

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

December 2, 2010

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This regular meeting concluded the Fall Semester. It was called to order at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

Announcements

Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary

A forum was held by the Better Beverage Alliance regarding at the Coca-Cola contract, to get student input for negotiations. The soft drink contract produces about \$600,000 divided among four departments. It's the second largest revenue source of the ASUC, \$200,000 a year, and is the largest revenue source of the GA, \$50,000 a year.

Regarding commercial activities in general all Auxiliary spaces are slated to be filled, producing about \$170K for the Auxiliary. Finally, as for Operational Excellence, three reports have been on outsourcing services the Auxiliary now currently provides.

ASUC Graduate/Undergraduate Mentorship Program

The Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program, in the ASUC Academic Affairs VP's office of the ASUC, was looking forward grad students to mentor undergrads.

Upcoming GA Events

The Grad Social Club will put on a holiday party. For the last couple of events 500 people have attended. People were needed to serve drinks for a little while.

GMORR will sponsor a study hall.

Resolution Referral

The following bill was referred to committee:

1012a, Directed Action In Support of Berkeley Student Co-operative's Efforts to Expand Co-operative Housing for Graduate Students

REPORTS

Round 3 Funding Report Approval

Groups that are denied funding could apply in another funding round. One group, Movies with Law Students, is run by astronomers, is dedicated to watching movies with lawyers, and to draw attention to a

loophole, put itself in the Law supergroup, although they were convinced to move to the Business supergroup.

Ms. Whelan will resign as Funding Committee Chair, with an election to be held in February.

The GA passed a Resolution last month with no provision to check groups' membership. Movies with Law Students was a test case showing that the GA had no information of groups' membership.

By voice-vote, the GA amended the Funding Committee Report by striking the funding to Movies with Lawyers. By voice-vote, the GA also struck funding for Law In Society, at the group's request.

The Vision Science Club requested \$60 over the limit and wasn't funded. A motion to fund the group at \$500 failed unanimously by voice-vote.

By voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee Report, including the awarding \$22,299.63 for GMER Round 3.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved changing the JSP's supergroup from Law to Humanities.

Public Health, 5% of the campus, was in the Public Policy supergroup, and there was no overlap among the two categories of groups. A motion to create a new supergroup for the School of Public Health passed by voice-vote.

Dissolution of Sustainable Budget Restructuring Action Agenda Item

The Budget Restructuring Agenda Item made its reports and could be dissolved. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA dissolved this Action Agenda Item. That made room for another possible Action Agenda Item.

Questions on Officer and Staff Reports

By voice-vote, the Humanities supergroup was renamed the Humanities and Social Sciences supergroup.

Restructuring Workgroup

A questionnaire was sent to current and former Officers and staff of the GA. The workgroup will meet with an expert in organizations and recommendations will be forthcoming.

Health Fee Advisory Committee

The Health Fee Advisory Board will to recommend a \$2.50 increase, from \$52 to \$54.50, resulting in about \$20,000 for improvements to Tang, a patient portal.

RSF Fee

Fees that currently fund the RSF will expire in 2015. Another fee referendum to re-fund it was being planned. Feedback can be provided. The current fee is \$82.50 per semester.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

Election for GA Graduate Council Representative

The Grad Council had an opening at that time. There were no nominations, and an election will occur at the February meeting. The Funding Committee chair position was also open.

Resolutions

By unanimous voice-vote, 1011a was approved, On Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities, as amended. It forms a workgroup to explore creating a grad community outreach program, with assistance from the EAVP. By unanimous voice-vote, Mr. Neiderhut was elected Chair. Delegates volunteered to be on the Workgroup.

By unanimous voice-vote, approved 1011b as amended, On Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee. It states that the GA does not recognize the CSF as grad student reps and supports the creation of a campus a Student Fee Advisory Committee; asks the Chancellor to comply with Systemwide Student Services Fee policy; and sends a letter to the UCSA and Student Regents.

By unanimous voice-vote, approved 1011c as amended, On Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation. It states the GA's desire to deprioritize relocation of the Center and doesn't support student fees going towards the Center.

Round 3 Funding Report Approval, Reconsidered

The GA discussed a group's request for InDesign software for a journal; getting a possible group license; and groups purchasing software or durable goods. By voice-vote, the discussion was tabled until at the February 3 meeting.

The meeting, concluding Fall Semester, adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Fall Semester, was called to order by Tiffany Ng at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary

Mr. Permaul said he would like to thank them very much for letting him join them that evening. With the time he had, he'd report on three issues. The first item dealt with Coca-Cola negotiations and the status

Announcements -- Mr. Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary (cont'd)

- 4 -

of the contract. On Tuesday night a forum was held by the Better Beverage Alliance, and 25 students joined himself, Mr. Marchand, Noah Stern, and the ASUC Auxiliary Associate Director. The forum was orchestrated by Prof. Kevin Sweeney, of the Business School. The goal was to get input from students about how to approach negotiations to either extend the soft drink contract or to go out to an RFP. There were some thoughtful ideas that came out of the meeting that will definitely come to the table.

Mr. Permaul said he thought most of them knew that the soft drink contract currently produces about \$600,000 a year to the campus. It's divided among four departments, including Intercollegiate Athletics, Recreational Sports, Residential and Student Service Programs, and the ASUC. It is the second largest revenue source of the ASUC, \$200,000 a year; and it is the largest revenue source of the Graduate Assembly, \$50,000 a year.

With a new contract, Mr. Permaul said they have the opportunity to either extend the current contract through two option years or go out to RFP. They would prefer to extend the lease, if possible, because that will increase revenue early on, and a lot of them, in the current fiscal climate, were in need of that. But they also expect Coca-Cola to sit down at the table and agree to certain conditions.

There were suggestions that came out of the meeting the other night that he thought were very good. The current contract calls for Coca-Cola to give the campus annual reports, and for the campus to measure them by customer service and corporate responsibility. The campus has not been measuring that, and Mr. Permaul said they believe there's a way to do that. The University of Michigan, for instance, brought in a third-party to help verify that what Coca-Cola was saying was accurate. Mr. Permaul said they also think that there are ways to have the contract grow over time and adjust, in terms of beverages and content, and also in terms of revenue. A number of ideas came up from students that he was sure will appear in the discussions. Students asked how they could get involved with this, and Mr. Permaul said they'd go through their Presidents. The Presidents of the GA and the ASUC will accompany him to the table when these negotiations take place, and they will be the funnel where student input will move. People might have read the article in the Daily Cal that day. It was horrible, poorly written and one sided. He wouldn't use that as a source of information. He thought there were things that came out of that meeting that could be really helpful.

Mr. Permaul said the second issue he wanted to raise dealt with commercial activities in general. At the last Store Operations Board, the Board approved the last of the new leases on Lower Sproul. They'll bring in an organic ice cream, yogurt, and cookie company, to be in the old CUBS space that faces out onto the Plaza. That will finally finish all their business spaces, for the first time since he's been there. By next year, if they have all these businesses in place, that would be about \$170,000 of additional revenue to the ASUC, which it desperately needed. So they're moving into that position. Their new vendors in the Food Court will be open in time for classes at the beginning of the year. The Coffee Spot will do a complete renovation of its space. All vendors' spaces will hopefully be renovated by the start of instruction. He would encourage people to visit Saigon Eats. When the Taste of Berkeley was there, Saigon Eats was the one vendor that had a line that went through the entire Plaza, throughout the afternoon. Students were very pleased with it. So he would encourage Delegates to stop by and visit them.

Finally, as for Operational Excellence, Mr. Permaul said that as they knew, the campus was engaged in a broad assessment of how to reduce operating costs and to look at ways of being more efficient, and clearly, to reduce the number of staff associated with certain, particular, back-end functions. The ASUC Auxiliary has had three reports done. One was done by RSSP. Interestingly enough, when they did an

Announcements -- Mr. Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary (cont'd)
-- ASUC Graduate/Undergraduate Mentorship Program

- 5 -

assessment of doing Auxiliary maintenance and custodial, RSSP expected the Auxiliary to provide them an additional \$200,000 a year in order to take over the service the Auxiliary was currently providing at the Student Union. It will be very interesting to see how that assessment turns out.

The second assessment was done by the Dean of Students, looking at taking over the advising done by GA and ASUC staff, and putting that under the Dean of Students. Mr. Permaul said Mr. Daal could speak to that, and had strong opinions about the report that was submitted. Mr. Permaul said he has yet to draft a response to either of those reports, which he'll be doing; and he was sure that Mr. Daal would share that with Delegates.

Mr. Permaul said another report will come out, more of a methodological analysis done by the Associate Vice Chancellor for BAS. The report will take a variety of back-end functions and compare how they could cost out services that the Auxiliary currently provides to services that could be distributed elsewhere on the campus, with the goal of sending more dollars back to student government. Mr. Permaul said he thought they should ask Mr. Daal about this, because it's not just strictly about money, but also about services.

Mr. Permaul said he wanted to thank them very much. He said it was a pleasure to visit the GA again and he'd see them after the holidays.

ASUC Graduate/Undergraduate Mentorship Program

Ms. Ng said Robin, of the ASUC, to make an announcement. Robin introduced himself and said he was the Director for the Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program, in the Academic Affairs VP's office of the ASUC. The program provides interaction and mentorship between undergrads and graduate students. There will be a DE-Cal next semester on Tuesday nights to provide guidance to undergrads to decide and engage with graduate students. Robin said they were very eager to find mentors for undergrads. The mentors, graduate students at Berkeley, will be paired up with undergraduate students by majors and interests. He came to the GA to ask for their help. They're all grads and were doing well in graduate school, so he hoped they could provide any help to undergrads. The job wasn't very heavy because grads didn't need to attend every meeting on Tuesday. The only thing they needed to do was connect to a mentee. And if undergrads have any problems with graduate school and send them e-mails, they could reply to the undergrads, meet with them, and talk about graduate student life. He thought this would be a very exciting experience for grads because they will know what undergraduates think and they'd be very proud if they could help undergrads. He'd send out a sign-up sheet to indicate an interest in this program. He called for any questions.

Mr. Marchand asked if there was a place where this program could be reached, and said he could send the information to Delegates who weren't present that evening. Robin said there's a Web site for the program as well as an e-mail address. If people sign up he'd send them all the information to become a mentor. The steps weren't very hard. He wanted to thank them. Ms. Ng said she'd like to thank him.

Upcoming GA Events

Announcements -- Upcoming GA Events
Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes
Resolution Referral

- 6 -

Ashley Russell said there's a flier out for a holiday party next week on Thursday. The Grad Social Club hasn't had too much trouble with attendance, and for the last couple of events they've had over 500 people. But the problem they've had is that they don't have people to serve alcohol. With her and Alex Baer working the door, they need people to show up and help out. It's fun, and people really love them when they get alcohol for free, and they'd meet a lot of people. People could stop by, for just an hour. People could send her an e-mail if they were interested. Someone suggested she make a list of the times people could work and what table people would be at. So if people send an e-mail at gsc@ga.berkeley.edu, she could forward that to them.

Elizabeth De La Torre said that on Wednesday, December 8, there will be a study hall sponsored by GMORR, with snacks and coffee, at 5:30. On Saturday, December 11, there will be a Woman's Project study hall. It's for women, by women, and everybody was welcome. It will be from 10:00 to 11:00 in Anthony Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Ms. Ng called for any objections or amendments to the agenda for that evening.

Mr. Marchand said they're going to add a Resolution for referral, Directed Action In Support of the Berkeley Student Co-operative's Efforts to Expand Co-operative Housing for Graduate Students.

Ms. Love asked for two minutes to make an announcement about the Health Advisory Board. Ms. Ng said that would be under Questions on Staff and Officer Reports.

Ms. Ng called for any other amendments to the agenda, and seeing none, said the agenda was approved. THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Ng called for any objection to approval of the October 7 minutes, and seeing none, said they were approved. THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 7, 2010 GA MEETING WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Ms. Ng referred the following bill to committee:

1012a, Directed Action In Support of Berkeley Student Co-operative's Efforts to Expand Co-operative Housing for Graduate Students, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, and Rules Committees

Mr. Rabkin said the bill looked innocuous and reasonable well written, and tells the President to write a letter. He asked if they could fast track it. Mr. Marchand said they couldn't since there was no public notice.

Resolution Referral (cont'd)
Round Three Funding Report Approval

- 7 -

Ms. Ng said they had a speaker scheduled for that evening who could not attend, Alfredo Mireles, from UCSF, because he had an important engagement there. By way of explanation, Mr. Mireles is the Student Regent Designate. That meant that he will serve on the UC Board of Regents. The Student Regent is selected by an application process each year to serve on the Board of Regents. One is chosen a year in advance to allow them, as Designate, to learn the ropes. Perhaps they could invite him back another time.

REPORTS

Round 3 Funding Report Approval

Ms. Whelan said there were a couple of corrections to the Funding Report. They weren't that big and she had correct copies available if people wanted to see the actual numbers. Some of the comments were not to fund some applications because they asked for too much money. This was just for GMER. There were off-campus events that couldn't be justified. She accidentally funded them, so she had to take them out and re-run the numbers. The change didn't affect other groups. If there's no comment next to it, such as "Exceeds \$500," or "Unjustified on-campus event," then the number by the group wouldn't change that much. They might get a few more cents.

Ms. Navab asked how many groups were impacted in this revision. Mr. Whelan said there were just two. They denied anybody who requested more than \$500, and she missed one, the Vision Science Club. Unfortunately, the Funding Committee decided to deny them that. In the original copy, however, the group was mistakenly given the money. The other one was the Vegan Legal Tastiness Organization. It didn't provide adequate justification for its on-campus event, so it also wasn't getting funded. But in the copy that was printed out, the group received the money. Those were the two corrections.

Mr. Marchand said that groups that were denied funding could apply for Round 4. Ms. Whelan said they could. In addition, groups could appeal the Funding Committee's denial within seven days, she believed, after the report is out. Groups were free to appeal and the Committee would look at that and make a decision.

Ms. Whelan said some issues don't like to die, so she would like to point out one specific group, Movies with Law Students. This group is run by astronomers that is dedicated to watching movies with lawyers. So they put the group into the Law supergroup just because there's a loophole, and just to draw attention to it. Ms. Whelan said she convinced them to move to the Business supergroup because they'd get just as

much money and not bother the lawyers. But it just draws attention to a loophole that allows groups to put themselves in whatever supergroup they care to because the GA doesn't require the group to get a Delegate to sign for that, since the GA moved away from that, per the Resolution they passed last month. But she didn't think they should talk any more about funding.

Ms. Whelan said she was resigning so the Funding Committee Chair will come up for election in February. It will be easy after this. But emotionally, she didn't think she could take any more e-mails. She called for any questions or concerns.

Round Three Funding Report Approval (cont'd)

- 8 -

A Delegate said that her department will ask the general Assembly for their group to change supergroups. She asked if it was possible while the numbers were being revised, to also just take out the JSP funding out of Round 3. Ms. Whelan said not for Round 3. They had to approve the Funding Report and she couldn't re-run the numbers that evening. The revision for supergroup allocations would take effect for Round 4.

Mr. Marchand said he wanted to take up the question of the Movies with Law Students group. He was extremely squeamish to say the group would get total funding because of a loophole. He thought the GA would want to discourage people from trying to game the system. He thought the GA should amend the Funding Report and say they wouldn't fund the group because the group was trying to abuse the system. He moved to amend the Funding Report to strike all funding to Movies with Law Students and move the request to Round 4. The motion was seconded.

A Delegate said that just so everybody knew, this group had absolutely nothing to do with Law students.

Mr. Klein said that given the Resolution the GA passed last month, there's no provision to double-check the membership of a group. Movies with Law Students claims to be in the Business School, and the GA had no way of knowing that they're not in the Business School. This was a case example, and the group should be denied funding. But the GA should only deny funding if they close the loophole.

A Delegate asked if these were students in Astronomy. Ms. Whelan said she wasn't supposed to know whether Astronomy students were behind this. And in fact, she didn't, because that was just hearsay. People could write down whatever they want on their funding application for what Delegates were being represented. There was an attempt to get a Delegate to sign a form so Delegates who represent the group's department knew who was applying for money from that department. In essence, the supergroup system, given that provision, doesn't really have any teeth. Because the GA doesn't do that, they have this example of Movies with Law Students which claims to be in the Business School.

Ms. Navab said that if they have to have put down their Delegate's name, in essence, that would be a check, because the GA could ask the Delegate if a student group was in their department. She asked if there's a Business School Delegate who signed the form. Ms. Whelan said the Funding Committee doesn't actually ask Delegates to sign. Ms. Navab said that the form asks to have a Delegate designated. Mr. Klein said the new procedure doesn't require a group to list a Delegate.

A Delegate said that his understanding of the Resolution that was passed was that it wasn't a case of getting a Delegate's signature, but that the wording, he believed, was that a roster would be provided. Ms. Whelan said that was struck out. The Delegate said he thought it was at the discretion of Funding

Committee, which would mean the Funding Committee would be able to place the group in a supergroup at the Committee's discretion if the group didn't provide the Committee with a list of names. So unless the group was making up a roster to fool the Committee, then the Committee should be able to make that decision. That was his understanding. Ms. Whelan said it was at the discretion of the Funding Committee, not her discretion. The discretion of the Funding Committee decided to fund the group. The Delegate asked what supergroup it was in. Ms. Whelan said it was Business. The Delegate said the Funding Committee didn't have to negotiate with the group to ask them to put something else on the form, and could place the group in a supergroup. Ms. Whelan said that was a bad road to go down. That meant she could place people wherever she liked. The Resolution the GA passed only took effect if a Delegate refuses to sign.

Round Three Funding Report Approval (cont'd)

- 9 -

Mr. Klein said that it would be great if they had rosters, but in the absence of a signature and a roster, the Funding Committee could only go by what the application says. This test case, Movies with Law Students, proves that the GA has no information of what the membership of this group was.

A Delegate said the Resolution didn't say they had to go by the application. Mr. Klein said the Funding Committee didn't know where to put the group.

Mr. Rabkin said the motion was to strike all funding for the group and to re-allocate that money into the pool for Round 4 of GMER. The Assembly wasn't trying to re-litigate the whole funding system or micromanage the Funding Committee. As an observation, the funding procedure the Assembly so painfully enacted last time binds the Funding Committee, but it doesn't bind the Assembly. So the Assembly could decide to not allocate this money.

A Delegate said she understood they're talking about funding, but what's happening in the Law School was that they're being divested of an entire program, and the GSP Program was being re-allocated to a supergroup, and they didn't have any control over that. Nobody asked them about it and they didn't know what to do about it. In addition, groups were adding themselves into the Law group. Law students said okay to that because at the beginning of the year, when everybody was confused and upset, and they didn't know what was going on, and the Law students agreed, without realizing what they agreed to. And there was not a proper infrastructure to make sure the Funding Committee guidelines were outlined properly. She didn't know how to fix the problem with this group, but she didn't think just divesting this one group of funds will fix the problem.

Mr. Marchand said he thought this would solve the problem of people trying to game the system because they're unhappy with something the GA passed. He moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

A Delegate asked if all this was based on hearsay or if the Funding Committee actually knew the group wasn't what it said it was. Ms. Whelan said they don't know.

Ms. Navab asked how this could be based on hearsay when Mr. Klein just said this made his statement. He wrote the request.

Mr. Klein said the GA should definitely not give the group money. He wrote the request, and it was an attempt to game the system. They should realize that there's a hole in the system.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. MARCHAND'S AMENDMENT TO THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, STRIKING FUNDING TO MOVIES WITH LAW STUDENTS AND MOVING THE AMOUNT OF THE REQUEST TO ROUND 4.

A Delegate said he would like to do the same to a JSP group, to give zero funding for this round. The group is Law In Society Graduate Association. It's the only group in the JSP Department that was put in the Social Policy Department. And he would like to change that from the Law supergroup to the Social Policy supergroup. The reason he wanted to strike the money was that the group could essentially apply for Round 4 without receiving money in Round 3. If his motion was approved, the group would have a chance to apply under the new supergroup. The motion was seconded.

Round Three Funding Report Approval (cont'd)

- 10 -

A Delegate asked what department the group was in. The speaker said they're semi-autonomous, in a School and the Law School.

THE MOTION TO AMEND THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S REPORT BY STRIKING FUNDING FOR LAW IN SOCIETY PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab said that if a department wanted to change supergroup affiliation, there wasn't a formal mechanism for that, and asked if a motion could simply be made to do so. Ms. Ng said there was no specific language for that action. Ms. Navab moved to create a new supergroup for the School of Public Health.

A Delegate asked if anybody in the room had an accurate Funding Report besides Ms. Whelan, and said that if the GA votes to approve a Funding Report, they should be able to look at the actual report. Mr. Marchand asked if all of the Funding Report that was distributed was correct, apart from two changes, to the Vision Science Club, and Law In Society. He asked if all the rest was correct. Ms. Whelan said she re-ran the supergroup funding so numbers were different by a few cents.

Mr. Klein moved to restore funding to the Vision Science Club, at \$500. The motion was seconded. Mr. Klein said that the group was cut because he asked for \$60 too much. The GA had the power to fix that.

Ms. Navab said she was in favor of restoring funding to groups and not just blanket cutting them. But she asked why they'd be giving a special privilege to this group and not to others that had requests that were over the limit.

Mr. Rabkin said there were a bunch of groups in that category. In the Report, Chemical Engineering Graduate Student Advisory Committee didn't exceed \$500, point number 21 on the report.

Ms. Ng said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by five minutes was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

A Delegate said that for point number 43, he had no idea who the Hellenistic Student Association at Berkeley was. They asked for \$507. On a point of order, a Delegate said there was a motion on the floor. If they were giving money to a group that went over the limit by \$60, maybe they should also give money to a group that went over by \$7.

Mr. Klein asked where all this money for this was coming from.

A Delegate asked what would happen if the Funding Report isn't accepted. Ms. Ng said the group would not receive notice by the expected deadline of funding.

A Delegate said that if they go through fixing groups that went over a limit, the GA would then end up always going through it. Every group that just went over the limit by a little will want their delegate to have their funding restored. And the GA will end up spending more time.

A Delegate said that for Funding Report point number 21, the group didn't exceed \$500. Ms. Whelan said that's because the group turned in multiple forms, and if they were added up, it was over \$500. There are

Round Three Funding Report Approval (cont'd)

- 11 -

different forms to describe different types of events, such as a repeating event versus a unique event. The group turned in multiple forms that asked for more than \$500. But only the first form was noted on the report.

A Delegate asked if they'll have a report that has accurate information. Ms. Ng said that was a question to ask the future Funding Committee Chair.

A Delegate said the GA should have funding guidelines that were clear, so the Funding Committee knew what to do. But if people were very concerned about going over the Report item by item, they were welcome to join the Funding Committee and not do that at the GA meeting.

A Delegate called the question on the motion to restore funding to the Vision Science Group.

Mr. Klein said they weren't sure where the money will come from and they're not even requiring that the group abide by a supergroup allocation. Ms. Whelan said the group would have gotten \$388 if it was placed in their supergroup. Mr. Klein said the amendment was for \$500.

The motion to allocate \$500 to the Vision Science Club failed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Rabkin said they all know the funding system they have wasn't perfect, and motions to improve it were welcome. But this was the best they have. Doing nothing wasn't a step forward, and it would be unfair to groups if they didn't approve the Funding Report.

Ms. Ng said speaking time had expired, so they would come to a vote on approval of the Funding Report, as amended.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, INCLUDING GMER ROUND 3, WITH \$22,299.63 AWARDED.

A Delegate said he wanted to change Jurisprudence in Social Policy from the Law supergroup to the Social Science and Humanities group. It's a supernumerary group, and currently has a departmental effort to reach out to the social sciences. They're trying to have more students from Sociology, Economics, and Anthropology to attend their events. This was methodologically and epistemologically closely aligned to the research they're doing. The founding model of the JSP Department was to study the law in action, and

not the law in books. So he would like to re-asses the validity of moving the group from Law to Social Science.

Ms. Whelan asked how many students were in the group. The Delegate said it was 45. Ms. Whelan said this would not take money from Law students, who are guaranteed, an amount, and it also wouldn't be a huge draw on the humanities. If it made more sense, ideologically speaking, to be in humanities, it wouldn't greatly impact any particular supergroup.

A Delegate asked why the group couldn't just apply for funding and say it was in social science. The Delegate Sasha said it's because they didn't want to game the system.

Mr. Klein said he thought the motion was good and he was happy to vote in support of it. However, when the GA gets stuff like this in the future, they wouldn't necessarily be able to verify that a group

Round Three Funding Report Approval (cont'd)

- 12 -

should be moved. They don't know if a small group of students was associated with one supergroup or another. The GA had to think about that as an Assembly, when these decisions get more difficult in the future.

A Delegate asked what percentage of the group's members were in social science and what percentage were in Law. The Delegate Sasha they're in the Ph.D. program, and their administrative structure was in both schools, including Law. He was applying to the graduate school for a Ph.D., not the Law School. Structurally, it's by joint appointment. The vast majority of the Department's faculty has joint appointments.

Mr. Marchand said there is the JSP Department with only one student group, but they're not talking about the student group, but about the department's make-up.

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

THE MOTION TO CHANGE THE JSP'S SUPERGROUP FROM ITS CURRENT SUPERGROUP, LAW, TO HUMANITIES, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab moved to create a new supergroup for the School of Public Health and the Health Service and Policy Analysis Program. They are 5% of the campus, and the whole purpose of supergroups was to make things more equitable, and for people to get out what they put in. Public Health was in the Public Policy supergroup currently. They're 5% of the campus. Being clumped in with the Public Policy School, which Public Health had nothing to do with. Public Policy was located across campus. The School of Public Health and the Health Serve Program were located in the same building and they hold all their social functions together. They don't have anything to do with the Policy groups. There's no overlap. Public Health only had two groups apply for funding, and if they get clumped in with another supergroup, their funding would be slashed dramatically.

The motion to add a new supergroup was seconded.

Mr. Klein said the motion made a lot of sense. He would caution the Delegate, and said it was best to lump on to another physical group if they if there's overlap. But if they don't, this was the right move.

But if they have a larger supergroup, they have access to a larger pool. A speaker said that right now it didn't make sense.

Ms. Navab said that since they have so few supergroups, they don't need to take other money. They don't lose all of theirs. The School of Public Health also includes the Health Services Policy Analysis Program.

A Delegate asked what a Public Policy supergroup would include. Ms. Navab said there were a whole bunch of groups.

A Delegate said that departments could also make that motion. Ms. Navab said they're 5% of the campus, and other professional groups have supergroups, like Law and Business. It made sense for the School of Public Policy to have its own.

A Delegate asked if he could move to refer this. Ms. Ng said it wasn't a resolution.

Round Three Funding Report Approval (cont'd)
Dissolution of Sustainable Budget Restructuring Action Agenda Item

- 13 -

Mr. Rabkin said the purpose of supergroups was to protect small departments. It turns out that this is not a small department and doesn't need protection. Having it as a supergroup would not hurt anybody and it wasn't adverse to anyone else.

Mr. Mikulin said he was in the Public Policy School. He asked what the implication would be for funding allocations to the Public Policy supergroup if they were to lose the population that was currently included in that supergroup to the school of Public Health and the Health Services Program. Ms. Navab said it would probably harm Public Policy. They get protected by Public Health. Ms. Whelan said it would basically split the current supergroup in half. Mr. Mikulin said that as a result, the overall pool of funding that their Policy supergroup would have to draw upon would be cut by half. Mr. Klein said the minimum guaranteed allotment would be cut by half.

A Delegate said that groups could collaborate in the Public Health School. Public Policy was using the supergroup's funding, but wasn't collaborating with Public Health students. Ms. Love said that wasn't correct.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded. The motion to end debate passed by hand-vote.
THE MOTION TO CREATE A NEW SUPERGROUP FOR THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE HEALTH SERVICES PROGRAM PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Dissolution of Sustainable Budget Restructuring Action Agenda Item

Ms. Ng said that Ms. Zohar wasn't present to discuss agenda item 4b, so they would move on.

Mr. Marchand said he thought Ms. Zohar thought the Resolution would be voted on that evening and wanted the GA to vote on it. He could explain the rationale. Information on it was also included in Officer and Staff Reports.

The Budget Restructuring Agenda Item was to make a report to the Budget Committee. Ms. Zohar did research, and as she says in the report, she presented reports to internal Officers, and it was to be presented to the Budget Committee and to some other Officers. Ms. Zohar said in the report this was dissolved, so he thought the GA could consider the item.

Motion to dissolve the Action Agenda Item for Sustainable Budget Restructuring was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE DISSOLVING THE ACTION AGENDA ITEM PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng said the GA now had only two Action Agenda Items active, which meant there was room for another one, which could be proposed.

QUESTIONS ON OFFICER AND STAFF REPORTS

Round Three Funding Report Approval (cont'd)

- 14 -

Dissolution of Sustainable Budget Restructuring Action Agenda Item
Health Fee Advisory Committee

A Delegate said he had a question for Ms. Whelan. She said it was just called “Humanities,” so would move to rename the supergroup to “Humanities and Social Sciences” to reflect the membership of the group. It includes Sociology, Anthropology, and Political Science. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO RENAME THE HUMANITIES SUPERGROUP TO THE “HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES” SUPERGROUP PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Hsueh said they have three Funding reports and only talked about GMER. She’d assume everybody read them and approved the other two. Mr. Klein said that when the GA approves a report, they traditionally approve all of them. They had one Contingency request for \$700 in the Grants Projects. People could look at it.

Ms. Navab asked why only one group got funded from Contingency. Mr. Klein said he could look that up. They had a long discussion about software. The Funding Committee decided not to fund that because they found open source alternatives that could be used. It seemed like the justification for the software was that it was because group members had previous experience with the program. The Funding Committee thought it could spend the money better for a grant for another group.

Ms. Love asked if that group, then, had no ability to publish. Mr. Klein said they did, with open source software. They assumed people could learn new stuff to write a journal.

Ms. Navab said that in the future it would be good if the Funding Committee could give a more complete account of its decision making and deliberation. They must have more material on what they decided and why, and the Delegates would appreciate seeing it. That would avoid questions and rehashing what the Committee did. Having two or three words wasn't as helpful as a more complete Funding report.

Restructuring Workgroup

Ms. Ng said she had a point of information, and said they needed an update from the restructuring workgroup. Mr. Marchand said the workgroup met once and will meet again next week. They sent out a quick questionnaire to current Officers and staff of the GA, as well as some former Officers they could still reach. They asked about their positions and what actually happened in their roles. Some people who were volunteers actually spent ten hours a week on things, which was something that might be surprising. There was a lot of important information they got from this questionnaire. They'll also talk about the structure of other graduate students at other universities that were similar to Berkeley. Before they leave for the winter holiday they'll meet with an expert in the School of Political Science who was an expert in these organizational questions. Hopefully, the workgroup will be able to find some specific proposals for the restructure and then make recommendations after they come back from the break.

Health Fee Advisory Committee

Health Fee Advisory Committee
RSF Fee

- 15 -

Ms. Love said everybody currently pays a fee of \$52 per semester that goes to fund the Tang Center operations. The Health Fee Advisory Board will vote on how to change that fee for next year and will recommend a \$2.50 increase, from \$52 to \$54.50. That will amount to about \$20,000 for improvements to Tang. They have decided to put that money towards development of a patient portal, to improve access and communications between patients and providers. They have received reports and analysis that this will cut down on the wait times. They considered other things but decided those uses were not as good a use of the money as the improvements from a self-service kiosk. The kiosks are not yet in operation and there are some ideas on how to make them better once they are in operation. They would improve communications from the Tang Center to students. That's what the Health Fee Advisory Board will recommend. If people have questions or feedback on that, the Board wanted to hear from them. Ms. Love said people could send her an e-mail by Friday at 5:00.

Ms. Navab said they've already approved the Funding Report, but she would like to move back to that, to discuss policy matters with Contingency funding. This was something they talked about when they approved funding procedures. She thought it merited a conversation. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rabkin called for the orders of the day. The motion would have been timely when the GA discussed the Funding Report, but they've done that. Ms. Navab said she just learned the reason why a group wasn't funded, and that wasn't something she could have foreseen. She moved to reconsider this line item in the Funding Report. Ms. Ng said that with no objection they would proceed to that after Mr. Daal's report. **THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE CONTINGENCY FUNDING REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

A Delegate moved to return discussion of the Funding Report after agenda item 6. The motion passed with by hand-vote. Ms. Ng said they would return to this later.

RSF Fee

Mr. Daal said he would like to call their attention to the last question on the Delegate feedback form, the fees that currently fund the Recreational Sports Facility will expire in 2015. People have begun to plan another referendum to re-fund it. They're trying to figure out how to package the referendum. The question on the feedback form gets at what was the most palatable package for such a referendum. The dollar amounts on the question aren't actual dollar amounts, but were to get an assessment on people's appetite for certain add-ons to referendum configurations.

Mr. Klein asked the question includes the idea of additional facilities and services, and asked if there was any idea of what those would be. Mr. Daal said they would like to increase the amount of recreational space across campus, including new gymnasiums. It would also perhaps include 24-hour gym service, expanded pool hours, things like that. Mr. Klein said he plays recreational Frisbee, and asked if those kinds of fees would go away. Mr. Daal said that if he tells him things like that in the comments, that would be helpful in order to package things to get people to vote for it.

A Delegate asked about health services. Mr. Daal said they're finding that graduate students in particular would like to see expanded health services. One way the fee could be packaged was as a general health

RSF Fee (cont'd)
Election for GA Graduate Council Representative

- 16 -

and fitness fee. Revenue from such a fee could be allocated to the Tang Center for health and fitness-related things, such as perhaps physical therapy. That budget constraint on the Tang Center would be decreased and more funding could go towards other things.

A Delegate asked the amount of the current recreational sports fee. Mr. Daal said it added up to \$82.50 per semester.

A Delegate asked if this would be a mandatory fee. Mr. Daal said it would be. Mr. Ortega said that every campus has a set of fees, "campus fees," imposed by the University or the students.

ELECTION FOR GA GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Saxena said the Grad Council has one opening at that time for a GA representative. It oversees academic affairs affecting grad students, approves new programs and revisions to programs, unit requirements, e.g., or normative time to advance to candidacy. That type of policy is set at the Grad Council. Often, the Grad Council also comments on larger issues affecting the UC System, like Operational Excellence, and other issues. The meetings are once per month, generally the first Monday.

Ms. Ng said that speaking as Rules Officer, the By-laws state that ideally, reps on the Grad Council should reflect the academic diversity of the graduate community. She called for any nominations.

Mr. Marchand nominated Karen. Karen said she's an Alternate Delegate. A Delegate nominated Josh Williams. Ms. Ng said that Mr. Williams wasn't present, and they couldn't really vote on him. Mr. Rabkin asked if someone had confident knowledge that Mr. Williams would accept. A Delegate asked if they have Alternate, if they could table this until January. Mr. Saxena said that would be a bad idea.

They want to get new people involved and aware of the issues. They've had a vacancy and he's been the only GA member who's been consistently attending for a while. He thought it would be good to get somebody new in as soon as possible.

A Delegate asked what the workload was. Mr. Saxena said there's one meeting a month. People tend to get an information packet roughly a week ahead of time that has everything in it. It's perhaps 130-pages, which people will want to understand so they knew what was going on, and could represent the interests of grad students. This representative also serves on the Executive Board. So if there was a problem with GSI salaries, for instance, they could inform other people. Ms. Ng said that being on the Exec Board involves attending one meeting per month, which lasts about two hours.

Ms. Berkeley said the document people receive for Grad Council meetings was large, but was broken down.

Mr. Saxena said that sitting on the Grad Council was a great way to learn about how the University works; and not just Berkeley, but the UC System as a whole.

A Delegate asked what influence the Grad Council has. Mr. Saxena said that any changes made to programs had to go through the Grad Council. He knew of people who would be interested if the GA wanted to table this.

Election for GA Graduate Council Representative (cont'd)
1011a, Resolution on Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities

- 17 -

Ms. Berkeley said she served on the Grad Council and it was chronically underrepresented by performance studies or anything that wasn't science. So having that representation would be very positive.

A Delegate nominated Jamie Apgar, who respectfully declined.

Ms. Ng said that seeing no nominations, they would postpone the Grad Council election until the February 3 meeting. She would ask Delegates to please spread the word that this position was open. It was a very important position. Although there was a time commitment, the return on it for grad students and the representative themselves was significant.

Ms. Ng said that as a reminder, the Funding Committee chair position was also opening up.

RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolution, 1011a was authored by Dillon Neiderhut:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO EXPLORE COMMUNITY OUTREACH POSSIBILITIES

WHEREAS, there appears to be an unmet demand among graduate students for community outreach opportunities; and

WHEREAS, external community outreach programs often fail to utilize the unique talents of graduate students and/or require time commitments that graduate students are unable to meet; and

WHEREAS, internal, department-based outreach programs are often limited by the size of their graduate cohorts and fail to take advantage of the diversity of talents within the graduate student community; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a Workgroup of no less than five Delegates be created to explore the feasibility, logistics, and implications of creating a graduate student community outreach program; and that this Workgroup shall recommend further action to the Delegate Assembly pursuant to the By-laws by or before the March 3 Assembly meeting.

Mr. Neiderhut said that it's been his experience that there is a significant demand by the graduate student community for community outreach possibilities. The Resolution would create a workgroup to look at the possibilities, and if acceptable, to create a new avenue for this.

A Delegate asked for a definition of "community outreach" and what he was advocating for. Mr. Neiderhut said he had his own ideas, but he was eager for people's input.

Ms. Navab moved to adopt the recommended amendments by the External Affairs Committee. The motion was seconded.

1011a, Resolution on Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities (cont'd) - 18 -

The following Whereas Clause would be added:

"Whereas, there are numerous funded undergraduate outreach opportunities that are closed to graduate students;"

The amendment out of committee would also add the following Resolved Clause:

"Resolved, that the EAVP will facilitate and provide assistance to the workgroup."

Mr. Marchand said there were other recommendations from Campus Affairs and asked if they were consistent. The only amendment with actual language from the External Affairs Committee. Language from Campus Affairs was just a recommendation. Ms. Ng said the only amendment that would be approved was from External Affairs.

Ms. Navab asked if the author objected to the amendments. Mr. Neiderhut said he didn't.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS OUT OF THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Seeing no other amendments or discussion, Ms. Ng said they would proceed to a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1011a, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO EXPLORE COMMUNITY OUTREACH POSSIBILITIES.

Resolution 1011a, authored by Dillon Neiderhut, was amended to read as follows:

Resolution on Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities

Whereas, there appears to be an unmet demand among graduate students for community outreach opportunities; and

Whereas, external community outreach programs often fail to utilize the unique talents of graduate students and/or require time commitments that graduate students are unable to meet; and

Whereas, internal, department-based outreach programs are often limited by the size of their graduate cohorts and fail to take advantage of the diversity of talents within the graduate student community; and

Whereas, there are numerous funded undergraduate outreach opportunities that are closed to graduate students;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that a Workgroup of no less than five Delegates be created to explore the feasibility, logistics, and implications of creating a graduate student community outreach program; and that this Workgroup shall recommend further action to the Delegate Assembly pursuant to the By-laws by or before the March 3 Assembly meeting.

1011a, Resolution on Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities (cont'd)
1011b, On Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee

- 19 -

Resolution 1011a, as amended: (cont'd)

Resolution on Directed Action to Explore Community Outreach Possibilities (cont'd)

Be It Further Resolved, that the EAVP will facilitate and provide assistance to workgroup.

End Resolution 1011a, as amended

Ms. Ng said that since they established a Workgroup, they now needed to elect a chair for it. She called for any nominations. A Delegate nominated Mr. Neiderhut. Seeing no other nominations, Ms. Ng said they would come to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. NEIDERHUT AS CHAIR OF THE WORKGROUP ON A GRADUATE STUDENT COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Ms. Ng said they could call for Delegates to volunteer at that time. Members indicating an interest were Mr. Klein, Ms. Mendoza, and Liz, and Apple. Ms. Ng said she would like to thank the Workgroup members.

The following Resolution, 1011b, was authored by Philippe Marchand and Miguel Daal:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A REPRESENTATIVE STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, the Student Services Fee (formerly the University Registration Fee) is governed by the University of California Student Fee Policy (the “Policy”), last revised by the UC Regents in May 2010; and

WHEREAS, the UC Office of the President also adopted Guidelines for Implementing the Student Services Fee Portion of the Policy (the “Guidelines”); and

WHEREAS, the Policy states that Student Services Fee revenues “shall be used to support services and programs that directly benefit students and that are complementary to, but not part of, the core instructional programs”; and

WHEREAS, the Student Services Fee provides around \$30 million in revenues to the Berkeley campus and constitute a major revenue source for key student services such as the Tang Center, the Career Center and the Recreational Sports Facility; and

WHEREAS, the revised Policy specifies how each campus' Chancellor shall consult students on the use of Student Services Fee revenues:

1011b, On Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee (cont'd) - 20 -

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A REPRESENTATIVE STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (cont'd)

At each campus, the Chancellor or his/her designee annually shall solicit and actively consider student recommendations, with the intent of honoring as much as possible student recommendations on the following: the use of Student Services Fee revenue; and the annual Student Services Fee to be set by the Regents. Student recommendations shall be provided by each campus' Student Fee Advisory Committee recognized by the Systemwide Council on Student Fees.

and

WHEREAS, the Guidelines specify that the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) “should be comprised of a majority of students who represent graduate, professional, and undergraduate students, and to the extent feasible, should reflect the relative populations of these students on each campus”, and that the SFAC “should maintain an official working relationship with undergraduate and graduate/professional student governments; and

WHEREAS, a 2003 Memorandum of Understanding between the ASUC and the UC Berkeley Administration states that:

Furthermore, it is recognized that the ASUC Academic Affairs Officer makes all appointments of undergraduate student representatives to campus and Administrative committees, while the GA Academic Affairs Officer makes all appointments of graduate student representatives on campus and Administrative committees, unless otherwise stated in the By-laws of the ASUC and GA, respectively.

and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Student Fees (CSF), which currently plays the role of SFAC on the Berkeley campus:

- (1) is composed of self-appointed students (i.e. new members are appointed by returning members of the committee);
- (2) has failed to include graduate and professional students in proportion to their population on campus, and reports to the UC;
- (3) is not accountable to students but rather reports to the UC Berkeley Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost (EVCP); and

WHEREAS, this structure of the CSF doesn't comply with either the Guidelines or the 2003 ASUC/UCB MOU cited above; and

WHEREAS, on eight (8) out of the nine (9) other UC campuses, the undergraduate and graduate student governments appoint representatives on their campus SFAC; and

1011b, On Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee (cont'd)

- 21 -

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A REPRESENTATIVE STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (cont'd)

WHEREAS, after months of discussions with ASUC and GA officers, the CSF has refused to reform itself to be more representative of, and accountable to, UC Berkeley students; and

WHEREAS, the Chair of the CSF, who is currently the only student on the workgroup responsible to bring UC Berkeley in compliance with the Student Services Fee Policy and Guidelines, has advocated against ASUC and GA participation in this workgroup;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly does not recognize the CSF as representatives of UC Berkeley.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA supports the replacement of the CSF by a committee:

- (1) composed of a majority of students appointed by the ASUC and GA;
- (2) of which the total student membership is representative of the undergraduate, graduate and professional student populations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA shall request that the Chancellor, or his designee,

(1) immediately address the issue of compliance with the Student Services Fee Policy and Guidelines, in consultation with the ASUC and GA student governments; and

(2) relinquish campus oversight of the Committee on Student Fees, leaving its successor organization to govern itself, in compliance with Student Services Fee Policy and Guidelines.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA External Affairs VP is directed to communicate this Resolution to the University of California Student Association (UCSA) and the student members of the UC Board of Regents, and request their support for this Resolution.

Mr. Daal said that last year, one of the fees that students pay, the Registration Fee, was transformed into the Student Services Fee. Some policy revisions came with this Fee, along with some guidelines for administration of the Fee. The guidelines directed having more student input involved in the allocation of the Fee. Berkeley receives about \$30 million of Student Services Fee each year. The Student Services Fee should not be used for academic purposes, but for activities that support student life and the academic enterprise.

Each campus has a committee that was supposed to be formed, the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC). Berkeley does not have an SFAC and isn't in compliance with the Guidelines. The closest thing they have to SFAC were two Committees, the Committee on Student Fees and the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services Fees (CACSSF). The Committee on Student Fees is comprised mostly of undergrads. There are some transparency issues with this Committee, how it selects members, and its representativeness, since there's only one graduate student out of the 13 members on the Committee. The

1011b, On Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee (cont'd) - 22 -

other committee, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Services Fees, was chartered by the Chancellor and is there to advise him on matters related to all fees.

Mr. Daal said the Resolution puts forth some preferences of graduate students regarding what the SFAC at Berkeley should look like, and the principles that should be involved in modeling such a committee at Berkeley. They ask for representativeness, meaning members in ratio to the actual segments of the population corresponding to undergrads and grads. They also ask for other things.

Mr. Marchand said amendments were proposed by the authors. The ASUC Senate, the undergrads, met and passed a corresponding Resolution. The Senate was in favor of the CSF continuing to appoint undergrads on campus. The GA can have its own position that applies only to grad students.

Mr. Marchand said amendments proposed that would change the wording in the first two clauses to say that they don't recognize that the CSF represents graduates and professional students. Secondly, they want the distribution of students on the Student Fee Advisory Committee to represent the population of grads and undergrads, and that all professional and grad student representatives would be nominated by the GA. They also divided Resolved Clauses under either "Standing Policy" or "Directed Action." Finally, because the ASUC wanted to keep the CSF as it is, but work incrementally to reform it, the

Resolution directs the GA President and CAVP to continue to work with the ASUC to add incremental changes. It was important to change how the CSF operates to make it more representative.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS BY THE AUTHORS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A Delegate moved to adopt the substitution wording adopted by the Rules Committee. Ms. Ng said the Rules Committee met informally online.

Mr. Daal asked how they could indicate to the ASUC that the GA could tolerate the option the Senate passed. Ms. Love said she didn't believe the GA had to. The GA's official position was that they don't believe the Committee on Student Fees should have a seat on the Committee. She didn't think they needed anything other than implied acceptance of ASUC policy. This Resolution was only addressing graduate students.

Mr. Marchand asked if there was a conflict between the GA bill and the Senate bill in terms of graduate representation. Mr. Marchand said he didn't feel there was. The last clause addresses the Senate bill. Mr. Daal said the GA Resolution was probably okay.

Mr. Marchand said that the amendments out of the Campus Affairs and Rules Committees don't conflict and were friendly to the authors. There was one situation where the two Committees conflict. The Campus Affairs Committee wanted the CAVP to oversee and appoint GA representatives, and the Rules Committee wanted the Assembly to appoint them. Mr. Apgar said that suggestion was simply to restate what was in the By-laws, in that the Delegate Assembly could review everything the GA does.

Ms. Navab moved to amend the Rules Committee amendment state, in Standing Policy, that the Campus Affairs VP would make nominations, with Delegate approval. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.**

1011b, On Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of a Representative Student Fee
Advisory Committee (cont'd)

- 23 -

Mr. Froehle moved to amend the eighth Whereas Clause, to strike "and reports to the UC." She would also move to amend, to strike lines 114 to 117 and replace them with line 112.

Ms. Love said that for practical purposes, the GA already has two reps on CACSSF who have a lot of experience and knowledge and will likely be the people appointed to the SFAC.

Mr. Daal said the Resolution was just the GA's preference, and all everything had to be agreed upon by the GA, the Committee on Student Fees, the CACSSF, and the Senate. It was a really difficult negotiation, and he hoped the bill allows him some wiggle-room.

Mr. Apgar said the By-law that establishes the CAVP's authority to appoint people to campus committees does not abdicate the GA's authority to review such an action.

A Delegate said that something else could be written if there's progress made on these issues.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. FROEHLE'S AMENDMENT TO STRIKE LINES 114-117 AND REPLACE IT WITH**

112 PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO STRIKE “AND REPORTS TO THE UC” PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1011b, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A REPRESENTATIVE STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Resolution 1011b, authored by Philippe Marchand and Miguel Daal, was amended to read as follows:

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee

Whereas, the Student Services Fee (formerly the University Registration Fee) is governed by the University of California Student Fee Policy (the “Policy”), last revised by the UC Regents in May 2010; and

Whereas, the UC Office of the President also adopted Guidelines for Implementing the Student Services Fee Portion of the Policy (the “Guidelines”); and

Whereas, the Policy states that Student Services Fee revenues “shall be used to support services and programs that directly benefit students and that are complementary to, but not part of, the core instructional programs”; and Whereas, the Student Services Fee provides around \$30 million in revenues to the Berkeley campus and constitute a major revenue source for key student services such as the Tang Center, the Career Center and the Recreational Sports Facility; and

Whereas, the revised Policy specifies how each campus' Chancellor shall consult students on the use of Student Services Fee revenues:

1011b, On Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee (cont'd) - 24 -

Resolution 1011b, as amended (cont'd)

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee (cont'd)

At each campus, the Chancellor or his/her designee annually shall solicit and actively consider student recommendations, with the intent of honoring as much as possible student recommendations on the following: the use of Student Services Fee revenue; and the annual Student Services Fee to be set by the Regents. Student recommendations shall be provided by each campus' Student Fee Advisory Committee recognized by the Systemwide Council on Student Fees; and

Whereas, the Guidelines specify that the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) “should be comprised of a majority of students who represent graduate, professional, and undergraduate students,

and to the extent feasible, should reflect the relative populations of these students on each campus”, and that the SFAC “should maintain an official working relationship with undergraduate and graduate/professional student governments; and

Whereas, a 2003 Memorandum of Understanding between the ASUC and the UC Berkeley Administration states that:

Furthermore, it is recognized that the ASUC Academic Affairs Officer makes all appointments of undergraduate student representatives to campus and Administrative committees, while the GA Academic Affairs Officer makes all appointments of graduate student representatives on campus and Administrative committees, unless otherwise stated in the By-laws of the ASUC and GA, respectively; and

Whereas, the Committee on Student Fees (CSF), which currently plays the role of SFAC on the Berkeley campus:

(1) is composed of self-appointed students (i.e. new members are appointed by returning members of the committee);

(2) has failed to include graduate and professional students in proportion to their population on campus;

(3) is not accountable to students but rather reports to the UC Berkeley Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost (EVCP); and

Whereas, this structure of the CSF doesn't comply with either the Guidelines or the 2003 ASUC/UCB MOU cited above; and

Whereas, on eight (8) out of the nine (9) other UC campuses, the undergraduate and graduate student governments appoint representatives on their campus SFAC; and

1011b, On Standing Policy and Directed Action in Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee (cont'd)

- 25 -

Resolution 1011b, as amended (cont'd)

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of a Representative Student Fee Advisory Committee (cont'd)

Whereas, after months of discussions with ASUC and GA officers, the CSF has refused to reform itself to be more representative of, and accountable to, UC Berkeley students; and

Whereas, the Chair of the CSF, who is currently the only student on the workgroup responsible to bring UC Berkeley in compliance with the Student Services Fee Policy and Guidelines, has advocated against ASUC and GA participation in this workgroup;

Therefore Be It:

Standing Policies

Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly does not recognize the CSF as representatives of UC Berkeley graduate and professional students.

Resolved, that all graduate and professional student representatives are nominated by the Campus Affairs VP and approved by the Delegates.

Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly supports a Student Fee Advisory Committee:

1. that is composed of a majority of students;
2. where the distribution of student seats reflects the relative proportion of undergraduate, graduate and professional students on the UC Berkeley campus;
3. for which all graduate and professional student representatives are nominated by the Graduate Assembly.

Directed Actions

Resolved, that the GA President shall request that the Chancellor, or his designee, immediately address the issue of compliance with the Student Services Fee Policy and Guidelines, in consultation with the ASUC and GA student governments.

Resolved, that the GA External Affairs VP is directed to communicate this Resolution to the University of California Student Association (UCSA) and the student members of the UC Board of Regents, and request their support for this Resolution.

Resolved that it is charged with serving student needs and representing student opinions.

End Resolution 1011b, as amended

1011c, On Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation

- 26 -

The following Resolution, 1011c, was authored by Waleed Abed and Miguel Daal:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A STUDY OF LOWER SPROUL PROGRAM AND FUNDING OPTIONS WHICH ENHANCE THE UC BERKELEY STUDENT EXPERIENCE

WHEREAS the B.E.A.R.S Initiative, to assess a mandatory on UC Berkeley Students to fund the revitalization of the Lower Sproul area, passed in April 2010 with a vote of 6,644 in favor and 3,659 opposed, and planning for the Lower Sproul area program is currently underway; and

WHEREAS the students of the two committees involved in the planning exercise, the Lower Sproul Program Committee and Workgroups, charge themselves to:

1. represent the diversity of, sometimes competing, desires of the UC Berkeley student population;

2. make decisions and recommendations consistent with their estimate of the best interests and desires of the UC Berkeley Student Population;

3. seek out all information necessary for making the most well-informed decisions and recommendations in their capacity as committee members; and

WHEREAS relocation of Career Center across the street from Lower Sproul, as well as fifteen other things, are featured on the non-binding Initiative ballot and terms & conditions as intended to be funded by the B.E.A.R.S Initiative fee revenue; and

WHEREAS each of those items, if incorporated in the Lower Sproul program, was chosen because they contribute positively to the Berkeley student experience; and

WHEREAS it has become clear that Referendum funding is not sufficient to deliver each of those items at the level initially contemplated; and

WHEREAS the constraint of funding calls for careful consideration of what level of fulfillment each of those items should receive in the Lower Sproul suite of programs or funding from the B.E.A.R.S Initiative fee revenue program; and

WHEREAS the question of whether to relocate the Career Center to the Lower Sproul area or to keep it in its current location presents the question: how can B.E.A.R.S Initiative fee revenue be used to most enhance the Berkeley student experience; and

WHEREAS on Wednesday, October 27, 2010, the ASUC Senate, in a vote unanimous among those present, called for the Lower Sproul Program Committee to study the option of placing the Career Center in basement of the Martin Luther King Student Union because it saw the potential for such placement to have a positive impact on the Berkeley student experience and because it wanted to support the student Program Committee members in making a well informed decision on the Career Center relocation issue;

1011c, On Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation (cont'd)

- 27 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF A STUDY OF LOWER SPROUL PROGRAM AND FUNDING OPTIONS WHICH ENHANCE THE UC BERKELEY STUDENT EXPERIENCE (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Assembly directs the GA President to request that the Lower Sproul Program Committee and Working Group commission an expedited study of the feasibility of placing the Career Center in the basement of the MLK *or* the impact on the project/operations funding gained if the Career Center were to stay in its current location as enabling other opportunities which enhance the student experience.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that that study shall incorporate policy, administrator and operations impacts of all options explored.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that opportunities to be investigated in the study, should include, but are not limited to:

- (1) expanded Hearst Gym Access (such as longer hours and supervised use of the pool)
- (2) subsidized and expanded access to existing campus practice and performance space
- (3) construction of additional practice and performance Space in Lower Sproul
- (4) administration, maintenance, and security for 24-hour use of campus classroom buildings (such as Dwinelle, Barrows, Wheeler)
- (5) construction of additional student group office and storage, as well as additional family friendly space in Lower Sproul.

Mr. Daal said the planning for the new Lower Sproul student center was underway and issues have come up illustrating the fact that they're constrained in funds and that they had to make difficult choices. One choice was what to do with the Career Center. It was an advertised element of the Referendum that students approved that the Career Center, currently at the corner of Bancroft and Oxford, would be moved to 2440 Bancroft, right across the street from Eshleman, a more proximate location to Lower Sproul. The total amount that would be paid for that move over the course of 17 years was around \$11.7 to \$13 million.

There are different options with regard to moving the Career Center. One option was to move it to 2440 and pay \$11-13 million. Another option was to move it to the basement of the MLK building, where textbooks were currently located, and pay the \$11.7 million, but have, e.g., \$7 million of that come back to the student governments for distribution to the students. In that case, the Career Center would rent space from student government.

And there are other options, such as leaving the Career Center where it is and retaining the fees to fund other elements that were advertised as part of the Referendum, such as 24-hour security, which was not currently in the budget for the 24-hour center.

A Delegate asked what "advertised" meant. Mr. Daal said that the ballot said that funds would be created that could go towards a list of 17 items. The Delegate asked if that list wasn't binding. Mr. Daal said it wasn't.

Mr. Daal said they wanted to state the preference to the Program Committee, which was in charge of figuring out what a Lower Sproul program would look like, to study the options listed in the final Resolved Clause.

1011c, On Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation (cont'd)

- 28 -

However, a new option has come to light, which they're calling a compromise. It would have the Referendum fund the move of the Career Center to across the street, which would cost \$4.7 million, and have the campus, through other resources, fund ten years of rent and onwards for the Career Center, therefore saving \$7 million for the Lower Sproul project to devote to things they don't have the money to fund, as they originally thought they would.

Ms. Navab asked why a move would cost millions. That seemed high to move office furniture and computers. Mr. Daal said the move would actually cost \$1 million. The other \$3.7 million was debt over 17 years. It cost \$1 million because the space had to be remodeled and people had to move out from that building to other places.

A Delegate asked if they could just leave it where it is. Mr. Daal said a lot of undergrads would feel really cheated if they just left it there. It was advertised on the ballot and they put it across the street because they estimated moving it would get them about 1,000 votes. So it was an ethical issue.

Mr. Saxena said the Career Center would also serve grad students, whereas other options would mean money would be spent on things that might not be as useful to grad students.

A Delegate said that it seemed like they didn't have enough money to do everything that was promised. Mr. Daal said there were some critical things missing. For example, the vision of Lower Sproul renovation was to have a 24-hour center, but they don't have security dollars for that. The Delegate said what he was hearing was that the undergrads would be unhappy and they'll break some promises. Mr. Daal said they will break some promises, no matter what, but the proposal broke the least.

Ms. Love said the Campus Affairs Committee recommended a GA position stating that they don't want to move the Career Center and don't want to spend any student fees moving it. She understood it was promised in a non-binding Initiative, so she thought the GA could say they don't support that.

Mr. Mikulin said that as far as deriving benefits from a career center, he thought it was an essential service, particularly for departments that don't have such services in-house. He didn't want any GA decision to create additional barriers to access those services and possibly impede people's development.

A Delegate said that all the GA was voting on was to direct a study of all the options, not necessarily to pick an option. Mr. Daal said they haven't considered Mr. Marchand's amendment. The Delegate said the original intention was to do a study, not necessarily pick an option. Mr. Daal said that was correct. That would delay the project a little bit, which would be expensive.

A Delegate moved to adopt the Campus Affairs Committee amendments. The motion was seconded.

A Delegate asked if the Career Center would move or not if the GA didn't vote on this. Mr. Daal said there are two binding MOUs in effect for Lower Sproul. One MOU directs that the Lower Sproul Program Committee has the right to decide whether or not the Career Center will be in Lower Sproul Plaza. The LSPC is comprised of grads, undergrads, and administrators, and whatever they decide must be by consensus. The MOU also gives the GA and ASUC Presidents the power to refuse to use Fee funding to support the Career Center. Ms. Love said it's basically a veto.

Mr. Mikulin said that given that students derive benefit from these services, he asked if it was legitimate to give veto authority on this and indicate they weren't willing to pay for those services. The theory that

the users pay, in an instance like this, seemed rational. Ms. Love said they already have veto authority. Mr. Mikulin asked what this would add. Ms. Love said the Career Center is on Bancroft and Oxford. While moving it was on the BEARS Initiative, the feeling of the Campus Affairs Committee and of Delegates generally was that grads either don't use it or seem to be fine with walking the two blocks to get there, and don't think they should spend \$4.7 million to move it. While that's not what the undergraduates want, the Committee is responsible for representing graduates.

A Delegate said the distance it would move, for the amount of money being spent, wasn't worth it. Given the scale of the campus, two blocks wasn't that far. The additional benefit of convenience was low. There

would be higher use if it was in a highly trafficked area, but if it provides such an essential service, the convenience aspect should be less important, given that it's not that far away.

Mr. Daal said a hand-out was distributed that gives information on how much graduate student usage the Career Center got.

A Delegate said he didn't think the location prevents people from using the Career Center, and the question was whether it provides essential services. No matter where it was, people would seek it out if they need it. He thought it was reasonable not to follow through on this element, and asked what was really gained by moving the Center.

Ms. Navab said that she was an undergrad at Berkeley, and part of the problem was that people don't know about the Career Center. She asked if the GA could promote the option of using money to encourage the Career Center to advertise more, rather than moving it. Mr. Daal said they could tell them that.

Mr. Marchand said that if the amendment passes, he would like to make further changes to make the Resolution consistent.

Ms. Ng said that in the first Whereas Clause, "fee" would be added after "mandatory." Because of changes to the Resolution, the last Whereas Clause was no longer relevant to the bill and would be deleted, dealing with the ASUC Senate's decision on October 27 to vote for a study of moving the Career Center to the Union basement. Also, all the Resolved Clauses would be replaced by the one clause the Committee recommended.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE CAMPUS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Marchand said the original title of the Resolution didn't make sense, so he would like to amend it to "On Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation." The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION AMEND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Froehle moved to approve Mr. Marchand's proposed amendment. The motion was seconded. The amendment would add a final Whereas Clause:

"Whereas, a proposed compromise was discussed with the ASUC and the Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, where the Lower Sproul Fee Revenues would be used to pay for the relocation of the Career Center and renovation of the new space, but not for rent or other operating expenses of the Career Center."

The amendment would also replace all Resolved Clauses with the following:

"Resolved, that the GA President is directed to support the Career Center move to 2440 Bancroft on the condition that Lower Sproul Fee revenues be only used to fund moving and renovating expenses of the Career Center."

Mr. Froehle said he thought this was a good middle ground. The Lower Sproul project was all about creating a sense of place and a vibrant atmosphere. One thing that was wrong with campus services was that things were spread out over the campus, and off-campus. He thought consolidating things to one area would lead to increased utilization. So he thought the GA should consider a middle-ground option.

A Delegate said he didn't think the Career Center would create a vibrant student atmosphere. People make an appointment, go there, and leave.

A Delegate said the Center also has excellent online services. Advertising these services would probably be useful to the majority of people who use the Center. He didn't know how much those services are used, but there are plenty of studies that state that location matters for everything. So if Delegates wish to support the idea of the Career Center being used more often, then location would make more of a difference than just about any form of advertising.

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

The motion to Approve Mr. Froehle's motion to amend failed by voice-vote.

A motion to call the question on the Resolution was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 1011c, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION REGARDING THE CAREER CENTER RELOCATION.

Resolution 1011c, authored by Philippe Marchand and Miguel Daal, was amended to read as follows:

Resolution on Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation

Whereas, the B.E.A.R.S Initiative, to assess a mandatory fee on UC Berkeley Students to fund the revitalization of the Lower Sproul area, passed in April 2010 with a vote of 6,644 in favor and 3,659 opposed, and planning for the Lower Sproul area program is currently underway;
and

Whereas, the students of the two committees involved in the planning exercise, the Lower Sproul Program Committee and Workgroups, charge themselves to:

1. represent the diversity of, sometimes competing, desires of the UC Berkeley student population;
2. make decisions and recommendations consistent with their estimate of the best interests and desires of the UC Berkeley Student Population;

1011c, On Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation (cont'd)
Funding Committee Report Approval, Reconsidered

- 31 -

Resolution 1011c as amended (cont'd)

Resolution on Directed Action Regarding the Career Center Relocation (cont'd)

3. seek out all information necessary for making the most well-informed decisions and recommendations in their capacity as committee members; and

Whereas, relocation of Career Center across the street from Lower Sproul, as well as fifteen other things, are featured on the non-binding Initiative ballot and terms & conditions as intended to be funded by the B.E.A.R.S Initiative fee revenue; and

Whereas, each of those items, if incorporated in the Lower Sproul program, was chosen because they contribute positively to the Berkeley student experience; and

Whereas, it has become clear that Referendum funding is not sufficient to deliver each of those items at the level initially contemplated; and

Whereas, the constraint of funding calls for careful consideration of what level of fulfillment each of those items should receive in the Lower Sproul suite of programs or funding from the B.E.A.R.S Initiative fee revenue program; and

Whereas, the question of whether to relocate the Career Center to the Lower Sproul area or to keep it in its current location presents the question: how can B.E.A.R.S Initiative fee revenue be used to most enhance the Berkeley student experience; and

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the GA President is directed to communicate:

- (1) the Delegate Assembly's desire to deprioritize relocation of the Career Center; and
- (2) that the Delegate Assembly does not support use of Lower Sproul Fee, or any other student-initiated fee, revenue to fund moving, renovating, operating expenses, or rent of the Career Center.

Round 3 Funding Report Approval , Reconsidered

Ms. Ng said the Assembly passed a motion to reconsider the Funding Report, which they'd consider at that time.

Ms. Navab said she understood a group asked for InDesign software and was denied because there's an open source version. When the GA talked about funding procedures, part of the conversation was about groups needing specific software, and then for the groups to determine what was necessary, and not for the GA to make that determination. If InDesign was needed for the journal, and most journals use it, one thing the GA talked about was getting a group license. InDesign has a group license available. So instead of funding this item for the group requesting it, she asked if the GA could fund a license out of Contingency that would meet this group's needs, as well as the needs of other student groups.

Funding Committee Report Approval, Reconsidered (cont'd)

- 32 -

A Delegate asked if anybody has done research to see if there's an open-source product. Ms. Love said there was, but people publishing the journal know InDesign.

Ms. Navab said that students don't have time to learn new software, and most journals use the same software.

A Delegate said this question should be addressed by the Funding Committee in its appeals process, not at the GA meeting. Ms. Navab said this was not an appeal to the group's funding, but a request to provide a group license for all grads, out of Contingency.

A Delegate asked how much InDesign costs. Mr. Klein said the group's application states that the cost of the appropriate software would be \$300 to \$500. But there was a possibility it was less.

A Delegate said that when they discussed this amendment to the funding procedure, they discussed InDesign specifically. To come back and say the GA doesn't think this was a legitimate expense would go against part of the discussion the GA had.

Mr. Mikulin said printers don't use open-source software, and use InDesign's format. Not using that would be a little problem.

A Delegate asked if this was the correct forum to discuss this. It seemed like this was a question between Policy students who made the request and the Funding Committee. If other groups use this maybe they could work together and figure out a solution.

Ms. Love said she didn't think a license could be used at two locations at the same time, and publishing a journal was very time sensitive. A Delegate asked if this should be discussed offline. Ms. Love said they didn't want to discuss this before the GA and thought this had been settled before, and thought the request was pretty clear. It was renegeing on an agreement, going back on an understanding that everybody had.

Ms. Ng said that since this was a motion to take additional money from Contingency, and no group has applied for this, the Chair would uphold the motion.

Ms. Navab said the GA hasn't specified how a group would apply for a durable good out of Contingency. Groups wouldn't apply for something as a student group, but on behalf of all graduate groups, such as for getting a license. She asked what the GA mechanism was for doing that.

A Delegate said that one problem the Funding Committee had was that the student group didn't do enough looking into the software to know how much it would cost. For GMER, a group had to provide an itemized list. When he orders things, he contacts the company to find out what the costs are before bringing the request to their boss.

Ms. Navab asked what the appropriate way to apply for a group license. A Delegate said the groups that need the license should be gathered. Mr. Klein said group signatories could sign if their groups would also like to make the purchase. He would suggest that the group appeal and put together a justification for the request.

Ms. Navab moved to table the discussion until the February GA meeting. THE MOTION TO TABLE DISCUSSION OF THE ROUND 3 FUNDING REPORT, AND THE REQUEST FOR INDESIGN SOFTWARE, UNTIL THE FEBRUARY GA MEETING PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng said that concluded the agenda and the meeting was adjourned.

This meeting, concluding the Fall Semester, adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary