsing this, but packets are available. Whatever the GA decides, Delegates were free to do what they want in their departments. Also, there are posters about the Robert Reich talk, on November 15, as part of the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture. Mr. Marchand said he believed the theme was "Class Warfare in America."

Announcements of Upcoming GA Events (cont'd) Guest Announcements

- 9 -

Mr. Ortega said that at the beginning of his report was all the information people needed to register for the SAGE Fall Summit. People had to RSVP. The Public Higher Education Summit will be held on December 2 from 2:00 to 5:00, a forum on the future of public graduate universities. They'll have Regent Bonnie Reiss and former Deputy Undersecretary of Education Robert Shireman, under Pres. Obama. The Chancellor and some others will also talk on two topics. One is the role of the public university and the state, and policy to create jobs and stimulate the economy, and the other topic is the federalization of the state university, and how they're moving into more of a federal university than a State system, and the implications of that. Mr. Ortega said he would really encourage people to go. This is part of an annual conference. If people go to sagecoalition.org they can register there for the conference.

Guest Announcements

Ms. Hsueh introduced herself and said she's the Business Manager for the GA. She was very happy to introduce Amanda-Nicole Ridel, the GA's Funding Advisor/Analyst. It took the GA 16 months to get her there, so Ms. Hsueh said she was so happy to have Ms. Ridel there. Some of them have already met her, and she's already met with the Funding Committee. Ms. Ridel is scheduling funding workshops and will be doing a lot of things. Also on her list of responsibilities was to fundraise for the Graduate Assembly. Ms. Ridel graduated from UC Riverside, so she's a UC alum.

Secondly, Ms. Hsueh said she wanted to say something about Diana Chandara. Most of them probably know Ms. Chandara, the GA's Interim Funding Advisor who came on board when the previous Funding Advisor left. Ms. Chandara will continue to help the GA and will work until the end of January to help them to have a smooth transition.

Lastly, Ms. Hsueh said that Daylight Savings Time changes that weekend, so people should make sure they change their clocks. She would ask people to please look at her reports. The GA will be closed on certain dates. People should read the report to find out the dates.

Mr. Cohen said he's on the Library Committee. Apparently Cal has a more diverse library than Stanford, and it has a lot of money. So if Delegates or if anybody they knew who was looking to publish a journal, both those avenues can be funded. It's a fully open access journal. It's a journal people could pay for,

\$15.00. People could apply for funding. The organization is called the Berkeley Research Impact Initiative (BRII), and people can Google that for more information.

Fatima Elkabti introduced herself and said she was from Optometry. He had fliers to pass around for a paid volunteer opportunity for the Research Center for Optometry. If people could publicize this, it would be appreciated. They need people who will sit and do stuff. A lot of research opportunities are available. They have contact research studies that pay up to \$25 an hour, depending on the research. If people could let their constituents know about this, it's as needed, and depends on how much time people can provide.

Mr. Malik said he was making this announcement for somebody from Anthropology who couldn't be there. They're helping to organize an event that has been recommended for funding by the GA, which the Assembly will be voting on. They're bringing Cornel West and Carl Dix to speak on campus on

Guest Announcements (cont'd)

- 10 -

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the Minutes

December 2 in Pauley Ballroom. The title of the event is "In the Age of Obama... Police Terror, Incarceration, No Jobs, Mis-education: What Future for Our Youth?" This is an extremely timely topic. Cornel West is a Princeton professor who campaigned for Obama, but has since become increasingly critical of Obama. He'll have a dialogue with Carl Dix, who spent two years in prison and is a revolutionary. The cost will be in the context of Occupy Wall Street, and all the rest of the increasing disillusionment with Obama and the system itself. The Mr. Malik said he thought this will be a big deal on campus. They're getting Pauley Ballroom and hope to have 1,000 people there. It would be great to have sponsorship from the Graduate Assembly for this event. It was very important for society and community people as well. For black men and youth, their options are poverty, prison, or the military. The questions on their future applies to their youth, and people graduating from universities, and even graduate students, since there's a question of going out into the world and being unemployed. People have to start having dialogues like this. He hoped the GA votes to fund the event.

Mr. Marchand said that for new Delegates, he introduced himself and said he's the Assembly Affairs Vice President. They should talk to him after the meeting if they feel they need more information or an orientation to the GA. And for the information of new Delegates, it was important for each Delegate to initial their name or add their name to the list on the table, at the front of the room. If they haven't done that yet, they should make sure to do so.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Marchand said he would request a motion to add to the agenda a Funding Contingency Report right after Approval of the Agenda. The Report was part of the material distributed for the meeting. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Marchand called for any other changes to the agenda.

Mr. Williams moved to table discussion and vote on Resolution 1110a, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of SB 259. He was making the motion because the GA had a lot to do that evening,

and this was a pressing matter, and secondly, because the External Affairs Committee has indicated they would like more time to research it. So he would like to table it until the December meeting. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO TABLE RESOLUTION 1110a TO THE DECEMBER GA MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Marchand called for any other changes to the agenda. A motion to approve the agenda, as amended, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Marchand asked for a motion to adopt the minutes from the October meeting. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2011 GA MEETING

Approval of the Minutes (cont'd)
Funding Contingency Report

- 11 -

PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. Mr. Marchand noted that the minutes are posted online a week before the Delegate meeting.

Funding Contingency Report

Mike Sheen said that the Funding Contingency Report was printed on the financial report that was available at the front table. This is a brief summary. It was pretty straightforward. They had one discussion they wanted to bring to the Delegates' attention that dealt with the first item.

The Berkeley Law Foundation does work fundraising to help students, mainly students of color, who have expressed an interest in public interest law. A lot of public interest law jobs occur over the summer, and not all of them pay, and not all of them are able to get work that pays. So the BLF holds an event, an annual auction. Professors and other donors donate objects like a trip to Napa or wine, and people bid on them. They raise money to fund students who want to go into this field and need financial support over the summer.

Mr. Sheen said the conversation they had about this particular allocation was that it asks for money to fund the cost of a fundraiser. According to the Funding Guide, the Funding Committee is not allowed to do that. The Committee was sort of unclear as to what decision they could make. There's one section that explicitly says they can't fund fundraisers or the cost of fundraisers. But then, in a separate area, the Funding Committee seemed to have a little bit more discretion with Funding Contingency. So the Funding Committee voted on the merits of the event. They all believed the mission of this event and its objectives were to do something that was very much in line with the objectives the Committee measures. So the Funding Committee overwhelming voted to support the event. But because they're sort of bound by this, they wanted to bring this to the GA's attention. They recommend that the Delegate Assembly fund it. He called for any questions.

Mr. Rabkin said he was really nervous with funding fundraisers. They could imagine a situation where a fundraiser breaks even, but suddenly, GA money, which comes with a lot of accountability, has been

turned into what he believed will be a practice that was totally unregulated, and money could be used for anything. This might come back and bite the GA if somebody does a fundraiser and pockets the money. The GA would have a very hard time supervising this.

Mr. Marchand asked if he was making a motion. Mr. Rabkin moved to strike approval of funds for fundraising. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Klein said he respectfully disagreed with the Committee's interpretation. If they read the Resolution, 1009d, it addresses this point specifically. It states that certain activities and items will not be granted funding from any category, and lists fundraisers, weapons, and other things.

Ms. Elkabti said she wasn't sure if they're discussing whether or not funding should be allowed for fundraising. That would be helpful. In Optometry they have to fundraise every year for their graduation. It's a huge amount, and it would be helpful if some funds that they get from the GA could be allocated for fundraising.

Funding Contingency Report (cont'd)

- 12 -

Ms. Pymer asked what they were budgeting these things for, and if it was room rental, etc. Mr. Sheen said that part of it was facilities fees, and the rest of it was food costs and general costs, he believed. Ms. Pymer asked where the event will be held. Mr. Sheen said it would be in Oakland. The group found a site that was accessible by BART and bus.

Mr. Sheen said they looked at the history of this topic and he looked at the Resolution that was cited. He thought there was a difference between funding fundraisers and funding weapons. And there are also limitations by the University. A lot of people weren't totally comfortable with an absolute ban on funding all fundraisers. If they could find something that merited their support, they could approve such uses. He thought they started a conversation where, maybe going forward, they could create some guidelines and internal policies needed to make sure the GA could fund a fundraiser. One thing he would point out for this event is that the Berkeley Law Foundation has been doing this for a number of years. They're estimating to fundraise maybe \$90-100,000 this year. But the Committee definitely checked with the group to make sure the group was fundraising over the amount the GA has given them. That was certainly part of their consideration.

Ms. Navab said she had a point of order. This was in the funding procedures, in the funding guide, and not in the GA's By-laws.

Mr. Marchand said that people were saying that the funding procedures were binding on the Funding Committee, so the discussion was in order.

Ms. Pickering asked why it would be a bad idea, and why the policy was to not fund fundraisers. Mr. Sheen said he thought the general understanding in past years was that the GA didn't want to give people money so they could fundraise more money. The idea was that if groups could do fundraising, they could raise funds themselves. Giving money to a fundraiser, to some people, was the equivalent of just giving the group money. In this case, because the group was raising money for scholarships, some people viewed it as if the GA was having money for a similar cause. The GA would be directly or indirectly giving the group money to pay for somebody's scholarship.

A Delegate asked what the problem was with funding the cause itself rather than giving money for fundraising. Mr. Marchand said the group asked for funding for the event. Mr. Sheen said that if the group was asking the GA to fund a scholarship, the GA would be directly funding somebody's scholarship. The idea for the fundraiser was that the GA could leverage a certain ratio. One thing they've been talking about is if a group could prove it was going to fundraise up to a certain amount, then maybe the GA could set a guideline where there's a maximum percentage of that amount that the group would be entitled to get, as part of the costs. But the Funding Committee felt that for the \$2,000, it was a good way for the GA to support the group. The group has proven they could raise money, and in past years, they've raised over \$100,000.

Mr. Niederhut asked why the group didn't set aside money if they raised upwards of \$100,000. Mr. Sheen said he couldn't answer that. Mr. Dominguez-Quiroga said he's a Law Delegate and helped the Berkeley Law Foundation put the application together. The Foundation has been having problems with the treasurer and changed the treasurer recently. That's why they're submitting the application that year. Usually the group fundraises, but with the way the economy is, after certain events, and with the prior treasurer, the group didn't have its finances in order. If people wonder why they didn't put aside \$4,000, it's because the group gives away everything to the students. The mission of BLF is to fund the fellowships so that

Funding Contingency Report (cont'd)

- 13 -

students in public interest and government jobs, individuals who wanted to enter that career field, aren't priced out and forced to work for a law firm or doing something else. The group was having a very special problem that year. He's talked with the treasurer.

Mr. Saxena asked if the application presented details on who the fundraiser would be for, or how people were selected. He asked if the GA could make sure the money wouldn't just go towards paying one of group's executives. Mr. Sheen said he believed the group is registered as a foundation. It has a board of directors and a decision-making process that includes students and alumni. There was definitely an oversight process. The group has been doing this for years. It's something that a lot of professors recommend every year.

Mr. Marchand said they were out of time for debate.

A motion to extend discussion by 30 seconds failed by voice-vote. A division was requested. The motion failed by hand-vote.

Mr. Marchand said the motion was to remove the Berkeley Law Foundation from the Funding Report. In response to a question, Mr. Marchand said that abstentions in Robert's Rules don't count, and a two-thirds vote doesn't count abstentions. Abstaining was essentially like being absent.

The motion to remove the BLF from the Funding Contingency Report failed by hand-vote.

Mr. Marchand said they would move to a vote on the Funding Contingency Report. Mr. Klein moved to extend speaking time for another five minutes to hear a description of the other items. The motion passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Sheen said that TRANSOC, the Physics Grad Student Association, CEE Grad Student Society, all requested general GMER-like funds. None of these groups applied for GMER for various reasons. All were acceptable to the Funding Committee, and the Committee recommended funding the groups

according to how much they would have received in GMER funding had they applied. The International Graduate Student Ministry applied for additional funding for a Thanksgiving event. He believed they received GMER funding, but not the full amount. If the group had applied for funding at the GMER phase, the Committee felt that this was in line with GMER policy. So the Committee recommended funding the group the \$230 the group requested.

The Social Justice Caucus is holding a one-day conference and asked for funding for that. He believed the Social Welfare Department was putting this together. The Kroeber Anthropological Society is asking for \$1,500 for the Cornel West event that somebody made an announcement about earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Davidson said the day of the Social Justice event was listed as February 4. He asked if that was in the next round. Mr. Sheen it was, but it was right after that round begins. The group was has been planning this since the summer and wanted to know it had the money.

Mr. Klein asked how much the GA started out the year with in Contingency, how much they've spent, and how much the request was for. Mr. Sheen said he couldn't answer off the top of his head, but could find that out. Mr. Klein said he would like to know what fraction of the Contingency Fund these requests represent in the monthly allocation. Mr. Marchand said that somebody could find that out while the GA still had debate.

Funding Contingency Report (cont'd)
Resolution Referral

- 14 -

Mr. Tentori said that it seemed like it was almost easier to get funding through Contingency than through GMER. A lot of groups apply for the \$700 amount and don't get it from GMER, so this seemed like a large incentive to apply for Contingency rather than to apply for GMER. Mr. Sheen said a lot of groups apply for \$700, and it's usually because they made a mistake on their application or because the super-group they're in impacted their total application. So they apply for Contingency money because if they didn't applied for GMER, they would have had an impacted amount. But groups that did apply for Contingency that would have been GMER-eligible were getting the full amounts because they're in super-groups that would have allowed them to get the super amounts.

Ms. Navab said the purpose of GMER funding is different than the purpose of Contingency funding. If people were unclear, they could ask Mr. Sheen to clarify that. Mr. Sheen said that "GMER" funding stands for Graduate Meeting, Events, and Resources. It's funding for general operational student groups. It includes regular meetings, supplies, food, those kinds of things. Last year the GA changed the structure of funding and reduced funding rounds from four rounds a year to two rounds a year, one each semester. They wanted to counterbalance that because they knew that some groups would either not start at the beginning of the semester or wouldn't have leadership ready in place by the deadline. So the Contingency pool was expanded to counteract that. Contingency is also for requests, and it's partly to top off, or make whole, student groups that didn't get a chance to go to GMER. It's also for requests for events that are outside the traditional bounds of GMER grants or other kinds of funding. Contingency gives the widest discretion as to how the Committee wants to fund something and also allows them to really check on the details and substance of events.

Mr. Marchand said they were out of time and the vote would be on the whole Contingency Report.

THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FUNDING COMMITTEE FOR THE FUNDING CONTINGENCY REPORT, ALLOCATING \$8,396.00, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Sheen said that if people have questions, they could e-mail funding@ga.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Marchand referred the following bills to committee:

1111a, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of Three Student Regents, to the External Affairs and Rules Committees

1111b, Standing Policy In Support of a Plastic Bag Ban in Alameda County, to the External Affairs, Environmental Sustainability, and Rules Committees

1111c, Budget Amendment to Invest \$30,000 in the Graduate Assembly's Fund Functioning as an Endowment, to the Budget and Rules Committees

1111d, By-law Amendment and Budget Amendment to Create a Graduate Student Advocate Position, to the Campus Affairs, Rules, and Budget Committees

Mr. Marchand called for any changes to referrals, and seeing none, said the Resolutions were referred.

Presentation by the Student Regents

- 15 -

PRESENTATION BY THE STUDENT REGENTS

Mr. Marchand said the GA would hear a presentation by the student representatives on the Board of Regents.

Jonathan Stein introduced himself and said he was the Student Regent Designate. That means he's in the first year of a two-year term. Alfredo Mireles is in the second year of a two-year term. They're giving this presentation to as many conferences of student leaders and student government meetings as they could across the System. Earlier that week they were at San Diego and the UCLA. Next week they'll be at UCSF, UC Irvine, and Riverside. The idea is that the content in the presentation, the data and the financial information, are the data and financial information that the Regents are using to make long-term decisions about at the University, its budget, and about student fees. If students are going to be active participants in that conversation, Mr. Stein said the Student Regents feel that students needed to have the same information that the Regents have. The presentation includes a lot of tables, charts, and data.

Mr. Stein said he's a graduate student at UC Berkeley, getting a Masters in Public Policy. He has a law degree and was part of the GA last year, working under Alberto Ortega in the External Affairs team. He has been doing student organizing and campaign and activism work for the last two years.

Alfredo Mireles introduced himself and said he's a UCSF graduate student in Health Policy. He's a Berkeley grad. Go Bears!. They had a pretty substantial presentation to give.

Mr. Mireles said the Board of Regents is the governing body of the UC System. They govern ten campuses, five hospitals, and three national laboratories. They have about a \$22 billion budget. There are 26 Regents, of which 18 are appointed by the Governor. There are also four constitutional officers, includ-

ing the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. There's also one Student Regent, the UC President, and two alumni.

The UC System has conferred 1.9 million degree over the existence of the University. The Student Regents are the official student voices for the 230,000 UC students currently in school.

Mr. Mireles said that throughout the presentation, they'll be referring back to the slide being shown, "Long term Fiscal Future of the UC." This was primarily why he and Mr. Stein were present that evening. Projected out from now until 2015-16, they're going to have about a \$2.4 billion budget shortfall. That's if they don't get any new revenues, other than slight tuition increases from 1% enrollment growth over that period. What he and Mr. Stein will be talking about is what the Regents have done to fill that budget gap thus far; some measures they've looked at to fill that gap but have rejected; and then some options that have been before the Regents that they'll consider in moving forward.

Mr. Mireles said that as to what was driving UC's costs, most of the reasons they had such a big budget gap were not for untoward reasons. It's enrollment growth, composition growth, guaranteed raises in union contracts, and post-retirement issues that will cost the University and employees tons of money moving forward. They have about a 7% increase in health care costs every year. Capital renewal is \$50 million annually. Then there are non-salary cost increases, such as for energy.

The next slide was "Internal solutions equal \$1 billion. What's left?" UC has a \$2.4-2.5 billion budget gap. Internally, they've handled \$1 billion of that. He couldn't say that \$1 billion in money they found

Presentation by the Student Regents (cont'd)

- 16 -

has been all uncontroversial. A lot of issues like Operational Excellence and increases in enrollment of out-of-State and international students have gotten a lot of press and have been dialogued a lot about; and Mr. Mireles said they'd be happy to talk about that in Q&A. But as far as the presentation went, they're counting that \$1 billion and they're trying to figure out how they're going to fill the \$1.4-\$1.5 billion that remains. In the presentation they'll take a step back and kind of give a point of reference for where they are and the context of the State budget. Mr. Mireles said he worked in the State Capitol last year. California's 2011-12 General Funding Budget was \$88 billion. Out of that, \$9.8 billion goes to higher education, which was 11.6%. But the portion of that which goes to UC is less than one-quarter.

Mr. Mireles said the slide shows all the things that are included in the State's higher education funding, including UC, CSU, community colleges, and UC Hastings, plus the Post-Secondary Education Commission and the Student Aid Commission.

Comparing State appropriations in 2008-9 and 2011-12, they've gone from \$3.2 billion to what will be that year, \$2.2 billion. So they've lost about one-third of their State General Fund revenues in one year. And if they get the trigger cuts from the Governor, they're going to lose \$750 million in one year.

They should also keep in context when they talk about the State, there are two phenomenon happening, as seen on the slide being shown, "Long-term divestment from UC." One thing that got a lot of headlines that year was that for the first time, students are paying more than the State when it comes to how much it costs to educate an individual student. What that means is that students are paying more than the State is to educate themselves. This is the first time that's ever happened. If they look back to 1990-91, the State paid about 75%, and now it pays under 50%.

The other trend that's important to notice is that UC has been a good steward of public dollars. They've seen the cost it takes to educate a student decrease dramatically over this period. It used to cost about \$22,000 to educate a student. Now it's close to \$17,000. They take how scarce State resources are from the State very seriously, and consequently they use them as efficiently as possible.

Mr. Mireles said the next slide illustrates two things that are often compared, higher education and prisons. If they look at UC funding and prison funding, in 1985 they were both about 6% of the General Fund budget. If they fast forward to 2010, the most recent information they have, UC has seen its portion cut in half, while prisons have doubled.

Mr. Stein said that in terms of what long-term divestment from public education means for students, it was most relevant for undergraduates. For graduate students, odds are they don't pay most or any of their fees. If they're a professional graduate student, like he and Mr. Mireles are, it probably means they pay dramatically more than what's represented in the slide.

Mr. Rabkin asked if the numbers were inflation adjusted. Mr. Stein said they've been presented as inflation adjusted, but he will ask if that was the case. They had an e-mail out because they anticipated that question, and they haven't heard back. Mr. Mireles said he was an undergrad at Berkeley in 2001-2 and that's about what he paid. Mr. Rabkin said that would mean the numbers weren't inflation adjusted. Mr. Stein said that regardless, it's obvious that there's been a dramatic trend. And so now, for the first time, they're at \$13,200 roughly speaking. The actual total depends on campus-based fees. For undergrads it's different. UCs pay slightly different amounts, but basically for everywhere, it's just over \$13,000 a year in mandatory campus fees, whereas a decade ago, the amount was a third of that.

Presentation by the Student Regents (cont'd)

- 17 -

The next slide showed tuition at UC versus peer institutions. The definition of "peer institutions" changes. But most typically, they compare themselves to peer public universities, like Michigan, Virginia, and Illinois. The slide was currently out-of-date. "UC proposed" is actually "UC current," and is the most recent round of fee increases that have gone into effect.

What can be seen from the slide is that UC is not dramatically more expensive than other majors, and is in the middle of the pack for undergrads and grads. What they note in the slide is that historically, UC has been a nationwide leader on affordability. For decades, they were far cheaper than anyone else. But being in the middle of the pack means that they've lost their status as a nationwide leader in that area.

Mr. Stein said the next slide compares their financial aid versus peer institutions and peer publics. The "total" bar is the average cost of attending a UC campus. It includes fees, tuition, books, health care, housing, etc. for the average UC student, the cost of living at UCs varies pretty dramatically. Merced students probably pay less than the full cost of living than UCLA. But the average cost is about \$27,700. The blue bar is what the average student pays, either by writing a check to the UC Regents or through loans. The yellow bar is gift aid, which is Pell Grants, Cal Grants, private scholarships, and other scholarships. What they see is that the average UC student comes to a campus with more gift aid, on average, than students at other universities. And as a result, they tend to pay a fairly reasonable amount out of pocket compared to other universities. But what was important to note was that UC educates a dramatically different community of students than is educated at other schools. UC educates students with far wider backgrounds across socioeconomic spectrums, and educates students who typically don't have access to other institutions. If they compare themselves to Michigan or Virginia, those student bodies are dramatically whiter and have dramatically higher income. The fact that UC students on average pay what

looks like a reasonable amount doesn't actually tell them what the experience of their students are in trying to afford going to school.

Mr. Stein said the next slide represents the same information in a slightly different way. This was the one slide in the presentation that they should all be very proud of. Pell Grants are the primary form of federal financial aid. A student is eligible for a Pell Grant from the federal government if their parent, parents, or guardians make less than \$50,000 a year. The percentage of Pell Grant recipients in the student body was a pretty good indicator of how many low-income students they're educating. The total across all UCs is 39%, which is a remarkable number. That's exactly how many UC undergraduates are the first in their family to go to college. It's not exactly 39%. There are a couple of UCs that educate over 50%, which was really unique among elite universities. Their peer institutions, the privates, including Columbia, NYU, Stanford, Harvard, and one peer public, UNC, are in the low single digits. Harvard is 7%. Michigan and Virginia are in between, but far closer to the privates.

Mr. Rabkin said that Harvard doesn't charge tuition if a student's parents make \$50,000 or less. Mr. Stein said but they could still get Pell Grants students. If a student's parents made \$60,000, Harvard will take the \$5,500 from the federal government and cover everything else.

Mr. Stein said that UC Berkeley educates more Pell Grants students than all the Ivy League schools do together.

As to what solutions the Regents have considered to fill the gap of \$1.5-1.4 billion, UCOP, the central Administration, based in downtown Oakland, considered three ways to fill the budget gap. They included reducing quality, reducing access, and reducing affordability.

Presentation by the Student Regents (cont'd)

- 18 -

To reduce quality, one thing that could be done was to increase the student-faculty ratio and make class sizes bigger. They could eliminate 870 faculty positions and save \$100 million. This would have dramatic effects on the quality of their institution, its prestige, and on their graduate students. The Regents chose not to go down this route.

To close the budget gap they could also increase the proportion of non-tenure track faculty. They could replace 1,100 faculty with instructors and lecturers and save \$100 million. The Regents chose not to go down that route.

Another possibility for closing the gap was to reduce staff and services. That's happened to a very significant extent already over the past several years. It results in a lack of services for students, such as in the library, or with mental health counselors, or career services. Reducing staff by 1,280 saves \$100 million. The Regents chose not to go down that path.

Reducing quality is the one macro option that the Regents were least interested in, or least willing to hear options about. Quality for them is paramount. That's the one thing they want to protect the most.

In their eyes, the other things are far more vulnerable, or open to compromise. Something else that could be done was to reduce access, and reduce California enrollment. The Master Plan in the broadest possible sense was an agreement that was made as a State, 50 years ago, to create the greatest system of public universities in the country, if not the world; and they would be totally free to anyone who wanted to come there. It was a really bold idea. No one else in the country had ever tried it. At that time they had a State

government that actually worked, and a population that was willing to tax themselves and sacrifice and make investments. And the State actually did it. They created UCs, the CSUs, and community colleges. Some of them already existed, but they were brought into one system. And they managed to create the single greatest system of public universities in the world, and they were free for a while. People would only pay fees, housing, and books. There was no tuition. The State maintained that promise until the Reagan Administration. That began to weaken. By 2001 it still cost less than \$4,000 to attend UC. So the State has really reneged on its promise.

Mr. Stein said the second promise the Master Plan made to students was that the student body of UC would be as diverse as the State of California. They've never really managed to meet that promise. They're more diverse than their peer publics and they're far more diverse than their peer privates. But they've never been as diverse as the State overall.

The last promise that the Master Plan made to students was that the top one-eighth of graduating high school seniors in California would have a place somewhere in the UC System. They might not be able to go to their preferred UC, but they would have spots somewhere in the System. That's the one last piece of the Master Plan that the Regents have managed to uphold.

Mr. Stein said that reducing California enrollment would renege on that final promise, and the Regents have chosen not to go down that route. In fact, they're going to increase enrollment ever so slightly over the next few years so that they can make the case that they're maintaining the commitment to the top one-eighth, even with population growth.

Mr. Stein said another thing to do that doesn't quite fit under "reducing access" was to increase non-California enrollment. An out-of-State domestic or international undergraduate pays \$34,000 a year, and in-

Presentation by the Student Regents (cont'd)

- 19 -

State students pay about \$13,000. Graduate students pay one year of out-of-State tuition before they begin to start paying in-State, or, for international students, they pay three years of out-of-State tuition before they can pay in-State. That was in contrast to out-of-State undergraduates, who pay out-of-State tuition all four years. So it's a substantial amount of money, particularly when compared to an in-State student. Every 7,700 new out-of-State students generates \$100 million in new revenue. That's why there are dramatic increases in the out-of-State students at UC Berkeley, and increases at UCLA; and Davis is targeting 5,000. Small schools like Santa Cruz, that typically have very, very low numbers of out-of-State students, were also trying to get in the game.

Mr. Marchand said he thought UC Berkeley was pretty much capped in terms of its population. He asked if that would mean they'd have to reduce in-State students at Berkeley. Mr. Stein that when Chancellor Birgeneau came to Berkeley, he set a target for in-State students at 21,000. And the school was at that figure for a couple of years. They began to drift up and they're now about 500 over that number. And now it's drifting back down. They're going to displace maybe 500 in-State students, but increase their out-of-Staters by several thousand; or they'll head in that direction. That would suggest that they're not actually at capacity. Maybe class sizes will grow. But what the Chancellor has been able to do in the past year, because of the influx of money from out-of-State students, was to open up new sections and reinstate classes that had been canceled. Berkeley is in a unique situation because they have the ability to attract out-of-State and international students, unlike any other UC. That enables the school to increase its revenues by itself, because it keeps the money that it generates from out-of-State students; but that impacts diversity, and has other impacts as well.

Mr. Stein said the last thing that could be done to close the budget gap was to reduce affordability. People can reduce financial aid. One-third of all undergraduate fees goes to a pot of money that is returned to financial aid. That's why financial aid in the UC System is called "return to aid." If return to aid is reduced by 11%, that would gain \$100 million. That has been rejected by the Regents.

Another option to close the gap was to have differential fees, and charge people more for going to a flashier campus. The Regents have chosen not to do that. Another option was to charge people more for being in more expensive, lucrative fields. Mr. Stein said his brother was an Engineering student there, and Mr. Stein said he was an English major. It costs more to educate his brother, who will earn more. So the argument could be made that his brother ought to be charged more for his education. Other schools actually do charge engineers more. But the Regents chose to go down that route.

If they're not going to reduce the quality of an institution, and they're not going to reduce the number of students they admit, and they're not going to reduce financial aid, what they're left with, and the answer the Regents have come to over and over, was to increase tuition. Every 6.4% increase in tuition raises another \$100 million. UCOP's current plan for funding the University going forward, which the Regents will consider over the next four or five months, which they'll probably vote on in the spring of next year, involves even more tuition hikes over the next several years.

Mr. Mireles said that at the September Regents meeting, after several meetings beforehand, after the Office of the President beat the drum, before they officially unveiled it to the Regents, the Regents got the proposal that to fill that \$1.4-1.5 billion budget gap they would need a 16% increase in revenue each year for the next four years. Their ideal way to do that was to get an 8% increase in State revenue and have an 8% increase in tuition for the next four years. But as was seen from the slide that was shown earlier, the University has gotten cut so significantly that he didn't think that was a realistic option. Neither was a

Presentation by the Student Regents (cont'd)

- 20 -

12% tuition increase and a 4% increase from the State. He thought expecting to get the same amount from the State next year that they did this year was pretty farfetched, considering their recent past.

So if they really need to fill the budget gap, which they do, the only plan left so far that's been presented to the Regents, has been 16% tuition increases each year for the next four years.

Mr. Mireles said that as to what that looks like, in year 2015-16, an in-State California student will be paying about \$22,100 a year. He hoped that was as startling to people at the GA meeting as it was to him and Mr. Stein.

Mr. Mireles said he's been there for over a year, and for the first time in his time on the Board, they have found some other Regents who are not completely willing to go along with the plan of the OP. Almost every Regent doesn't oversee micro-level decisions. They delegate that to the OP. As to how the Regents get information presented to them, it was through senior leadership from the Office of the President coming and making a presentation. For something sensitive like tuition increases, they bring out a couple of Chancellors. Chancellor Birgeneau, e.g., will say they need approval of the proposal to maintain a high-quality institution at Berkeley. Chancellor Blumenthal, from Santa Cruz, will say the same thing. And Chancellor Fox, from San Diego, will say the same thing. And then, after the Chancellors have spoken, Pres. Yudof will echo precisely what the Chancellors said, and what staff was saying. Usually, that

was everything the Regents needed to agree with what the OP wanted. Typically, that's how a decision was made at the Board.

But in this specific instance, Mr. Mireles said that it was the first time during his time on the Board where he saw some dissension. He didn't want to be too strong with his language, and he would say there was light rejection, frustration, and wanting UCOP to come back with another plan. They didn't like the proposal, but the Regents didn't know what they wanted to do.

Mr. Mireles said that enough Regents raised a large enough concern that this plan was essentially put on the back burner, somewhat. He was happy to talk in Q&A about what the OP's plan was moving forward. The answers they had for what could be done to get that revenue, without radical fee increases for the next four years, were paltry at best, and only scratch the surface, if at all.

Mr. Stein said the idea of a massive new corporate fundraising plan was thrown out. He thought five years ago he personally would have opposed any form of corporate fundraising for the University, but that was a little naïve. There have always been intertwining between the University and corporations. But he would have been opposed to basing a huge portion of the University's budget on corporate dollars. And he continues to be opposed to the University going to Chevron, e.g., and having Chevron donate money to the Chemistry Department so research could be done that Chevron was interested in. What the Regents are pursuing in the corporate financing plan was unconditional dollars going the school. If they could raise \$100 million from corporations with no strings attached, that was money that didn't have to come from students. He would be okay with that, while five years ago, he wouldn't have been okay with it. And that's in the works.

Mr. Stein said another idea that was thrown out was a single-issue ballot initiative. The idea was to pass an oil severance tax or do something else to raise taxes on the wealthy or on corporations in order to raise money for UC. One Regent threw it out and another Regent echoed it. There were some mumblings of support, but the idea never went anywhere. In fact, there are no firm answers coming from the Board of Regents at that time.

Presentation by the Student Regents (cont'd)

- 21 -

That leaves people wondering where UC was right now as an institution, how they'll fund this place going forward, what it will look like going forward, and how much it will cost.

Mr. Stein said he had to leave, and he would apologize for that, but would leave his contact information. He wanted people to have his e-mail address and cell phone number. If people have any concerns or questions, they should feel free to access him or Mr. Mireles. Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank him.

Mr. Cohen said he had a question from an earlier slide, and asked how much federal aid UC got. Mr. Mireles said he didn't have the specific number, because it comes from so many different grants. He'd be happy to e-mail that to the GA. Mr. Cohen said that Chancellor Birgeneau's e-mails to all students at the beginning of the year stated that the State was the fourth largest funder of the UC, after the federal government, Pell Grants, tuition, and private philanthropy. Mr. Mireles said that was the case.

Ms. Navab said that since they met with Pres. Yudof a week ago, he said there was a possibility of not pursuing the four-year plan. But she's also heard rumblings from other people that instead of proposing a four-year plan with 16% increases, they'll just ask for a one-year approval of the four-year plan, because that was less controversial. Mr. Mireles said that from what he understood, the way they're going to pro-

ceed was that at the November Regents meeting, they'll vote for the expenditure side of the budget. And then in March, they'll vote for just next year. But that's typically how they vote for budgets, one year at a time. The President would be tying their hands by making the Regents vote for the expenditure side without making a commitment for where they'll get that revenue. That will be a question he brings up at the Regents meeting.

Mr. Tentori asked how donations compare at the UC System compared to other universities. Mr. Mireles said compared to publics, they do pretty well. He thought last year, Systemwide, they had about \$1 billion in alumni donations. But compared to other elite, private institutions, they're not even close. There's an expectation from a lot of California residents and students that says they paid for their tuition while they were in school, and they pay taxes now, so therefore they didn't have a duty to make robust donations like they would if they went to a private school. The Regents were trying to change that mindset; and hopefully everyone in the room will become big boosters of the University when they finish. The other point he would make is that while they get millions and millions of dollars in donations, very little of it was actually unrestricted funds that could be spent as people want. Rather, it's people like Regent Blum building a building and naming it after himself. That's more common than somebody giving an anonymous donation for student scholarships.

Mr. Rabkin asked what happens if they pass the expenses and don't pass the revenue, or if the revenues are less than expected. Mr. Mireles said he thought that if they pass the expenses side first, they'll be wedded to that plan, and then the Regents will be essentially arm-twisted and guilt-tripped into voting for the expense side year-by-year. Mr. Rabkin asked who would be next on the chopping block if they didn't pass the expense side. Mr. Mireles said that has not been established.

Mr. Hoople said he would like to speak to what was mentioned on salaries for higher-up people in the UC, and what percentage that involved. Mr. Mireles said that executive salaries are less than 1% of overall UC expenditures. They're not the ones getting raises. There's actually a salary freeze, he believed, for people making over \$250,000. From a budgeting standpoint, those salaries could get cut significantly and barely scratch the surface. But from a fairness standpoint, it only makes sense for the most fortunate amongst them to make greater sacrifices.

Presentation by the Student Regents (cont'd)
Recess for BGSF meeting
Reports

- 22 -

Mr. Huet-Vaughn asked which Regents seemed sympathetic to having a Statewide initiative for more revenue. There's a protest planned in two weeks and he asked if there will be an attempt to try and disrupt the meeting. And he asked if there was anything that Mr. Mireles would advise. Mr. Mireles said that as they saw in the last slide, they have no firm answers. They're really in a challenging position.

Mr. Cohen asked if there was any national examples of public universities that have worked together to come up with a solution. Ms. Navab said that Chancellor Birgeneau is working on something on the national level. Also, SAGE, the coalition of graduate student governments in public universities, is also working on coalitions. She said that Mr. Ortega just got back from lobbying on the federal level and will talk about that.

Mr. Mireles said it was really helpful to have these forums and he really appreciated the GA's time. The Student Regents are only as good at their jobs as they are connected to students. So he would ask them to please see the Student Regents as resources and allies. If there's an issue that's more Berkeley-focused, they could turn to Ms. Navab and other student leadership there. But if there's a Systemwide issue, the

Student Regents would be really happy to work with them. He wanted to thank them for the opportunity to speak, and hopefully they can come back and speak another time.

Ms. Navab said that if anybody would like to be the Student Regent, she believed applications come out in January for the next Student Regent. Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank Mr. Mireles.
(Applause)

Mr. Marchand said that for the next part of the meeting, they'll recess, but will meet as the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. Delegates are members of the Foundation. The BGSF is something the GA created two years ago. He first had to make sure they had quorum for the Foundation meeting. He asked all Delegates and Alternates replacing Delegates to raise their hands. After a show of hands, Mr. Marchand said the quorum was 42, and they were over that by quite a few people. He called for a motion to recess in order to have a meeting of the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. He said that this part of the meeting would be chaired by Ms. Navab. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

REPORTS

Back in regular session, Ms. Navab, GA President, reported. Ms. Navab said she chairs the Council of Presidents, the Council of all undergraduate and graduate UC Presidents. They met with Pres. Yudof on October 22 and talked about the four-year plan that UCOP was proposing. Pres. Yudof assured them the importance of the plan was to scare Sacramento, and to say that if Sacramento didn't invest, they'd have to raise tuition 16% a year. The Presidents expressed their concern about the message. Apparently the plan was to give them a way out, saying that if the State didn't give the University the money, then UCOP would just put it on the students to keep paying more. Ms. Navab said they got some feedback from other people at UCOP that instead of putting forward a four-year plan, they just might do it year by year. They'd still have a four-year plan, but they just wouldn't call it a "four-year plan." That was also really concerning to the Council.

Reports (cont'd)

- 23 -

Ms. Navab said that Regent Lansing, the Chair of the Regents, along with Regent Reiss, expressed their concern over the four-year plan. The Council has been writing letters to them, thanking them for speaking up against the proposal and encouraging them to continue, and to prevent the four-year plan from being implemented. This proposal won't come up for a vote until the March meeting of the Regents. But they will vote on expenditures before that.

Ms. Navab said that in talking to Pres. Yudof, it was really clear that a lot of Regents don't really understand graduate student education and don't understand why they need to invest in grad student education. They think all grads are on research funding and have grants. So the Council was working on better educating Regents about graduate students and their funding needs. At least at Berkeley, they'll work with Don Mogulof, PR head for the campus, to perhaps do education, like videos or short things they could give the Regents on why it's really important to invest in Berkeley and UC graduate students.

Ms. Navab said the GA will create, depending on how the Assembly votes on the Resolution at the next meeting, a graduate Student Advocate position. ASUC undergrads have a Student Advocate Office, and

it's come to the GA's attention that the SAO has been getting an increase in graduate cases. However, the undergrads don't feel they can handle graduate cases that come up that deal with about grievances, academic issues, or housing issues. The SAO tries to advocate for those students, but doesn't feel it was right for undergrads to advocate for grads. So the SAO came to the Graduate Assembly and asked if the GA could take on these issues. As a result, the idea was to create a graduate advocate to take on those cases. People would be trained as advocates and play that role efficiently. GA committees will consider the bill.

Ms. Navab said she would report on Lower Sproul, and asked to go into closed session. The motion to go into closed session was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting entered into closed session.

Back in open session, Ms. Navab said a couple of different groups on campus want to initiate student fee referendums for the spring, to be voted on in the ASUC elections. Grad students usually don't vote very highly in these elections, although they should, since there will be fees on the ballot that grads also would have to pay. One fee referendum was for the Class Pass, which pays for bus passes. It expires next year. To renew it, there had to be a vote in order for students to assess themselves to pay for the Class Pass.

Another referendum could be the health and RSF referendum. It would build a new rec sports facility that would also include a teaching space, a gym, and a meditation space. That was still going through the proper channels, but will likely come up in the spring. The GA is trying to hire a grad student to work on this referendum to try and gauge student interest and to explain to students both sides of the issue. The GA hasn't filled this paid position as yet, so she would ask Delegates to spread the word about this.

There are a couple of other referendums on the table. There was a technology fee, but students asked the campus to hold off on putting that on the ballot. The Daily Cal also wants to put in a fee referendum, and Ms. Navab said they have asked the paper to hold off on doing that. Cal Corps also wants to put in a fee, and has also been asked to hold off on that. And lastly, they've been hearing from some departments that student research grants are now being charged overhead costs. If that was the case, the GA would love to hear more stories from grad departments about this, so the GA could properly advocate for this. The reason they charge overhead to faculty is because they have administrative costs. There are people doing post- and pre-grant work. But students don't have that, so the question was why they should pay administrative costs.

Mr. Marchand said they're out of time and people could ask questions later.

Reports (cont'd)

- 24 -

Mr. Marchand, Assembly Affairs VP, reported. He said he's responsible for organizing GA meetings and communicating with Delegates and with the GA's membership at-large. If people have any questions or feedback related to the GA, they should talk to him. His report, which was posted on the Web site, includes other items.

Mr. Marchand said he wanted to give an update the committee membership. As they knew, the GA approved committees at its last meeting. But they have new Delegates who should be appointed to committees. So he would suggest that the GA approve them. A motion to approve new committee memberships was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Marchand said the Rules Chair has informed him that the Rules Committee was having trouble meeting quorum. If Delegates were on the Rules Committee and couldn't make committee meetings, and wanted to change their committee membership, Mr. Marchand said they should talk to someone. If

someone is on a different committee and couldn't make those meetings, and would be interested in Rules, they should talk to someone. The Rules Committee reviews all Resolutions. It's the smallest committee.

Ms. De la Torre, Campus Affairs Vice President, reported. Ms. De la Torre said the WOCI Coordinator just quit for personal reasons. Ms. De la Torre said she needed a motion to post the job description. The Women of Color Initiative needs a project coordinator. This person takes care of the Conference as well as programming throughout the year for women of color. Ms. Navab said she just needed permission to this out. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO POST THE OPEN WOCI COORDINATOR POSITION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. De la Torre said her office will take charge of the Mental Health Advocacy Agenda that the GA passed last time. There were two goals for them this year. One will be to do a graduate student mental health survey, hopefully by February. They'll send it out and get a lot of questions answered, so they can know what departments are and aren't using mental health services, which ones have issues with mental health, and the types of problems they have. Mental health is often stigmatized and it shouldn't be, because graduate students can often be isolated and need that help. One goal was trying to figure out where the needs are. So the survey should help with that. In order to do this survey, Ms. De la Torre said she needed the help of a person who knew how to conduct surveys. It will be a paid position, coming out of her line item for staff.

Ms. De la Torre asked how many people knew they could go to Evans to get mental health services, and a GSI wouldn't have to see undergrads there. She noted that one person raised their hand. Grad students don't want to see their students when they go to get help. So there are satellite offices at the Law School, Evans, and other areas. She would ask people to spread that around. A lot of grad students are not aware of the actual services on campus. So the GA was trying to collect that information in one user friendly guide. That was the other goal she had, to be done by March. And for that she would also like some help. So she'll send out a notice for that.

Mr. Ortega, External Affairs Vice President, reported. One thing he wanted to highlight from his report was a really interesting survey that was conducted last year regarding the City of Berkeley and business districts, and what grads and undergrads wanted to see at various locations. It's on the main GA Web site.

Reports (cont'd)

- 25 -

From the State side, Mr. Ortega said they're currently working on going to in-district visits. If any Delegates were interested in accompanying the office on these, they're setting them up. They can accommodate different people, so people should send him an e-mail if they want to go on them.

Mr. Ortega said they have a postcard campaign, part of what they were working on with the UCSA. Delegates should have gotten one of the cards when they came to the meeting. He would ask them to leave them at the desk on their way out.

Mr. Ortega said that what he really wanted to focus on was federal issues the External Affairs office was working on. He just realized that the report wasn't printed out. They're putting together a conference and he wrote down the address on the board.

Mr. Ortega said there's currently a petition going to the White House, from the "We the People" Web site. It looks at one of the main items the office has been working on at the federal level, changing the taxation status of graduate student fellowships. He would encourage Delegates to sign the petition.

Mr. Ortega said he just came back from Washington, D.C. and had a lot of very productive meetings. Some of them were disheartening, but they gave him a framework of what to advocate on behalf of grad students at the federal level. One thing that was really important to look at was how the economy was affecting funding for graduate education. Pretty much everything at the federal level was currently at a standstill because of negotiations going on in the Super Committee. Nobody wanted to introduce any proposals or advocate for any new sources of funding, or any other changes, until they figure out what they're doing. So pretty much every person he met said they're not doing anything until they heard the results of the Super Committee.

With that said, a number of things were happening that people were starting to prepare for. The Higher Education Act of 1965 needed to be re-authorized every ten years, he believed, and it was coming up for re-authorization in 2014. That was something that could make a big impact on all student programs, whether undergrad or grad, and even the number of programs that are focused on high school students to get into higher education.

Mr. Ortega said that while in Washington, he met with people in the Department of Education. The main focus they told him was that they didn't want to hear about taxes. They're changing the conversation to quality. But Mr. Ortega said such a focus makes it really difficult to try and frame a federal policy that incentivizes students, from a quality perspective. But one idea that was out there was to look at accreditation of universities and who was getting different federal dollars. One thing to highlight with that was the 90/10 rule. That refers to for-profit universities, which limit 90% federal dollars and 10% private. That was really ridiculous, if people think about it. Many for-profit institutions actually would like to exceed, and do exceed, federal dollars, because they don't have money at the other end. That meant that publicly-traded institutions were being funded through federal dollars, whereas UC Berkeley just receives a fraction of that amount. So the question was how to incorporate federal language for that.

Mr. Ortega said the other thing he wanted to bring up was that they probably all heard the President Obama's announcement last week about consolidation of student loans. It sounded like a great idea, although in practice it was really limited. One thing that was clarified during the DC trip was that it only applies to students who have new loans after 2008. People who took out a loan before 2008 don't qualify. That would pretty much include all grad students. It also meant they'd have to take a loan out after 2012.

So pretty much, no grad student would be able to take advantage of this policy. The reason was because the only way the President could push forward with this was by not increasing costs, and the consolidation of loans under the policy will create savings that will pay for that process. That was a really interesting component. What the federal government calls a "negotiated process" will happen in the spring. It will look at the details of how this proposal will actually be implemented. They're looking for nominations for people to be part of the process and they suggested he would be good as a grad student representative at the graduate, federal level. If Delegates know of anybody who might be interested, or if they would be interested in being part of this, they should let him know.

Mr. Ortega said the other issue that was going on is the Teach Fellowship Program, and it was also having a federal committee formed to look at it, and would benefit from a grad student. It goes towards students who focus on teaching careers.

Mr. Ortega said that one of the main things they'll work on through External Affairs in the next few months was to put together a set of priorities that they, as grad students, want to put forward for longer-term provisions. If any Delegates were interested in doing any of the research, or helping to brainstorm on how they can impact some of these changes, he would ask them to please let him know.

Mr. Ortega said that for the SAGE Conference, in addition to the forum, there will also be a meeting of Student Advocates for Graduate Education. Because it's at Berkeley, Delegates were invited to attend. They'll discuss how different graduate student governments represent grads at some of Berkeley's peer institutions. They'll also plan the federal Advocacy Agenda for the spring.

Ms. Navab said that she had one quick announcement to make. Faculty Mentor Awards applications for next year are now available. People could go to the GA Web site for it. One Delegate made a fabulous poster, which is posted there. People should start to make nominations.

Mr. Marchand called for any questions for Officers, and seeing none, said they would move to Resolutions.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Marchand said he had an amendment to distribute, and because he would about a bill, Ms. Navab would chair the rest of the meeting.

Consent Calendar

With Ms. Navab chairing the meeting, she said that just to remind people, all bills are placed under the Consent Calendar. Unless somebody pulls a bill off the Consent Calendar, to amend it or discuss it, all bills will be passed when the Delegates approve the Consent Calendar.

Consent Calendar (cont'd)

- 27 -

1110b, Directed Action In Support of Having the GA Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series

The following bills were up for consideration that evening under the Consent Calendar: 1110b, Directed Action in Support of Having the Graduate Assembly Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series; 1110c, Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the ReFund California Campaign and the Nov.9th-16th Week of Action; and 1110d, Standing Policy In Support of Expression, Assembly, and the Occupy Wall Street Demonstrations.

Ms. Navab said that 1110c was automatically pulled off the Consent Calendar because an amendment was being proposed. All the bills have recommended amendments from committees, but unless somebody pulls them from the Consent Calendar, they wouldn't get amended.

All Resolutions were removed from the Consent Calendar. There were no bills under the Consent Calendar.

Resolution Discussion and Vote

The following Resolution, 1110b, as amended on the floor and approved by the GA, was authored by Clara Haskell Botstein and Alberto M. Ortega Hinojosa:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF HAVING THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY SIGN ON AS A SPONSOR OF THE PANEL SERIES

WHEREAS, City- and University-affiliated groups have organized a fall Panel Series, which will continue in the spring, to increase dialogue between the City of Berkeley and the University community around important local issues. The series is sponsored by the Office of Mayor Tom Bates; Councilmembers Laurie Capitelli, Darryl Moore, and Susan Wengraf; UC Berkeley Government and Community Relations; Berkeley City College; the Berkeley Chamber of Commerce; Downtown Berkeley Association; Telegraph Business Improvement District; Berkeley Community Media; Livable Berkeley and Berkeleyside; and

WHEREAS, having the Graduate Assembly sign on as a sponsor of the series is appropriate, given the series' goal of promoting dialogue between the City and the University community, informing students about important local policies, and encouraging their involvement in City affairs; and

WHEREAS, having the Graduate Assembly sign on as a sponsor of the Panel Series would help attract graduate students to the events. Furthermore, signing on would allow the Graduate Assembly to help shape the discussion topics and select panelists to ensure that they are representative of the diverse perspectives and backgrounds of local residents and stakeholders, as there has been concern about the lack of diversity among the panelists selected thus far;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly sign on as a sponsor of the fall and spring Panel Series.

1110b, Directed Action In Support of Having GA Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series (cont'd) - 28 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF HAVING THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY SIGN ON AS A SPONSOR OF THE PANEL SERIES (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Affairs Legislative Director, Clara Botstein, will be the Liaison to the Panel Series, and the External Affairs Committee will also provide feedback on the composition of the panels.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Executive Board has the authority to review GA sponsorship and analyze decisions about sponsorship.

Mr. Ortega said that last year, through City Affairs, the External Affairs Office started working with the City and put together a number of forums that addressed issues that affect graduate students and students at-large at Berkeley. One thing was a little contentious because grads didn't really have input as to who the panelists were, and some individuals thought the panelists didn't reflect the diversity of students and faculty. So one thing they'd like to do is to be officially a part of the series and have more of a say on what topics will be discussed next semester as well as to who the panelists should be.

A Delegate asked where these sessions will be held and what will be discussed. Mr. Ortega said they usually pick a topic that the City of Berkeley and graduate students have a stake in. They're held at different places, in different rooms in MLK. Panelists are chosen based on their expertise and representation on the subject. They've had legislators, City Council members, and faculty on campus.

Ms. Navab asked how the GA sponsoring the panel would guarantee the GA a say in who the series speakers are. The make-up of the series speakers was the issue before when there was some controversy. Mr. Ortega said that part of the Resolution makes clear that the City Legislative Director position would ensure that the GA has more input. Part of the problem was that they weren't engaged in discussions when some of the original panelists were selected. And part of that was because it was over the summer, when External Affairs wasn't effective in that area.

Ms. Pymer moved to amend the Resolution to adopt the first amendment suggested by the Rules Committee. She would also like to add another Resolved Clause at the end, and adopt the External Affairs Committee recommendation. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Ms. Navab said she still had concerns about this. She appreciated that if the GA was part of the conversation, that would help them. The panel series happened that semester. The GA was listed as a sponsor even though the GA hadn't agreed to sponsor it. She got a lot of really nasty e-mails from people asking why the GA was sponsoring an event that had no diversity in its speakers, was exclusionary, etc. So she'd guess she was still concerned about sponsoring this if they don't have any guarantee. She would ask what would happen if there was still a problem, and if they could pull their sponsorship at that point. So she still had some concerns.

Mr. Ortega asked if the GA could pull its sponsorship at any time they want. Ms. Navab said she would defer that question to the Rules Committee Chair. Ms. Mendoza said the GA doesn't have an official sponsorship policy yet. But what the Delegate Assembly could do was to give Ms. Navab a directed action. She asked when the panel will occur. Mr. Ortega said they're about every six weeks or so. Ms. Mendoza said that if there's a point where the Delegate Assembly was going to meet and they want to pull

1110b, Directed Action In Support of Having GA Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series (cont'd) - 29 -

sponsorship right away, they might want to give Ms. Navab the power to do that. Ms. Navab said that decision could also be made by the Executive Board.

Mr. Rabkin said there was something slightly surreal about this. The panel series listed the GA as a sponsor even though they weren't. The GA could, at any time, vote to send a letter saying they're no longer a

sponsor and ask to be removed from the panel material. The panel organizers clearly seemed to be unable to respond to that. So it's not worth being too fussy whether or not the GA was an official sponsor or whether they could officially remove themselves since the panel organizers weren't listening.

Ms. Navab said that when she realized the GA was listed as a sponsor, she contacted them, the GA was removed from future material.

Ms. Pymer asked who the next speaker will be, and asked what the topic will be. Mr. Ortega said he wasn't sure. But he wanted to add that even though there was a lot of critique against who the panelists were, if they step back and look at the panelists who were represented and the topics that were addressed, the topics were very relevant to the campus. While they might have lacked diversity, they had people like Bruce Cain, Matthew Skinner, the Disability Director from the campus, and a speaker from the GA. They just all happened to be white. It never really crossed their mind to have a different kind of diversity. The panel organizers are very open to working with the GA and having better representation.

Ms. Pymer asked if the GA could vote to sponsor this, even if the composition of the panel is changed. She asked if the GA had time before its next meeting to respond if the panel series did something controversial. Mr. Ortega said the GA had time for the spring series.

Ms. Navab said she thought the power to grant GA sponsorship could be given to the E-Board, if the Assembly chose to do so.

A Delegate said that this happened with people already involved. She asked if the panel organizers have already considered what the GA was proposing. Mr. Ortega said he believed that Ms. Botstein has been in communication with the organizers and they are open to taking the GA's suggestions. The organizers have been open in taking suggestions since there was opposition to the line-up for speakers.

A Delegate moved to approve the bill, giving the E-Board the authority to pull back GA sponsorship if it deems that to be necessary. Ms. Navab said she would take that as an amendment to the Resolution, adding a Resolved Clause to state that, "the Executive Board has the authority to review GA sponsorship and analyze decisions about sponsorship." The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Froehle said he thought the amendment was unnecessary as the E-Board had the ability to act on matters that concern the Delegate Assembly if the Assembly is not in session, if the concern affects the GA's financial or legal status. Having the GA sponsor something that was racist might impact their legal status.

Ms. Navab said the Rules Officer's was saying that it was her interpretation that GA By-laws say the E-Board can only act on urgent matters that put the GA at significant financial or legal risk. Ms. Navab said she didn't think sponsorship was one of those things.

Ms. Pymer asked if they could limit the E-Board's sponsorship decision just to this matter. Ms. Navab said they could.

1110b, Directed Action In Support of Having GA Sign On as a Sponsor of the Panel Series (cont'd) - 30 -
1110c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the ReFund California Campaign, the UCSA Budget Campaign, and the November 9th-16th Week of Action

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT, ADDING A RESOLVED CLAUSE, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A motion to approve the Resolution as amended was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1110b, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF HAVING THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY SIGN ON AS A SPONSOR OF THE PANEL SERIES.

The following Resolution, 1110c, as amended by the author, was authored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ReFund CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN, THE UCSA BUDGET CAMPAIGN, AND THE NOVEMBER 9th-16th WEEK OF ACTION

WHEREAS, in recent years, declining State revenues have been driving budget cuts to all levels of public education in California, as well as fee increases in colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, if the State does not realize revenue levels projected under the June 2011 budget deal, the University of California (UC) will face an additional \$100 million cut that would result in a 5.9% tuition increase in the spring, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the ReFund California campaign was created by a Statewide coalition of student and labor organizations, including the UC GSI union (UAW 2865), with the goal of increasing State funding to essential services and public education; and

WHEREAS, the ReFund California campaign is asking higher education leaders to “publicly support forthcoming ballot initiatives and legislation to increase taxes on Wall Street corporations and California’s super rich in 2012,” and “reverse the tuition hikes, layoffs, and cuts.” (Source: makebanks.paycalifornia.com); and

WHEREAS, the ReFund California campaign is organizing a week of action, set to coincide with the November meetings of the Community College Governors, CSU Trustees, and UC Regents, that would include campus rallies on November 9th, as well as a rally at the UC Regents meeting on Nov. 16; and

WHEREAS, the University of California Student Association (UCSA), of which the GA is a member, is calling on Governor Brown to “include progressive taxes in his 2012 budget,” and calling for the Governor, the Legislature, and the UC Regents to support a reform of Proposition 13 to make corporations pay a fair share of property taxes (Source: ucsa.org); and

WHEREAS, the UCSA has launched a postcard campaign to raise support for its budget advocacy goals;

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ReFund CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN, THE UCSA BUDGET CAMPAIGN, AND THE NOVEMBER 9th-16th WEEK OF ACTION (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly supports the goals of restoring State revenue to public education through progressive tax measures and a reform of corporate property tax.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA directs its Officers to ask the Berkeley campus Administration, the UC Office of the President, and the UC Regents, to publicly support this same goal.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA supports the peaceful demonstrations that will occur during the November 9-16 Week of Action.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA President be directed to send an e-mail to all graduate students informing them of the November 9-16 Week of Action and their specific rights to engage in these activities.

Ms. Navab said Mr. Marchand just circulated a friendly amendment to the bill, as the author.

Mr. Marchand said the amendment was mostly based on some new information that came out, since this is an ongoing campaign. The new version was more accurate. The bottom line is that as they heard from the Student Regents, there is a lack of funding for UC, and the Regents have pretty much given up on most options except for increasing tuition. This was obviously a large issue that students care a lot about. From the UAW 2865, the GSI Union, and the UC Student Association, there's a campaign to bring in more revenue for public education. Mr. Marchand said he decided to write the bill to try and combine ideas and generate support for the upcoming Day of Action, which will occur on the 9th and the 16th. He wanted to invite Charlie Eaton, the Financial Secretary for UAW 2865, and a coordinator of this campaign, Statewide, to talk for a few minutes about grad students, both from the GSI point of view, what they want grads to do in the California ReFund campaign, and what the goal is.

Charlie Eaton said that what really happened in California was that the banks destroyed \$627 billion in home wealth. When that happens, that means there is no longer \$627 billion in home wealth to tax. That's why there was a collapse in revenue in the State, and that's why there was a collapse in revenue for UC. There has been whether there should be tuition hikes or tax hikes. The debate they need is who is going to pay, and whether it will be students, teachers, workers, and parents, or Wall Street corporations and the super rich, people like UC Regent Dick Blum, who is Chairman of the largest commercial real estate corporation in the world.

If Dick Blum alone paid real estate property taxes on the real value of his property holdings, there wouldn't be a revenue problem in the State. As for who has paid, \$17 billion has been cut to public education in the last two years. Budget analysts are proposing additional cuts. Tuition hikes have increased 200%. As to who has not paid, Wall Street banks and corporations haven't paid. Bank of America and Wells Fargo paid 0% tax because of corporate tax breaks and subsidies. As to who the board members are of their schools and universities, they are the same people who aren't paying any taxes, like Monica Lozano, UC Regent Board member, from Bank of America, or Russell Gould, a Regent, and a former VP of Wells Fargo, a position he won after he drove Wachovia Bank into bankruptcy.

Mr. Eaton said they're having a Week of Action. A lot of people in the street say that students, teachers, and workers have paid their share. They can't pay more. Now the banks, the corporations, and the super rich, who have done really well, need to pay their share. On the Board of Regents there are about 15 corporate elites. On the boards of the CSU, UC, and community colleges, about 50. Both CSU and UC Regents are meeting next Wednesday. There's a real alternative. Income taxes could be increased on California's wealthiest. There's a ballot initiative forthcoming to increase taxes on millionaires in California. It would raise \$5-7 billion in new revenue alone. What they're asking is that the UC Regents, instead of hiking their tuition any more, and selling the University to corporations, instead, pledge to support ReFund California. If powerful people like Dick Blum, Monica Lozano, and Russell Gould, got out in support, it would make a tremendous difference in the State's ability to raise taxes on the rich and on corporations, including the ballot initiative he mentioned.

Mr. Eaton said they're going to pass sign-in sheets around for people to go to the Regents meeting on the 16th. They have 32 buses going already. They expect thousands of folks to be there. And next Wednesday they're inviting folks to come out all day long, to teach out. If grads teach a section that day, they are encouraged to teach-out on Sproul Plaza, at any point in the day, and to bring their classes, especially at noon, to Sproul Plaza for a rally and a march on the Bank of America. There are packets available that folks can take on the way out. There are enough fliers to give to folks in their classes, and sign-in sheets to collect that they can then give back to the GA office. If people could be there on the 9th or the 16th, he would ask them to please sign up. He wanted to thank them for their time.

Mr. Marchand said that just to clarify, there's been a friendly amendment to swap out the version of 1110c to instead, use the version that he just passed out. If people didn't have the new version, they should raise their hand.

Ms. Navab said that regarding the last Resolved Clause, she had a meeting that day with the campus Executive Committee on Crisis Management in anticipation of the Day of Action on Wednesday. The Committee would like her to send out an e-mail to grad students on what the GA's position is, and if nothing else, to at least tell grad students what their rights are. So she'll send that out. But she would rather send it out with direction from the Delegate Assembly. She called for any questions for either Mr. Marchand or Mr. Eaton before entering into debate.

Mr. Rabkin moved to strike the third Resolved Clause, calling for the GA to support the Week of Action. There are some people present who may not have been there in 2009 when there was a wave of campus activism and things kind of got out of hand. People also pull fire alarms to disrupt other people's days. It disrupted a lot of his classmates, who had to stand outside in the rain, hoping to get their work done, while a building was locked. He was nervous to endorse the Week of Action without really knowing precisely what it is. They'll look very foolish if things get out of hand. And it would be really unfortunate if the GA had its name on it. He would like to not endorse this without a lot more confidence that it will go well.

Ms. Navab said the campus will also send out an e-mail about the Code of Conduct and about appropriate actions during protests. That will include not pulling fire alarms. With that said, 2009 was also the year of the most successful peaceful protests, when 5,000 students protested against Prop. 209 repeal. And no fire alarm was pulled. So the campus also uses 2009 as the best and worst years for protest.

The motion to amend seconded. Ms. Navab said they were in debate on the amendment.

Mr. Trager said he wanted to point out that in reality, when it's said that things got out of hand, things were out of hand with the budget situation right now. That's what was actually out of hand, not classmates standing out in the rain. He thought they would rather stand out in the rain and then want to go back into buildings and do work instead of not having a department or building to do work in. It's most important that they keep having things funded there and that they maintain their activism and voices and that they're heard, and that they can direct their comments and questions towards getting things done at the level of having things funded there.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said he thought it was a bad decision to strike the Resolved Clause. There could always be someone who does some tactic at a protest that one doesn't like. But that was no reason to not support the protest. Also, to calm people's fears, he's organizing the Coalition of Public Education, and there's a lot of discussion of people involved from two years ago. People understand the fire alarm tactic was not helpful to the cause and there's been discussion with organizers to not use that tactic. At the strike yesterday, there were 10,000 people, and 95% of them did nothing. If some people threw a rock, that's not a reason to not support a more equitable society and to help education.

Mr. Saxena said that although he agreed with the principle behind the motion as a whole, he thought it undermines the GA's effectiveness to effect change. The GA was very good at working within the system to lobby and campaign and effect change. He thought that endorsing something like this could potentially undermine their ability to do that. If the GA chooses to keep the Resolved Clause, he would recommend trying to be a little more specific in terms of what they were endorsing. For example, they might say something like they support the educational aspects of the Week of Action rather than a blanket support of everything.

Ms. Navab said they could also support something specific, like a peaceful protest.

Ms. Elkabti said she thought they're giving a vote of confidence to the students when the GA supports a Week of Action. It's just like giving support to any organization. There could be some weird thing happen, but they're instilling their trust.

Mr. Niederhut said that if there's concern that this might open them up to any legal action, they could say they support the Week of Action but not any violence or illegal activity that might be associated with the Week of Action.

Mr. Rabkin they had a class up there an hour ago. The odds are good that if they push for a tax measure, the money would get eaten by the system. The average police officer is paid \$180,000 a year, and the average police officer in Vallejo before it went bankrupt was paid much more than that.

Ms. Navab said they're talking about policy, which is different. Mr. Rabkin said the Week of Action is set up by the unions who want to do to California what they did to Vallejo, Detroit, and Oakland. This was basically just about taking money from the banks, which are actually losing money at this point and weren't profitable right now, and spending money on unions. This wasn't actually good for grads or for UC. People were being played for fools. He didn't think the GA should endorse the Resolution.

Mr. Marchand said the main point that people seemed to be worried about was that the GA would be endorsing something at which actions might be done by people who are part of the protest, but who don't

the UCSA Budget Campaign, and the November 9th-16th Week of Action (cont'd)

respect what others were doing. That's something that could happen at any protest. There is a rally on Sproul and at the Regents meeting, and that's what the GA was going to advertise in the mass e-mail. In 2009 there was a broad-based movement of 5,000 people, and it was a very peaceful demonstration. Since then, they've had another broad-based movement. Taking part was the way for the GA to have something that was a broad view of students and not something to radicalize against the students. It wasn't in just making comments that the protesters were radicals when people weren't adding their contribution. They had to push for the student actions that they wanted to see.

Mr. Cohen asked if there's an agenda for the Week of Action, and asked if the GA could say that it wants to support the educational events or seminars. Ms. Navab yielded time to Mr. Eaton. She asked if there were a series of plans for the week. Mr. Eaton said there are plenty of fliers. There are two events in Berkeley for the Week of Action, both on Wednesday. On the 9th teach-outs will begin on Sproul; at noon there will be a rally and a march from Sproul; and at 5:00, a Bay Area-wide convergence on Sproul. On the 16th, buses will start picking people up at 7 a.m. and they'll assemble at 10 a.m. at Mission Bay for the Regents meeting.

Mr. Helu said he thought it was fine for the GA to support a protest movement, and it's in their interest to do that as grads and as representatives. But they shouldn't have a blanket statement of support. Maybe they should be specific about the goals the GA would say it supports, and specific events, so that what they were supporting was clear. He would also note that the other three Resolved Clauses already pretty much state that. Support of the Week of Action was contained in the other three Resolved Clause anyway.

Ms. De la Torre said she thought the characterization of how much police get was unclear.

A motion to call the question on the amendment was made and seconded. The motion to end debate and come to a vote passed with no objection.

The motion to amend the bill by striking the third Resolved Clause failed by hand-vote 13-20.

Mr. Helu moved to amend the bill to say that the GA supports the peaceful demonstrations that will occur November 9. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote 13-20.

Mr. Helu moved to amend the bill to have the third Resolved Clause read as follows:

"Resolved, that the GA supports the peaceful demonstrations that will occur during the November 9-16 Week of Action."

The motion was seconded.

A Delegate said that if they say the GA supports the peaceful demonstrations, that would mean they're supporting the teach-out, the walk-out, and the demonstration at the Regents meeting. Ms. Navab said they're supporting the right of students to engage in those activities.

Mr. Twigg moved to amend the amendment, to add "and lawful," to have the amendment read:

1110c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the ReFund California Campaign, the UCSA Budget Campaign, and the November 9th-16th Week of Action (cont'd) - 35 -

1110d, On Standing Policy In Support of Expression, Assembly, and the Occupy Wall Street Demonstrations

"Resolved, that the GA supports the peaceful and lawful demonstrations that will occur during the November 9-16 Week of Action."

The motion to amend was seconded.

A Delegate asked if that would include civil disobedience and fire alarms.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said he didn't like the idea of suggesting that only legal things will be supported, since illegal tactics might have relevance.

Mr. Rabkin said he didn't want to turn this into a seminar on protest tactics, but the premise of this campaign was to convince the voters to impose more taxes on people. There were eight tax measures on the ballot in 2010 and every one failed. The current population of the State seems remarkably resistant to tax measures. And those tax measures even failed in a good year for Democrats, when Jerry Brown was elected. So the GA should be careful in what its tactics are, given the goal is to convince swing voters in Orange County to impose taxes on themselves.

Mr. Trager asked if Rosa Parks was obeying the law.

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

The motion to amend the amendment, to add "and lawful," failed by hand-vote 13-22.

A motion to call the question and come to a vote on the amendment to the third resolved clause, adding support of the "peaceful demonstrations" passed by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE THIRD RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 34-1.

A motion to call the question and end debate on the Resolution was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1110c, AS AMENDED BY SUBSTITUTION BY THE AUTHOR AND AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ReFund CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN, THE UCSA BUDGET CAMPAIGN, AND THE NOVEMBER 9th-16th WEEK OF ACTION.

The following Resolution, 1110d, as amended on the floor and approved by the Assembly, was authored by Wolf Rendall:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY IN SUPPORT OF EXPRESSION, ASSEMBLY, AND THE OCCUPY WALL STREET DEMONSTRATIONS

WHEREAS, we believe in the rights of expression and assembly as confirmed by the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Human Rights, and Standing Policy of the University of California; and

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY IN SUPPORT OF EXPRESSION, ASSEMBLY, AND THE OCCUPY WALL STREET DEMONSTRATIONS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the struggle of people of modest means and the most susceptible to exploitation should occupy a central role in the national discourse; and

WHEREAS, nonviolent demonstration and peaceful resistance have proven the most effective strategies for achieving positive social change; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has consistently voted to uphold decent labor practices, responsible management, and accountability from government; and

WHEREAS, distinguished faculty members, including Robert Reich, Emmanuel Saez, and George Akerlof have studied the positive role of government, optimal level of taxation, and the efficiency of high wages for labor. Their work forms an intellectually rigorous basis for rejecting conservative policies in national and global economic affairs; and

WHEREAS, the occupations taking place in New York, Oakland, Berkeley, and numerous other cities demonstrate the harm done to our communities by unemployment, foreclosures, and ineffective policy, in many cases written and executed by members of the same businesses the laws intend to regulate; and

WHEREAS, the role of corporations in society and corporate personhood as viewed in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* is a matter of concern and the accession of unlimited corporate political contributions impinges on the rights and influence of natural individuals; and

WHEREAS, the demonstrators protesting the growth of money in politics, corporate power, and government corruption reflect the ideals enshrined in all our guiding documents;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly expresses its support for peaceful assembly, free speech, and democratic principles.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly expresses its support for the Occupy Wall Street Movement, limits on corporate influence, and policy measures to ensure economic and environmental justice for our students, their families, and society at large.

Wolf Rendall said he authored the Resolution a few weeks ago, when Oakland was still being raked in the media. He thought that as a progressive institution, UC Berkeley should take an early and firm policy position to say that they support the peaceful aspects of this movement. He thought it was probably one of the most inspiring things that's happened in the past political cycle insofar as people were actually starting to demand things of their leaders and trying to face the problems that exist and find solutions. One thing he thought UC Berkeley could do was to draw on its intellectual capital. Many of the faculty support this, including some of the most distinguished faculty, one a Nobel Prize winner, who talked about policy to create a more equitable society. It's an important step for the University to take to support the demonstrations going on, especially because people of modest means were most vulnerable to exploitation and in need of the most support. An institution with as much credibility as Berkeley has could do a lot to support these people while they're going through this struggle.

Ms. Navab said there were several recommended amendments from the External Affairs and Rules Committees.

A motion was made to amend the bill as recommended by the Committees.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the amendments suggested by the External Affairs and Rules Committees. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE AMENDMENTS OUT OF COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Froehle moved to amend the sixth Whereas Clause to include Oakland among listed cities, to read, "...New York, Oakland, and Berkeley...." The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Froehle said that one amendment the GA made was to strike the wording about the role of corporations in society and corporate personhood. It would be within their place to put something back in about that. Perhaps the original text was too strong to begin with, but it would behoove the GA to mention something about this.

Mr. Wolf suggested replacing "outrageous" with "concerning." Mr. Froehle moved to amend the seventh Whereas Clause to read:

"Whereas, the role of corporations in society and corporate personhood as viewed in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission is a matter of concern and the accession of unlimited corporate political contributions impinges...."

Mr. Rabkin said he skimmed the ruling. He thought the majority had an interesting point. But it looks silly for an Assembly of non-lawyers to say they're really indignant about a court case. He asked who there has looked at the case. The vast majority have not read it or skimmed it. Maybe they could take a step back and say this wasn't their area of expertise as an Assembly.

Mr. Trager said it wouldn't be too far of a stretch to say they don't think corporations are people. He'll be in New York City, at Occupy Wall Street, and he would like to read the Resolution out, if nobody would object to that. He was moving to have this read at Occupy Wall Street. Ms. Navab said that as an Officer, Mr. Trager couldn't make motions.

Mr. Rendall said he could clarify what the ruling was in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission. The ruling states that it was invalid for the Commission to restrict freedom of speech, which the Supreme Court equated to spending money on electioneering communication. So if a corporation had something to say, which includes spending money on something, they were allowed to do so.

A motion was made to call the question on the amendment. The motion to end debate and come to a vote was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO AMEND THE SEVENTH WHEREAS CLAUSE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Helu said he had problems with the Resolution. Occupy Wall Street has no stated goals. The GA would be supporting it if it passed the Resolution, but he would ask what it was that the GA was supporting. As a group, Occupy Wall Street can't agree what they actually want to do or what their beliefs are. It's a protest movement of anger. Mr. Helu said he appreciated the anger, and understood it, but would ask what the GA would be supporting. It seemed like they were just offering a blank check for people who don't know themselves what they support.

A speaker said he always had a bit of discomfort supporting very broad causes. As a representative of his department, he felt this was a pretty politicized movement, and the GA would be giving blank support.

Mr. Trager said he didn't know how many people have been down to Occupy Oakland or who have paid as much attention to it as he has. It's a broad movement with a lot of demands, with questions about diversity and what the protesters were asking for. He thought that was actually the wrong question. He thought that what the protesters were representing was the idea for discussion about the fact that there is wealth inequality in this country. That's a fact. Secondly, it's a movement to have Americans and the world in space where they could acknowledge that inequality and come up would solutions. The federal and State governments have done nothing. If people start to listen to a broad base of individuals, somebody might have a good idea.

A Delegate said he disagreed with the statement that Occupy Wall Street doesn't have a concerted, concentrated issue, and that it seemed like there were no concerns. The reason people were occupying Wall Street was because they object to the Citizens United ruling. The protesters have said repeatedly in various fora that there is no longer taxation without representation and that the role of corporations, specifically banks, in the political process, was so large that nothing could be done about it. He would challenge anyone there to find a legitimate statement from anybody at an occupy protest where that was not on the list of things.

Mr. Huet-Vaughn said there has not been a specific policy and there are lots of different movements. But there are policy demands. There is a "declaration of occupation." They talk about issues of economic inequality. It's quite clear that Occupy Oakland has additional demands. So there are clear demands from some occupy movements.

Mr. Niederhut said that given that the Resolved Clause states that the GA supports peaceful assembly, he asked what the GA was saying that was unclear. It seemed that the objectives of the GA were spelled out in the Resolved Clauses.

Mr. Helu said he objected to the second Resolved Clause, stating that the GA supports Occupy Wall Street. He didn't think Occupy Wall Street had a clear idea of all its demands.

Mr. Rendall said he believed that if they could capture the space, they could create more concrete policy demands. That's part of the goal of the Resolution.

A Delegate said he had discomfort supporting the Occupy movement. He asked which stated goals the GA would be supporting, the New York goals or the Oakland goals.

A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and failed by voice-vote. Ms. Navab said the question was automatically called.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1110D, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY IN SUPPORT OF EXPRESSION, ASSEMBLY, AND THE OCCUPY WALL STREET DEMONSTRATIONS

Ms. Navab said that concluded their agenda. She would like to remind people that the first round of drinks at the Bear's Lair was on the GA. She would ask people to please help with the chairs and tables in restoring the room so 1% didn't do 99% of the work.

This meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary